



**MONTGOMERY COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT**  
THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

February 24, 2010

**MCPB**  
**ITEM # 2**  
**March 4, 2010**

**MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** Montgomery County Planning Board

**VIA:** Dan Hardy, Chief – Move/Transportation Planning Division *DKH*

**FROM:** Tom Autrey (301-495-4533), Supervisor, Move/Transportation Planning Division *TA*  
David Anspacher (301-495-2191), Planner Coordinator, *DA*  
Move/Transportation Planning Division  
Katherine Holt (301-495-4549), Planner Coordinator, *KH*  
Vision/Community-Based Planning Division

**SUBJECT:** Purple Line Functional Plan – Worksession Number One

**STAFF**

**RECOMMENDATION:** Approve selected revisions to Draft Plan.

---

**Recommendations, Prior Actions and Schedule**

Recommendations

Staff asks Planning Board concurrence on the following discussion topics. A second worksession will be scheduled to review a Final Draft and approve the transmittal to County Council.

1. Retain Draft Plan trail location on north side of the Georgetown Branch right of way between Bethesda and Jones Mill Road.
2. Retain Draft Plan at-grade crossing at Lynn Drive with understanding that active warning devices such as lights, pedestrian gates, bells, and or other components may be part of hazard mitigation at this location. Request MTA to review potential alternatives to this crossing.
3. Retain Draft Plan double track configuration along entire segment of Purple Line.
4. Confirm objectives related to Capital Crescent Trail and Met Branch Trail connections at the Silver Spring Transit Center.
5. Confirm status of concept design and analyses underway related to the Purple Line along Bonifant Street.
6. Clarify Draft Plan width of Silver Spring Green Trail on Wayne Avenue as minimum eight foot wide joint use path and five foot buffer.

7. Confirm Draft Plan recommendation that design will incorporate space necessary for possible future station in vicinity of Dale Drive.
8. Approve selected technical edits in response to comments received from public, stakeholders, and governmental agencies.
9. Approve selected formatting and editorial changes recommended by staff.

The following paragraph provides specific recommendations, findings, and proposed revisions to Plan wording for each of these topics (**in bold**). Recommended additions to the Plan wording are in **bold underline**, and all recommended changes are also labeled as “a.” through “g.” for reference in Topics 1 through 9.

#### Prior Action

Prior actions related to this phase of Purple Line project planning include the following:

- October 30, 2007 – Master Plan Advisory Group Meets for First Time
- October 17, 2008 – Maryland Transit Administration Releases Alternatives Analysis / Draft Environmental Impact Statement (AA/DEIS)
- January 15, 2009 – Planning Board Recommends Medium Investment Light Rail Alternative with modifications as Locally Preferred Alternative
- January 27, 2009 – County Council Recommends Medium Investment Light Rail Alternative with modifications as Locally Preferred Alternative
- February 2, 2009 – County Executive and County Council forward recommendation on Locally Preferred Alternative to then Secretary Porcari (see Attachment A)
- August 4, 2009 – Governor O’Malley Selects Medium Investment Light Rail Alternative with modifications as Locally Preferred Alternative
- October 29, 2009 – Planning Board Approves Public Hearing Plan Draft Plan
- December 10, 2009 – Public Hearing on Purple Line Functional Plan

#### Future Tentative Schedule Related to the Functional Plan

- March 4, 2010 – Worksession Number 1
- April 1, 2010 (Tentative ) – Worksession Number 2
- April 2010 – Planning Board Forwards Draft Plan to Council
- May and June 2010 – County Executive Fiscal Review of Plan
- June 2010 – County Council Hearing Notice Period
- July 2010 – County Council Review and Adoption of Plan.

#### Latest Estimated Schedule for MTA Purple Line Project Planning

- Winter/Spring 2010 - MTA submits New Starts application and request to enter Preliminary Engineering (PE) / Final Environmental Impact Study (FEIS)
- Spring 2010 – Begin PE/FEIS
- Winter 2012 (First Quarter Calendar 2012) – Complete PE/FEIS


- Spring 2012 – Begin Final Design
- 2013 / 2014 – Begin Construction
- 2016 / 2017 – Complete Construction

## Background

The Planning Board Public Hearing Draft Plan was approved on October 29, 2009. A Public Hearing on the Purple Line Functional Plan was held on December 10, 2009. The comment period closed on February 12, 2010. The comment period was extended twice – the first time because of a technical error in the Public Hearing notice and a second time because of newspaper failure to publish the notice related to the snowstorm in December. This is the first worksession on the plan.

The Purple Line Functional Plan is an update of the Georgetown Branch Master Plan Amendment (January 1990) and as such, will amend other adopted plans and the Master Plan of Highways that previously reflected a Purple Line from Bethesda to Silver Spring. This Public Hearing Draft Plan also confirms the previously adopted alignment over the Georgetown Branch right of way with the adjoining Capital Crescent Trail and (unlike previously adopted plans) extends the Purple Line east of Silver Spring to the County Boundary on University Boulevard (MD 193) where the Purple Line enters Prince George’s County and continues east to New Carrollton. Figure 1 depicts the Purple Line within Montgomery County.

**Figure 1 – Purple Line Within Montgomery County**



## Public Testimony

A total of 40 individuals testified at the Public Hearing on December 10, 2009 – some representing groups but many testifying as individuals and not representing any specific group. Over 80 additional individuals or groups submitted written testimony prior to the close of the comment period at the end of the day on Friday, February 14, 2010. The staff also received a

number of comments in advance of the Public Hearing – between the time the Public Hearing Draft was approved on October 29, 2009 and the Public Hearing on December 10, 2009. All of the above testimony or comments are summarized in Attachment B of this staff memorandum. Attachment B also includes staff responses to the testimony or comments. The testimony and comments are in chronological order.

## **Worksession Objective**


The objective of this first worksession is to examine those issues raised by the testimony that have not been previously addressed by the Planning Board and County Council. In that regard, this memo does not revisit the issues of the Purple Line alignment or mode. This memo also does not examine mitigation efforts related to environmental impact – important considerations that were included in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and that will be further examined and refined throughout Preliminary Engineering (PE) and the development of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS).

**This memo, therefore, focuses on other issues raised in the testimony for which the staff is seeking guidance prior to the development of the Planning Board Draft Plan that will be forwarded to County Council.** There are also proposed changes and/or housekeeping items related to the document layout, organization and narrative that the staff would also like to review with the Planning Board that were not part of the public testimony.

### **1. THE CAPITAL CRESCENT TRAIL – NORTH SIDE OR SOUTH SIDE IN BETHESDA-CHEVY CHASE?**


The Public Hearing Draft of the Purple Line Functional Plan reflects the Locally Preferred Alternative and therefore shows the trail on the north side of the Georgetown Branch right of way from Pearl Street in Bethesda east to a point just south and west of the Jones Bridge Road / Jones Mill Road intersection where the trail crosses to the south side before going under Jones Mill Road. Figure 2 depicts the segment where the trail is on the north side of the right of way.

**Figure 2 – Purple Line from Bethesda to Jones Mill Road**




The Town of Chevy Chase boundary in this area extends east along the south side of Georgetown Branch right of way from 47<sup>th</sup> Street (just east of Wisconsin Avenue) to East West Highway. There are three trail access points in this area – one at Pearl Street (see Figure 3), one at Lynn Drive (see Figure 4), and one from East West Highway (also shown in Figure 4).

**Figure 3 – Purple Line and Trail @ Pearl Street**



Source: MTA Website – LPA Drawings

**Figure 4 – Purple Line and Trail @ Lynn Drive and East West Highway**



Source: MTA Website – LPA Drawings




The Town of Chevy Chase presented testimony at the December 10, 2009 public hearing and also submitted supplemental written comments on February 12, 2010. The testimony and supplemental comments are included as Attachment C. The Town's testimony and comments include a number of concerns. One particular focus (particularly in the case of the supplemental comments) is the location of the trail and the at-grade crossing that provides pedestrian access to the trail at Lynn Drive (to/from the south) and Montgomery Avenue (to/from the north). A discussion of some of the factors related to this issue is presented below.

It should be noted at the outset of this discussion that the supplemental comments submitted by the Town conclude with a request to "deny the State's request to amend (the plan) ... until the State conducts sufficient preliminary engineering on both alternatives (trail on either north or south side) ..."

#### Current Master Plan (1990 Georgetown Branch Master Plan Amendment)

The 1990 Master Plan includes a trail on the south side of the right of way and a "pedestrian lane/bridge" over the right of way providing a path between Montgomery Avenue to Lynn Drive (see Figure 5 below). The closest access point to the trail to the west is at Elm Street Park. The closest access point to the east is a stairway on the north side of East West Highway. Just to the east of that location is a pedestrian path on County right of way at Sleaford Road that goes under the Georgetown Branch right of way. The 1990 Master Plan includes a proposed future station under East West Highway that would be served during off-peak hours only.

**Figure 5 – Lynn Drive Access Point in Current Master Plan**



Source:

*Georgetown Branch Master Plan Amendment – Approved and Adopted – January 1990, Figure 22, page 56.*

#### Public Hearing Draft Plan and Locally Preferred Alternative

The Draft Plan reflects the LPA as shown in Figures 3 and 4 above and therefore shows the trail on the north side with access points provided via pedestrian ramps on the north side of the right

of way at Pearl Street, Lynn Drive, and East West Highway and via a pedestrian path on the south side at Lynn Drive. The crossing of the right of way at Lynn Drive is at-grade – there is no bridge.<sup>1</sup> There is also no planned station at East West Highway in the Draft Plan.

### Proximity to the Right of Way Center Line

One issue raised by the Town is proximity to the light rail vehicles – specifically the loss of the buffer provided by the trail on the south side of the right of way along the Town boundary.

A fundamental question in responding to this concern is how many people and what type of buildings are in closest proximity to the light rail vehicles? The staff examined the issue of proximity along the right of way between the Bethesda Station and Jones Mill Road. Specific segments were identified to facilitate review by the various stakeholders.<sup>2</sup> These segments included:

- Elm Street Park to Western Edge of Columbia Country Club
- Connecticut Avenue to Jones Mill Road

The methodology included examining the number of parcels where the structure closest to the right of way fell within 30, 50, or 80 feet from the center of the right of way – ignoring for a moment where the train and trail are located relative to one another. The underlying objective (for residential locations in particular) is to try and determine if there is any significant difference when comparing the north side and the south side.

A summary of the findings is presented in Figure 6 below. As noted in the summary, there is no significant difference in the number of parcels when considering the entire segment from Elm Street Park to Jones Mill Road. Within the segment that includes the Town boundary to the south, there are two more single family homes than on the north side but there are more residences (multi-family) on the north and those residences are closer to the centerline.


**The staff therefore does not believe there is any material difference between the north side and the south side when considering proximity to the right of way. If anything, the number and proximity of the residences on the north side in the segment along the Town boundary favor placing the trail (as a buffer if proximity to the train is the major or sole criteria) on the north side – not the south side.**

---

<sup>1</sup> There was a bridge proposed over the right of way at the Lynn Drive access point with the trail on the south side of the right of way in an earlier concept plan developed by the MTA Project Team. One example can be found in the Purple Line Functional Master Plan Purpose and Outreach Report – January 2008 (page 33). The drawing is dated November 2005. The link to the report is:  
<http://www.montgomeryplanning.org/transportation/projects/documents/FINALPURPOSEANDOUTREACHREPORT010808.pdf>

<sup>2</sup> While the focus of this discussion is on the concerns expressed by the Town of Chevy Chase, it should be noted that there are stakeholders that prefer the trail be located on the north side of the right of way. The East Bethesda Citizens' Association, for instance, has submitted written testimony specifically noting its opposition to the position taken by the Town of Chevy Chase.

**Figure 6 – Residential Proximity to Georgetown Branch Right of Way**



Source: Staff Analysis

### Noise Related To Train Operations

The Town of Chevy Chase has also raised eight specific concerns related to the methodology used by the MTA in assessing the noise impact of train operations (see Attachment C). The MTA has indicated that it will be responding specifically to those concerns raised by the Town. It is anticipated by staff that any modifications to the evaluation and proposed mitigation will be identified by the MTA in the FEIS and throughout preliminary engineering. The noise effects of the LRT are not expected to be significant from an acoustical perspective but noise effects will be considered in developing screening techniques.



**Staff concurs with the MTA evaluation that the location of the trail has no significant effect on the noise impact from light rail vehicles on adjacent properties to either side of the right-of-way.**

### Trail Experience

One reason for locating the trail on the north side of the right of way between downtown Bethesda and Jones Mill Road is that the existing topography allows for the trail to be on average about four feet above the rail along segments where there are no changes in elevation required for transition into a tunnel (e.g., Bethesda) or underpass (e.g., Jones Mill Road) without incurring significant additional expenses related to providing the vertical separation. Under East West Highway for instance, the trail and train tracks are separated by a bridge support. A MTA illustration of the trail separation is provided below in Figure 7.

**Figure 7 – Purple Line and Trail Just West of East West Highway**



Source: MTA

The Town has noted in its comments that “trail experience” as a reason for moving the trail from the south side to the north side “seems not be based upon on any specific engineering and cost analyses”.

**The staff finds the MTA was responsive to stakeholder concerns about the need to provide as much separation (both horizontal and vertical) as possible between the trail user and the train. The staff also believes that the topography on the south side along the Town boundary is such that additional costs would be incurred to construct the trail on the south side – relative to the costs of the trail on the north side (all other considerations being equal).**

## 2. LYNN DRIVE AT-GRADE PEDESTRIAN CROSSING

The Town has expressed concern about the at-grade crossing at Lynn Drive. As previously noted, the 1990 Master Plan and earlier (December 2005) concept planning done by the MTA Project team located the trail on the south side of the right of way with a pedestrian bridge or overpass at Lynn Drive.

It is important to review the operational and design context of this crossing. Some of the key characteristics include the following:

- Hours of train service – similar to Metrorail.
- Frequency of service in peak period – six minutes in each direction.
- Design speed along this segment – 45 mph.
- Right of way width – 66 feet.
- Two schools on the north side of East West Highway.
- Existing “tunnel-like” pedestrian approaches to the right of way from both directions
- Two major one-way roadways north of the Georgetown Branch right of way

A map depicting the location of the trail access at Lynn Drive in relation to the surrounding area is provided in Figure 8.

**Figure 8 – Trail Access at Lynn Drive**



The current trail access is a path that is narrow (about 5-8 feet) and bordered by a fence (south of the right of way) and building walls (north of the right of way).

A photo of the access from Lynn Drive on the south side of the right of way is shown in Figure 9.


**Figure 9 – Entrance to Trail Access from Lynn Drive**



Source: Google Earth

The constraints on the north side of the right of way are similar. The path west of the Rivera Apartments is even narrower than the path on the south side as noted in Figure 10 below.

**Figure 10 – Entrance to Trail Access from Montgomery Avenue**



Source: Google Earth

Given the operating environment and design or physical constraints with the setting, staff reviewed available literature related to safety criteria for light rail pedestrian crossings. We were



interested in reviewing standards related to at grade crossings given the Town's concerns and the proposal as contained in the Draft Plan.

One document in particular provided guidance – standards used by the Tri-County Metropolitan Transportation District of Oregon or Tri-Met, the transit agency serving the greater Portland, Oregon area.<sup>3</sup> According to the article, Tri-Met's general approach to planning and design is to eliminate hazards where possible, then mitigate or warn. More specifically, the approach is to:

- Eliminate hazards through planning and design where feasible.
- Mitigate unavoidable risks by providing safety treatments in instances where planning and design does not allow for the elimination of hazards.
- Provide warning devices (passive or active) where neither planning, design, nor safety treatments effectively eliminate identified hazards or adequately reduce associated risks and hazards.
- Determine whether an identified risk or hazard that cannot be eliminated or mitigated is acceptable.

In the staff's opinion, the above approach is reasonable – one that would be expected to be a normal part of the preliminary engineering phase the Purple Line project planning is about to enter. **We will to explore this issue with the MTA Project Team at the work session.**

The Tri-Met standards call for consideration of both active and passive warnings at pedestrian crossings in environments like that at the Lynn Drive crossing<sup>4</sup>. Active treatments include pedestrian flashing signs/light, audible warning devices, and/or automatic pedestrian gates.

The Tri-Met standards also examine the sight distance requirements for various speeds. The standards indicate the sight distance required for unanticipated stops at a speed of 45 mph is 651 feet.<sup>5</sup> Our cursory review suggests that sight-distance at the Lynn Drive crossing is sufficient, but we do not have the capability to make that finding based on the planning-level materials available to us. **We will also review this issue with the MTA Project team at the work session.**

One question the staff has in reviewing this issue is whether we want to provide a crossing at Lynn Drive at all. A case could be made that the focus of any (new) design considerations should be on directing pedestrians (students specifically) to cross East – West Highway at Pearl Street or provide some type of grade separated crossing of East – Highway (either over or via the trail under the highway) rather than directing pedestrians toward the intersection of Montgomery Avenue and East – West Highway.

---

<sup>3</sup> Transportation Research Circular E-C058 presented at the 9<sup>th</sup> Annual Light Rail Transit Conference, "Safety Criteria for Light Rail Pedestrian Crossings", Don Irwin, Tri-County Metropolitan Transportation District of Oregon, pages 266 – 288.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid. Table 1, page 286.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid. Figure 4, page 287.



From a safety standpoint, it would therefore appear some consideration should be given to alternative ways to cross the Purple Line from the south side of the right of way at Lynn Drive. Examples might include:

- Constructing a second trail on the south side parallel (and within to the extent space allows) to the right of way from the Lynn Drive access point east to a ramp that would provide access to the north side of East – West Highway or extend the trail to Sleaford Road where a planned pedestrian path will go under the right of way and provide access to the north side.
- Utilizing the existing sidewalk on Elm Street to connect with a planned ramp that would provide access to Pearl Street via a ramp in the Air-Rights Building tunnel and a pedestrian bridge over the right of way from the south side at Elm Street Park to the north side.
- Constructing a path on the south side of the right of way west from the Lynn Drive access point to connect with the ramp accessible via Elm Street Park.
- Constructing a pedestrian overpass at the access point at Lynn Drive (similar to the 1990 Plan concept in Figure 5). Due to space constraints adjacent to the Riviera Apartments, this option might preclude access between the trail and Montgomery Avenue via the path next to the Riviera Apartments.

These options would address the safety concerns posed by the at-grade crossing but would likely increase capital costs. Examining the feasibility of these types of solutions (or other alternatives) is an example of the process outlined in the Tri-Met process. The first step is to determine if a safety concern can be eliminated altogether and then to examine mitigation techniques. It is also an example of the kind of more detailed analysis that is part of the preliminary engineering phase of the project.

**The staff therefore agrees with the Town that additional study is needed to identify approaches to either eliminate or mitigate the safety concern created by the at-grade crossing.** Our review of the Tri-Met approach to this issue suggests that an at-grade crossing at this location could be designed in a manner that would mitigate potential hazards. The design would include passive devices such as fencing and might involve active warning devices like signals, pedestrian gates or barriers, and/or bells.

As previously noted, there is also the potential that pedestrians crossing from south to north could be directed toward Elm Street Park and East West Highway. This guidance is an operational element involving signing, marking, and public education (with community concern specifically directed toward school students); below the radar of a master plan. The proposed Elm Street Park access, however, is not well described in the Public Hearing Draft Plan.

**Staff recommends that the following modification be made to the Public Hearing Draft Plan:**

- a. **Replace the wording associated with the 5<sup>th</sup> bullet under the description of the trail features on page 14 with the following sentence:**

**“trail access to and from the south side of the Georgetown Branch right of way via a pedestrian ramp within the tunnel adjacent to Elm Street Park.”**

### **3. SINGLE TRACK SEGMENTS ALONG GEORGETOWN BRANCH RIGHT OF WAY**

Many comments were received expressing opposition to the fact that the Draft Plan reflects the Locally Preferred Alternative and therefore proposes that the Purple Line will have double tracks – one track in each direction – along the entire segment. This is different than the current plan that featured some single track segments between Bethesda and Silver Spring – the limits of the current adopted plan.

**Staff maintains that double tracking is necessary** for the following reasons:

- Double tracking provides more line capacity.
- Double tracking makes it much easier to respond to travel time delays created by operating in mixed traffic or non-exclusive right of ways – key features of the Purple Line east of the Silver Spring Transit Center. Schedule adherence would suffer with single track segments.
- Double tracking allows for more efficient and cost-effective operations related to emergency responses, preventative and unscheduled maintenance, and other factors like weather, disabled trains, etc.

The MTA completed a separate analysis of this issue in response to community concerns and concluded by stating “the MTA strongly recommends against single-tracking any segment of the Purple Line.”<sup>6</sup>

### **4. CAPITAL CRESCENT TRAIL AND MET BRANCH TRAIL CONNECTION AT THE PAUL S. SARBANES SILVER SPRING TRANSIT CENTER**

The Washington Area Bicyclist Association (WABA) and other stakeholders have expressed concern that the Functional Plan is not clear with respect to how the Capital Crescent Trail will connect with the Metropolitan Branch Trail at the Silver Spring Transit Center.

---

<sup>6</sup> See the following link to the MTA Purple Line web site:


[http://www.purplelinemd.com/images/stories/purpleline\\_documents/Opportunity%20for%20Single%20Track%20-%20Final%204-3.pdf](http://www.purplelinemd.com/images/stories/purpleline_documents/Opportunity%20for%20Single%20Track%20-%20Final%204-3.pdf)

The Met Branch Trail extends north from the District of Columbia to the Silver Spring Transit Center. Part of the trail is already constructed in the District. The Planning Board recommended at its February 4, 2010 review of the County Executive's CIP that design, land acquisition, and construction of the trail be accelerated so that the project schedule more closely matches that of the Silver Spring Transit Center and the trail construction to the south.

**Stakeholder concern is focused on the need to develop a design that allows the two trails to safely connect without requiring cyclists to dismount or conflict with transit passengers.**

The challenge is creating a design that brings the Capital Crescent Trail down to grade east (or south) of Colesville Road to meet the Met Branch Trail, while avoiding conflicts with pedestrians in the plaza area in front of the Metrorail station entrance and transit passengers on the bridge connecting the Transit Center with the MARC tracks. A rendering of how the Met Branch Trail would pass between the Transit Center (on the right), the MARC/Metrorail (elevated and to the left), and the MARC bridge in the foreground, is shown in Figure 11. The Purple Line is not shown but essentially would be elevated (higher than the MARC / Metrorail tracks) above the area where the Met Branch Trail is shown.

**Figure 11 – Looking Northwest along the Met Branch Trail (Toward Colesville Road with Transit Center on Right)**



VIEW ALONG METROPOLITAN BRANCH TRAIL,  
COLESVILLE ROAD IN THE DISTANCE

Source: Montgomery County DOT

The Planning Board held a Mandatory Referral Hearing on the Transit Center in 2007. The staff report for the hearing noted that following:


*“As was the case with the initial submittal, the Transit Center plans provide for the Metropolitan Branch Trail through the site adjacent to the CSX right of way, sloping down to meet the planned Metro Plaza Park. The latest submittal also includes a connection to the third level of the Transit Center at Bonifant Street, a feature that was not included in the original design.*

*Continuation of the Capital Crescent / Metropolitan Branch Trail along the Purple Line Master Plan alignment north and west of the Transit Center is included as part of the Purple Line DEIS/AA effort. Currently, the MTA Project Team is optimistic that they will be able to provide permanent trail access to the second or third level of the Transit Center over Colesville Road. This feature (i.e., the crossing of Colesville Road on an aerial structure) is part of the work that is being conducted by the MTA on the Purple Line planning effort and is not part of the Transit Center scope of work.”*

The current plans call for the Purple Line to cross Colesville Road and enter the Transit Center area from the northwest at a point where it is about 10 feet higher than the 3<sup>rd</sup> level of the Transit Center and about 23 feet above the Metrorail / MARC tracks (the 2<sup>nd</sup> level of the Transit Center). The Capital Crescent Trail would cross Colesville Road from the west and enter the space between the MARC / Metrorail tracks and the Transit Center at an elevation that is about the same as the 2nd level of the Transit Center.

Earlier MTA drawings of the vertical and horizontal relationship among the Purple Line, trail and Metro/MARC tracks are shown below in Figure 12.


**Figure 12 – Purple Line and Trail Over Colesville Road and Purple Line Platform at Silver Spring Transit Center (Looking Southeast toward Bonifant Street) – Along With Current Conditions Looking In Same Direction**



A view of the existing conditions – looking east toward the Transit Center is shown in Figure 13.



**Figure 13 – Photo Looking Southeast as MARC / Metrorail Cross Colesville Road**



Source: Google Earth


Currently, the MTA Project Team is examining how and where to bring the (eastbound) Capital Crescent trail down (after crossing Colesville Road) to grade to directly connect with the Met Branch Trail, while minimizing conflicts with pedestrians in the plaza area in front of the Metrorail station entrance and transit passengers on the bridge connecting the Transit Center and the MARC tracks. A look at the Transit Center (from Colesville Road) is provided below in Figure 14.<sup>7</sup>

The MTA has identified three potential solutions in which the Capital Crescent Trail is elevated over the plaza area and then either passes: a) over, b) under, or, c) intersects the MARC bridge, before connecting with the Met Branch Trail at grade. The last example is not ideal because it brings higher speed cyclists and high-volumes of transit passengers into a common area, creating safety concerns.

---

<sup>7</sup> Some elements shown (e.g., the information store at the location shown near Colesville Road) are no longer part of the scope of the project. The development shown adjacent to the Transit Center is a concept plan. No development in that area has been approved to date.

**Figure 14 – Silver Spring Transit Center**



Source: Transit Center Illustration - Montgomery County DOT. Adjacent development is based on conceptual plans – not approved plans.

This issue is important for a number of reasons. The respective trails make up a significant part of the regional trail system. There are many pedestrians and some of them will be in an unfamiliar area – looking for information and maybe in a hurry to get to a bus or train. **Every effort needs to be made to insure a direct and safe connection that avoids conflict between trail users and transit passengers.** The staff agrees that the Plan wording should be revised to better describe the overall location of planned connections.


**The staff recommends modifying the existing wording on page 20 of the Draft Plan related to where the trails will connect at the Silver Spring Transit Center:**

- b. Replace the 6<sup>th</sup> bullet under the Capital Crescent Trail section on page 20 with “the trail will cross Colesville Road on a bridge and enter the Silver Spring Transit Center area between the Metrorail/MARC tracks and the bus bays at or near an elevation close to the second level of the Transit Center.”**
- c. Replace the 7<sup>th</sup> bullet under the Capital Crescent Trail section on page 20 with “the trail will provide access to the Transit Center for rail and bus users.”**
- d. Add the word “area” after “Transit Center” in the sentence associated with the next to last bullet under the Capital Crescent Trail section on page 20.**

## 5. BONIFANT STREET

The Purple Line alignment is on the south side of Bonifant Street west of Georgia Avenue and (going east) transitions to the north side of Bonifant Street east of Georgia Avenue (see Figure 15). The Purple Line (again going from west to east) is elevated at the Transit Center and returns to grade just west of Dixon Avenue.

**Figure 15 – Purple Line along Bonifant Street**



Source: MTA

Currently, there is two way traffic and no on-street parking allowed on Bonifant Street west of Georgia Avenue. Once the Purple Line is constructed in this area, Bonifant Street traffic will be westbound only in this segment west of Georgia Avenue.

Currently, there is two way traffic and on-street parking on both sides of Bonifant Street east of Georgia Avenue (see Figure 16).

**Figure 16 – Bonifant Street East of Georgia Avenue – Existing Conditions**



Source: Google Earth

The ultimate traffic pattern on Bonifant Street between Georgia Avenue and Fenton Street is under review by the County DOT and MTA. The options (with the Purple Line on the north side of Bonifant Street) include (1) one lane of one-way traffic and on street parking or (2) two lanes of traffic.

The community, the Department of Public Libraries, and other stakeholders have expressed concern about the potential impact on small businesses that the removal of parking and changes in traffic circulation created by one-way traffic could have in the long term. The elimination of any on-street parking on Bonifant Street – along with any resulting impact on traffic operations - is an issue that the MTA and the County DOT are currently reviewing.

The staff agrees that the current wording in the plan needs to be revised to more clearly distinguish between Bonifant Street on the east and west sides of Georgia Avenue and that the issue of the ultimate configuration on the east side remains an operational element requiring further review. The staff therefore recommends:

- e. In Table 12 on page 23, delete the paragraph related to parking and replace with **“On-street parking along Bonifant Street east of Georgia Avenue may be prohibited to accommodate the Purple Line. Some of the on-street parking could be retained if the street was restricted to one lane of vehicular travel. Recommendations for traffic**



**operations on Bonifant Street will be finalized during later phases of project planning.”**

## **6. SILVER SPRING GREEN TRAIL**


The Silver Spring Green Trail is a master planned shared use bike path that is planned to be on the north side on Wayne Avenue parallel to the Purple Line from Fenton Street to Sligo Creek Parkway. The Draft Plan (page 24) notes that the path is to be eight feet wide.

The Silver Spring Green Trail is not part of the Purple Line project but the Purple Line project planning needs to be closely coordinated with the Green Trail project planning and design objectives. The MTA Purple Line project planning is accommodating a Green Trail that includes an eight foot trail and a five foot green buffer area between the path and the curb on the north side of Wayne Avenue. This is a typical section that the staff has supported as a reasonable compromise to provide a safe and functional trail while at the same time reducing the potential for requiring additional land in the form of the strip acquisitions required at certain locations along Wayne Avenue.

Various stakeholders (e.g., some residents in East Silver Spring and the Washington Area Bicyclist Association) have expressed concern that an eight foot wide Green Trail is not what other Master Plans have contemplated for this facility and is not consistent with AASHTO standards (10 feet). The preference is for a separate ten foot joint use bike path and five foot sidewalk.

There are locations along Wayne Avenue where it is going to be difficult to devote more than 13 feet to any combination of path, sidewalk and/or buffer. One location is on the north side of Wayne Avenue where Whole Foods is located. The current concept plan for this area is shown below in Figure 17 and existing Green Trail on the north side of Wayne Avenue is shown in Figure 18. The Green Trail is also shown on the north side of Wayne Avenue in Figures 19 and 20 in the following discussion on the Dale Drive Station.

**Figure 17 – Purple Line at Fenton Street and Wayne Avenue**



Source: MTA

**Figure 18 – Existing Green Trail Adjacent to Whole Foods**



Source: Google Earth

The MTA is currently reviewing the plans to determine the areas where additional room for the Green Trail could be provided without requiring additional right of way. In a preliminary review conducted by staff, there appears to be some areas where an additional space could be devoted to the Green Trail. There are other areas like the area shown above where it is unlikely that additional space will be available.

**The staff recommends that no change be made in the plan that would suggest anything other than a minimum of thirteen feet of combined path, sidewalk or buffer be dedicated to the Green Trail in the area where it is adjacent to the Purple Line.**

**The staff does believe that the Plan’s current wording of at least eight feet wide does not make it clear that the current planning is based upon providing a minimum of a total of 13 feet from the curb line on the north side of Wayne Avenue for some combination of path, sidewalk and buffer. Staff therefore recommends that the following modification be made to the Public Hearing Draft Plan:**

- f. Delete the phrase “at least eight feet wide” on page 24 and insert a new sentence:**

**“The combined trail and buffer will be at least 13 feet wide with a minimum 8 foot wide trail. “**

This revision would better communicate the intent that a path wider than eight feet is contemplated in some areas and that trade-offs will be required in considering the ultimate configuration.

## **7. POTENTIAL STATION AT DALE DRIVE**

The Planning Board recommended to the County Council that the proposed station at Dale Drive be eliminated from further consideration. The County Council recommended that the MTA project planning provide for the ability to add the station at some later date if desired. The Locally Preferred Alternative as identified by the Governor refers to the status of the Dale Avenue station as “under study.” The Draft Functional Plan refers to the station as “not being included in initial construction phase; the timing of implementation to be determined.” Staff views this wording as consistent with the recommendation by County Council.


The MTA has conducted an analysis of the Locally Preferred Alternative and found that the elimination of the Dale Drive station results in a ridership loss of about 1,600 boardings and an increase in the cost-effectiveness from \$22.12 per hour to \$23.27 per hour. The MTA is recommending that the County reconsider its position on not including the station in the Locally Preferred Alternative. The MTA recommendation is not based solely on the improvement in the cost effectiveness rating but also a position that the community would benefit from the improved access to the Purple Line. On a related item, US Secretary of Transportation LaHood recently announced changes to how candidate New Starts projects will be evaluated. The changes effectively place less emphasis on cost-effectiveness and more emphasis on how the project helps meet livability and sustainability goals.<sup>8</sup>

The concept plan – both without and with the station platform is shown below in Figure 19 and 20.

---


<sup>8</sup> See the following link on the USDOT web site:  
[http://www.fta.dot.gov/documents/Dear\\_Colleague\\_New\\_Starts\\_and\\_Small\\_Starts\\_Project.pdf](http://www.fta.dot.gov/documents/Dear_Colleague_New_Starts_and_Small_Starts_Project.pdf)

**Figure 19 – Purple Line at Wayne Avenue and Dale Drive without Station**



Source: MTA

**Figure 20 – Purple Line at Wayne Avenue and Dale Drive with Station**



Source: MTA

It appears in reviewing the concept plans in Figure 19 and 20 that there is additional right-of-way acquisition required on the north side of Wayne Avenue east of Dale Drive if there is a station platform. While that is understandable, the staff has interpreted the County Council recommendation as requesting that the initial construction and design include all of the area that would ultimately be required to later construct the platform and other supporting facilities without requiring additional land acquisition. **The staff will review this issue with the MTA Project Team at the worksession.**<sup>9</sup> This issue is also related to the ultimate configuration of the Silver Spring Green Trail on the north side of Wayne Avenue (see following discussion).

---

<sup>9</sup> Staff also needs to seek clarification on the signalized intersections along Wayne Avenue that will have separate or dedicated left turn lanes. The Draft Plan notes that the only one that will not have a separate left turn lane is the eastbound to northbound left turn at Cedar Street.

The MTA has issued an evaluation of the merits of the station.<sup>10</sup> The evaluation essentially makes the point that the ridership for the Dale Drive station is in part due to the riders from the area south of Wayne Avenue – the high rise apartments on Thayer Avenue being an example.

The MTA analysis estimates that a Dale Drive station in 2030 would have double the boardings of the Fenton Street Station (i.e., 1,400 vs. 750). Staff has previously discussed with the Board our concerns about this estimate given the level of detail in the forecasts to account for differences in walk access between stations in close proximity. MTA acknowledges the walk-access forecasts will be a focus of subsequent model refinement.

The community remains divided on this issue. Many residents agree with the MTA position and believe the community would ultimately benefit from a station. An MTA representation of how the station might look in the median of Wayne Avenue is presented to the left in Figure 21.

**Figure 21 – Dale Drive Station**



Source: MTA

Many other residents believe the location of a station at Dale Drive would present problems with school access and/or could potentially lead to higher densities in the immediate area. It should be noted that there are Planning Department work program elements in FY 10 and FY 11 that advance Purple Line Station Area planning underway in the Takoma Langley Crossroads, Long Branch, and Chevy Chase Lake station areas – so that community based visions can be adopted for guiding new development and reinvestment initiatives. There is no similar planning effort contemplated for the Dale Drive station area – now or in the future. As for school access, the MTA Project Team and staff from the Planning Department and the County Department of

---

<sup>10</sup> See the following link to the MTA Purple Line web site:  
[http://www.purplelinemd.com/images/stories/purpleline\\_documents/Dale%20Drive%20and%20Wayne%20Avenue%209-14-09.pdf](http://www.purplelinemd.com/images/stories/purpleline_documents/Dale%20Drive%20and%20Wayne%20Avenue%209-14-09.pdf)



Transportation continue to work with representatives from Montgomery County Public Schools on issues related to the Purple Line.

**Staff recommends that the Planning Board retain the language in the Draft Plan with respect to the Dale Drive station and show the station location on Plan maps. Staff also recommends that the MTA continue to examine the issue in subsequent model runs with an emphasis on refining how the model accounts for walk access to station in close proximity of one another.**

## **8. RESPONSES TO OTHER TESTIMONY**

We received 132 comments on the Draft Plan. All of the comments and the staff responses to those comments are included in Attachment B.

Many comments were related to the issues previously examined in this staff memo. A summary of additional comments from agencies and individuals follows as a means of providing additional understanding of the subject areas and the staff responses.

### **Executive Branch Comments**

The Executive Branch, through the Department of General Services, submitted comments on the Draft Plan that reflected both a consolidated commentary and interests of individual Executive Branch Departments (see Attachment D and the staff response in Attachment B comment 79).

#### Elements in Joint Letter of February 2, 2009

The Executive Branch comments note that the Draft Plan “reflects the County Executive and County Council February 2, 2009 joint letter (also included in Attachment C) containing recommendations for the locally preferred alternative and closely follows the Maryland Department of Transportation locally preferred alternative.” The joint letter recommended nine specific objectives or additional analyses that should take place in preliminary engineering. The Executive Branch comments include a recommendation that the Plan should “list these additional analyses and identify the right of way issues associated with each”.

The staff agrees that the items should be addressed in subsequent analysis but we do not agree that they need to be referenced in the Functional Plan. The staff believes subsequent planning and engineering coordination activities remain the appropriate forum for defining the scope and potential solutions of these issues.

#### Department of Transportation (DOT) Comments

A summary of County DOT comments is provided below:

*The Plan should identify feasible locations for electrical substations – specifically how they will be accommodated along the Capital Crescent Trail and the East Silver Spring segments.*

The MTA has begun to identify some preliminary locations (see Figure 2 of this memo) for the traction power substations that are subject to change. The staff believes the MTA should continue to identify these locations throughout preliminary engineering in concert with other technical analysis along the alignment. The Draft Plan (see last paragraph on page 11) acknowledges that the Plan's "dimensions, features, and description are subject to modifications as project planning continues into preliminary engineering, final design, and construction."<sup>11</sup> The staff therefore does not recommend that the Functional Plan identify final locations for these facilities.

*The Plan does not develop comprehensive station area plans and leaves out how formal and informal kiss and ride will be accommodated. The Plan should also identify the location and condition of sidewalk and bicycle access to each of the stations and identify facilities that need to be built or reconstructed to accommodate the Purple Line stations.*

Station area planning is underway in the Takoma Langley Crossroads Sector Plan, the Long Branch Sector Plan, and the Chevy Chase Lake Sector Plan. The staff, County DOT staff, and the MTA Project Team (through our development review coordination process) has been actively involved with the coordination of Purple Line project planning at the Bethesda and Silver Spring stations – in addition to selected locations all along the alignment. Where known, these station area attributes have been included in the Draft Plan. The MTA Project team as part of its on-going work is examining station access and passenger amenity components at all stations including stations where there is no station area planning or major development plans underway (e.g., Lyttonsville, Manchester Place, and Gilbert Street). This work is still underway and modifications to the location, design, and scope of the station area support components will change as the project proceeds through preliminary engineering and even subsequent phases. The staff therefore does not recommend that the Functional Plan identify features that have yet to be finalized and are still at a concept level stage. As noted above, the Draft Plan has language on page 11 acknowledging that modifications are expected as project planning continues into the preliminary engineering phase and beyond.

*The Plan delves into operational issues (proposed restrictions to existing on-street parking, adding left turn lanes at existing signalized intersections, etc.) where the Purple Line is intended to be located on existing streets. DOT opposes having such details in a planning document and urges their removal.*

The staff believes most of the Draft Plan statements related to operations are highly qualified and clear that additional analyses will be undertaken. The proposed changes described in Topic 5 of this memorandum are intended to help clarify this position.

#### Department of Police Comments

*The Police Department recommends that an interagency working group similar to the Interim Operations Working Group for the Silver Spring Transit Center Project construction be created to deal with and plan for traffic patterns and coordination during the construction of the Purple Line.*

---

<sup>11</sup> A similar qualifying statement is included as footnote at the bottom of page 31 of the Draft Plan.

The staff agrees.

#### Department of Public Libraries Comments

*Libraries would like the recommendation to make Bonifant Street one way eastbound with parking on the south side to be reviewed before a final decision is made to include this recommendation. This decision would make for a very awkward access path to the Libraries' drop off/book drop location. This will also require wayfinding. If Bonifant is to be one way, the Department of Public Libraries strongly recommends that the one-way direction for Bonifant Street be studied by MCDOT to see what is the most appropriate direction for making Bonifant Street safe and convenient for the public.*

The staff agrees, as described in Topic 5 of this memorandum.

#### Department of General Services Comments

*The impacts on parking and driveway access in the commercial areas are of critical importance to the businesses in downtown Silver Spring. The Purple Line Functional Plan should emphasize the need to for these details to be addressed in the final design of the Purple Line. If parking must be removed from a commercial street, then it may be necessary for off-street public parking to be provided. Loss of parking can have severe economic impacts on businesses that depend on public parking for their customers.*

*The Plan should also address the importance of maintaining access to businesses for loading and parking via drives and alleys. This access should be maintained for left turns, particularly into high volume entrances such as the Whole Foods Market off Wayne Avenue.*

*The impact of parking by transit riders on neighborhood streets should be reviewed around station located in residential areas as a design issue to ensure that it addressed in the final design and location of these transit stations.*

*The Executive Department appreciates the hard work of the Planning Staff and of the Advisory Committee in preparing the Plan. We will continue to work with Planning Staff and the Maryland Transit Administration to develop a Plan that preserves the right of way needed for the Purple Line and identifies transportation issues that need to be addressed in the preliminary engineering phase of the Purple Line.*

The staff agrees and believes the issues raised by the specific comments of the Department of General Services have been addressed by the inclusion of the nine items noted on page one of the Department's letter (see the additional Plan language as noted in Topic 7 above).

The Department of General Service comment related to parking in neighborhoods adjacent or near transit stations is a valid concern directly related to station location and the fact that many Purple Line stations are "walk-up" stations where walking and bus are expected to be the primary modes of access. Stations at Chevy Chase Lake, Lyttonsville, 16<sup>th</sup> Street, Fenton Street, Dale Drive, Mansfield Place, Arliss Street, and Gilbert Street all fit this category.

In practical terms, parking restrictions and enforcement are used to prohibit parking in neighborhoods that would reach a level where safety, access or functionality is compromised.

Of particular importance is that in both instances – our station area planning and the MTA’s preliminary engineering work – plans are evolving and changing at the station area level as the Functional Plan is being considered and adopted. Some potential changes could involve (as an example) the location of the alignment and platform in some of the station areas. Discussion of potential changes in the Arliss Street and Gilbert Street station (platform) locations have been a part of the very early work as part of the Long Branch Sector Plan activity. The MTA is currently examining the feasibility of moving the platform at the Lyttonsville Station further east to improve access to that station. The staff believes the statements included in the Draft Plan at the bottom of pages 11 and 31 adequately convey the fluid nature of the project planning at this time.

## **MTA Comments**

MTA submitted a number of technical comments as included in Attachment E. These proposed changes are largely technical or editorial and staff proposes to include the changes in the Planning Board Draft unless noted otherwise in this staff memo or in Attachment B.

## **Comments Related To Purple Line Alignment**

Many comments expressed opposition to the Purple Line alignment. As previously noted, the Draft Functional Plan reflects the Locally Preferred Alternative. Staff response to specific comments related to this issue are included in the summary in Attachment B.

## **Comments Related to Wording and Suggested Changes of a Technical Nature**

A number of comments related to routine editing and other changes specific to the Draft Plan text were submitted. These are also included in Attachment B. The staff response includes recommendations on whether the staff is recommending these changes be made.

### **g. Staff supports technical changes as described in Attachment B for the following comments:**

- **Comments 3 and 4 from Bethesda Chevy Chase Chamber of Commerce**
- **Comments 11, 12, and 14 from the MTA (as subsequently summarized in Attachment E)**

## **9. STAFF RECOMMENDED CHANGES**

In addition to the above comments and responses, the staff recommends the following additional editorial modifications to the Draft Plan:

- **Change the format to 8 ½ x 11 – the current format is attractive but is difficult to view on our web site.**

- Show trail access points on maps.
- Page 2 – add all of the other Master Plans that will be amended once the Purple Line Functional Plan is adopted.
- Page 4 – update the County Council and Planning Commissioner’s list.
- Page 4 – Note the development shown around the Transit Center is illustrative.
- Page 7 – Add a Glossary and change the title of the existing Glossary to “List of Acronyms”
- Page 8 – Add Dale Drive Station as “Potential Future Station” to Map 1 and Map 5.
- Page 12 – Change “Kentbury/County Club” to “Columbia Country Club.”
- Page 18 – revise graphic and/or narrative to reflect that location of crossing of CSX right of way at or near Rosemary Hills Elementary School is under study.
- Page 19 – Add map showing location of yard and shop facility.
- Page 22 – show Capital Crescent Trail in correct location – immediately adjacent to CSX right of way.
- Page 33 – Update staff list

TA:DA:tc

#### Attachments

- Attachment A: County Executive and County Council forward recommendation on Locally Preferred Alternative to then Secretary Porcari
- Attachment B: Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments
- Attachment C: Testimony and Supplemental Comments from the Town of Chevy Chase
- Attachment D: Comments from Executive Branch
- Attachment E: Comments from Maryland Transit Administration

cc: Mike Madden – MTA Project Manager  
 Gary Erenrich – Montgomery County DOT Director’s Office  
 Glenn Kreger  
 Tina Schneider  
 John Carter  
 Margaret Rifkin  
 John Marcolin  
 Scott Whipple  
 Kathy Reilly  
 Mellissa Williams  
 Bill Barron





OFFICE OF THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE  
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND 20850

February 2, 2009

Isiah Leggett  
County Executive

RECEIVED  
0178  
FEB 06 2009

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN  
THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL  
PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

John D. Porcari, Secretary  
Maryland Department of Transportation  
7201 Corporate Center Drive  
Hanover, Maryland 21076

Dear Secretary Porcari:

We have completed our review of the Maryland Transit Administration's Purple Line Alternatives Analysis/Draft Environmental Impact Statement (AA/DEIS) and are sharing with you our recommendations for the Locally Preferred Alternative.

We all recognize the need to address mobility and accessibility issues in the corridor between Bethesda and New Carrollton. The corridor is experiencing unacceptable levels of roadway congestion, unreliable transit travel times, limited travel mode options and degraded transit accessibility to the larger metropolitan region due to inferior connections to radial Metrorail lines and to other rail and bus services. Furthermore, construction of the Purple Line would provide environmental benefits to an area classified by the Environmental Protection Agency as a serious non-attainment region, while simultaneously providing a stimulus for community revitalization. It is also critical to another shared goal of promoting smart growth.

We have arrived at our recommendations only after discussions with many stakeholder groups and individuals, and after reviewing the testimony from MTA's four public hearings, the thousands of pieces of correspondence we have received, and detailed analysis and recommendations from our Planning Board. We also considered the meeting between you and County Executives Johnson and Leggett. After considerable analysis and discussions, it is evident that light rail is the more viable long-term option given the consistency with the Master Plan, the high level of forecasted ridership, the better travel times, and the ability of light rail to better support transit-oriented development.

As we transmit these recommendations, we would be remiss if we did not take the opportunity to thank Governor O'Malley for his championing this project, not only in his words but in his deeds: in particular, his retaining full funding of preliminary engineering and design of the Purple Line, while many other projects in the Consolidated Transportation Program have had to be eliminated or scaled back significantly.

We also want to recognize the tremendous job by MTA and its consultant team in bringing the project to this point in its development. We especially want to express our gratitude to Mike Madden, MTA's study manager, who has personally shepherded the Purple Line study through good times and bad over the past decade.

John D. Porcari, Secretary  
February 2, 2009  
Page 2

The Montgomery County Executive's and Council's joint recommendations regarding the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) are to:


1. Select Light Rail Transit (LRT) as the transit mode for the Purple Line.
2. Select the Medium Investment LRT that uses the master planned Georgetown Branch right of way between Bethesda and Silver Spring, with the modifications noted below:
  - Incorporate the High Investment LRT design for the Capital Crescent Trail through the tunnel under Wisconsin Avenue.
  - Curtail the tail tracks west of the Bethesda stop so that they would extend no further than 100 feet west of the portal of the Apex Building, and less than 100 feet west if possible.
  - Plant grass between and to each side of the tracks where the line is parallel to the Capital Crescent Trail and not on a bridge or in a tunnel.
  - Expand the pavement width of the Capital Crescent Trail to a minimum of 12 feet, and, where existing right-of-way is available (i.e., between the western end of the Columbia Country Club to the east end of Rock Creek Park) and cost and tree loss would not be significant, expand the pavement width to up to 16 feet with a wider buffer between the LRT and the trail.
  - Before selecting the LPA, evaluate the cost, impacts, and operations implications of single-tracking one or more sections of the LRT where it would parallel the Capital Crescent Trail.
  - Before selecting the LPA, bring the evaluation of a tunnel option between the Silver Spring Transit Center (SSTC) and the vicinity of Wayne Avenue/Mansfield Road to the same level of detail as has been already completed for the surface option between these points.
  - If the surface option is ultimately selected for Wayne Avenue, delete the Dale Drive stop from the LPA but design the line in a way that would facilitate adding a stop there in the future.
3. Perform the following analyses during the preliminary engineering phase:
  - Examine the feasibility of using hybrid light rail vehicles (or dual powered vehicles) that do not require wires, poles, and electrical substations.
  - Identify more access points to the Capital Crescent Trail than those currently appearing in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (e.g., from the Coquelin Parkway right-of-way in Chevy Chase and from the Grubb Road/Terrace Drive intersection in Silver Spring, and others).
  - Investigate design and building techniques to maximize the retention of existing trees in the corridor.
  - If the surface option is selected for downtown and East Silver Spring, give special attention to the LRT vehicle crossing of Georgia Avenue and intersection of Fenton Street/Wayne Avenue to ensure that the LRT, pedestrians, and vehicular traffic will operate in a compatible manner.

John D. Porcari, Secretary  
February 2, 2009  
Page 3

- If the surface option is selected for downtown and East Silver Spring, conduct a detailed study to address:
  - a. Pedestrian safety and station accessibility;
  - b. Forecast ridership at the SSTC and Fenton Street stations;
  - c. Transit, vehicle queuing, and parking operations in shared lanes, including options to minimize adverse economic effects on retail businesses along Bonifant Street; and
  - d. Wayne Avenue Green Trail design.
- Develop design details for the Capital Crescent Trail that include:
  - a. detailed plans for all access points, including the connection to the Rock Creek Trail;
  - b. retaining walls and security or privacy fencing;
  - c. landscaping (including shade trees);
  - d. aesthetic treatments for the bridges crossing Rock Creek (including coordination with the National Park Service);
  - e. signing and marking;
  - f. bicycle facilities at Purple Line stations; and
  - g. a public plaza at the Woodmont East terminus.
- Prepare a phasing plan along University Boulevard in the Takoma/Langley Crossroads area that identifies how LRT implementation will be coordinated with establishment of the wider master planned typical section.
- Provide continuous sidewalks and/or shared use paths on both sides of roadways that carry the Purple Line alignment.
- Include mitigation strategies for the following impacts:
  - a. Wetlands and Waters of the US, with impacts and mitigation identified by watershed;
  - b. obtains Parks Department approval for proposed mitigation sites in parkland;
  - c. noise impacts at wheel squeal locations;
  - d. historic resources – including mitigation for the impact for Falkland Apartments); and
  - e. Parks Department property impacts, including the Brookville Road Maintenance site.

We look forward to working with you and our colleagues in Prince George's County to gain Federal funding approval for preliminary engineering and, ultimately, for the design and construction of the entire 16-mile Purple Line. This is a vital project for the state and the region, and we must collectively move forward to bring the Purple Line into service as soon as possible.

Sincerely,



Isiah Leggett  
County Executive



Phil Andrews, President  
County Council

John D. Porcari, Secretary  
February 2, 2009  
Page 4

cc: The Honorable Martin O'Malley, Governor of Maryland  
The Honorable Barbara Mikulski, United States Senate  
The Honorable Benjamin Cardin, United States Senate  
The Honorable Christopher Van Hollen, United States House of Representatives  
The Honorable Donna Edwards, United States House of Representatives  
The Honorable Steny Hoyer, United States House of Representatives  
The Honorable Richard Madaleno, Chair, Montgomery County Senate Delegation  
The Honorable Brian Feldman, Chair, Montgomery County House Delegation  
The Honorable Jack Johnson, Prince George's County Executive  
The Honorable Marilyn Bland, Chair, Prince George's County Council  
The Honorable Melony Griffith, Chair, Prince George's County House Delegation  
The Honorable C. Anthony Muse, Chair, Prince George's County Senate Delegation  
The Honorable Kathy Strom, Mayor, Town of Chevy Chase  
The Honorable Bruce Williams, Mayor, City of Takoma Park  
Royce Hanson, Chair, Montgomery County Planning Board  
Samuel Parker, Jr., Chair, Prince George's County Planning Board

**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments**  
**Dec 10 through Feb 12**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTRAK #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
18	Michael	Evenson	Individual	Against Purple Line on Master Plan alignment. It will result in the destruction of trees and the loss of recreational space. Purple Line belongs on a roadway - not the trail right of way. Planning is ignoring the need to directly serve the Naval Medical Center.	CTRAK	2009-1084	Primarily Future Capital Crescent / Interim Georgetown Branch Trail	12/10/2009	Staff does not agree. The selected Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) is along the Master Plan alignment. This is consistent with the County Council and Planning Board recommendations. The needs of the National Naval Medical Center (NNMC) have not been ignored. The MTA conducted an analysis of serving the NNMC via both Jones Bridge Road and the Master Plan alignment (see the following link - <a href="http://www.purplelinemd.com/images/stories/purpleline_documents/Medim%20BRT%20Variations.pdf">http://www.purplelinemd.com/images/stories/purpleline_documents/Medim%20BRT%20Variations.pdf</a> .) Access to and from NIH/NNMC via transit will be improved under the LPA when compared to existing service.
19	David	Saltzman	East Bethesda Citizen Association	The Purple Line cost at \$100 million per mile is prohibitive and funds a project that does not serve the Naval Medical Center. The ridership estimates are questionable and there are too many stations. The cost are exorbitant and the time savings are minimal. The Purple Line is not Green - trees will be destroyed and the electricity to run the system will come from burning coal. Any benefits related to the reduction in air pollution or traffic will be either non-existent or minimal based upon the MTA's own conclusions.	CTRAK	2009-1084	Project Overall	12/10/2009	1) The costs and number of stations are comparable to other new projects recently funded by the FTA - especially given the inner-suburban location of the Purple Line. As part of the Purple Line financial plan, the State has to demonstrate the feasibility of paying for all existing transit systems and to pay for the Purple Line. 2) The estimated weekday ridership is significantly higher than that of other new projects. The time savings are also significant as there is an estimated 10,000 new transit trips every weekday by 2030. This is essentially the same level of estimated new transit trips for the Phase I Metrorail extension to Dulles.
20	Dean & Karen	Cooper	Individual	Support stop at Dale Drive. Live within walking distance to station.	CTRAK	2009-1084	Dale Drive Station	12/10/2009	See Comment # 13
21	Byrne	Kelly	Individual and MPAG Member	There is a need to analyze an aerial alignment in the Silver Spring CBD and also in the Takoma Langley Crossroads area. This alternative has not been examined at the same level of detail as the surface and tunnel options.	Written Statement / Testimony submitted via e-mail - see number 60 below.	N/A	Aerial Alignment	12/10/2009	The staff does not believe an aerial alignment is feasible from a cost standpoint nor desirable from an urban design standpoint. The MTA examined the feasibility of an aerial crossing in the Takoma Langley Crossroads area (it was included as part of the Light Rail and BRT High Investment Alternatives) and found the dedicated lanes on University offered close to the same travel time benefits at much less cost. The City of Takoma Park supports an at-grade Purple Line.
22	Deborah	Vollmer	Individual	The Georgetown Branch Trail is a linear park that needs to be preserved. The plan for two tracks - as opposed to one - will create environmental and safety issues. The Purple Line Draft Functional Plan ignores the BRAC expansion at Naval Medical. Why can't the Purple Line be constructed underground as part of the stimulus program? If funds are not available, a more reasonable approach is to use buses on Jones Bridge Road and/or East West Highway.	CTRAK	2009-1091 and 2009-1095	Future Capital Crescent / Interim Georgetown Branch Trail	12/10/2009	The selected Locally Preferred Alternative is along the Master Plan alignment. This is consistent with the County Council and Planning Board recommendations. Montgomery County has envisioned using the Georgetown Branch rail corridor as a combined rail transit and shared-use path since purchasing the right-of-way from CSX Transportation, Inc. in 1988. In January 1990, the County approved and adopted the Georgetown Branch Master Plan Amendment. This master plan amended a prior Georgetown Branch plan of 1986 and established as County policy the intent to construct, operate, and maintain a trolley and adjacent trail between Bethesda and Silver Spring on the Georgetown Branch right-of-way. A secondary intent was to provide recreational opportunities. While there are trade-offs, the Purple Line will provide a vital east-west transportation link that improves accessibility and mobility throughout the corridor. It increases transportation choices for those who cannot or choose not to travel by automobile and reduces travel times for people living and working within the region. It supports plans for economic development, community revitalization, and transit-oriented development, while providing an alternative to driving which could reduce greenhouse gas emissions. At the same time, the Purple Line project will preserve and complete the Interim Capital Crescent Trail. The Capital Crescent Trail will be paved between Bethesda and Silver Spring, have a minimum width of 10 ft and 2 ft shoulders on either side, and provide connections to existing trails such as the Rock Creek Hiker-Biker Trail and the Metropolitan Branch Trail. The Purple Line project will employ best practices to preserve the tree canopy, reduce noise and visual impacts, and provide safe at-grade crossings. While the trail will be different – there will be fewer trees and tree cover and some homeowners may loss direct access from the property to the trail – the trail will be improved, safe, functional and still very much a resource for the County.



**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments**  
**Dec 10 through Feb 12**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTRAK #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
22	Deborah	Vollmer	Individual	The Georgetown Branch Trail is a linear park that needs to be preserved. The plan for two tracks - as opposed to one - will create environmental and safety issues. The Purple Line Draft Functional Plan ignores the BRAC expansion at Naval Medical. Why can't the Purple Line be constructed underground as part of the stimulus program? If funds are not available, a more reasonable approach is to use buses on Jones Bridge Road and/or East West Highway.	CTRAK	2009-1091 and 2009-1095	Future Capital Crescent / Interim Georgetown Branch Trail	12/10/2009	Double tracking is necessary to provide more line capacity to accommodate forecast demand, make it much easier to respond to travel time delays created by operating in mixed traffic or non-exclusive right of ways (schedule adherence would suffer with single track segments), and allows for more efficient and cost-effective operations related to emergency responses, preventative and unscheduled maintenance, and other factors like weather, disabled trains, etc. MTA has determined that single tracking will not reduce the loss of trees due to construction staging requirements. Furthermore, there is room for the double tracks according to MTA project engineers. This was acknowledged in the Georgetown Branch Master Plan Amendment. It is true that the trail experience will be different and that the affect of replanting and other mitigation actions will take time.
23	James	Crilley	Individual	Oppose a double track Purple Line because of destruction of linear park, concerns about noise and safety, and additional development at Connecticut Avenue. There are jobs in Prince George's County. The Purple Line project's emphasis on providing access to jobs in Bethesda is exaggerated. We can not afford the Purple Line - it is too expensive. There are significant questions about the ridership estimates.	CTRAK	2009-1095	Future Capital Crescent / Interim Georgetown Branch Trail	12/10/2009	The selected Locally Preferred Alternative is along the Master Plan alignment. This is consistent with the County Council and Planning Board recommendations. Also, see Comment #19 about costs and ridership, Comment #22 about impacts to the Capital Crescent Trail, and Comment #22 about double tracking.
24	Pat	Burda	Town of Chevy Chase	Choosing light rail with its huge price tag limits the state's ability to meet other pressing transit needs. The light rail route completely misses the new Walter Reed National Military Medical Center at Bethesda. There are inaccuracies in the State's analysis of the Jones Bridge Bus Rapid Transit alternative. The Purple Line is incompatible with the trail - over 17 acres of trees will be cut down and the path limited to a width of ten feet where it will share a corridor with trains traveling 45 mph running every 3-6 minutes. The Draft Functional plan is inconsistent with the single track approach of the currently adopted plan. The trail should be on the south side adjacent to the Town as in the initial designs. Why was this changed? We have safety concerns about the planned crossing at Lynn Drive, the width of the trail, and the trail through the tunnel.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Project Overall	12/10/2009	The Staff agrees that additional study is needed to identify approaches to either eliminate or mitigate the hazard created by the at-grade crossing at Lynn Dr. MTA has agreed to work with the Town of Chevy Chase to design a safe at-grade crossing of the Purple Line at Lynn St. They have indicated that both a physical barrier, which forces pedestrians to turn and look in the direction of the tracks, and possibly pedestrian signals, which warn pedestrians that the light rail vehicle is approaching, are examples of steps that could be taken to address this issue. The travel speed for the Purple Line in the westbound direction is estimated to be 40-45 mph at the Lynn St at-grade crossing. Additional discussion of this important issue is presented in the staff memo. Overall, the maximum travel speed is estimated to be nearly 45 mph. Between Bethesda and Silver Spring, the average travel speed -- including stops -- is estimated to be 31 mph and the maximum travel speed is estimated to be 50 mph between Bethesda South Station and the Silver Spring Transit Center. To buffer pedestrians from the light rail vehicle, the 10 ft shared-use path will be separated both vertically and horizontally from the tracks. Horizontal separation will be achieved with a landscaped buffer of up to 11 feet. Vertical separation will also be achieved by elevating the shared-use path and landscaped buffer above the tracks, with a fence between the landscaped buffer and the tracks. The Capital Crescent Trail is located to the north of the Purple Line tracks between Jones Mill Road and Wisconsin Ave due to a more favorable topography that permits the trail to be on average about four feet above the rail along segments where there are no changes in elevation required for transition into a tunnel or underpass without incurring significant additional expense. The staff believes that the MTA was responding in part to stakeholder concerns about the need to provide as much separation as possible between the trail user and the train to improve the trail user experience. The staff also believes that the topography on the south side along the Town of Chevy Chase boundary is such that additional costs would be incurred to construct the trail on the south side relative to the north side. MTA has presented this change at numerous public meetings. Based on policy direction provided by the County Council (see page 7 of the Functional Plan), we intend to seek opportunities to widen the trail to a minimum of 12 ft and a maximum of 16 ft through Preliminary Engineering, where existing right-of-way is available and the cost and loss of trees is not significant.
24	Pat	Burda	Town of Chevy Chase	We think the tracks should extend less than 100 feet into the Woodmont East plaza. We are in favor of grass tracks and are concerned that funding constraints may result in this feature being dropped from the project scope. The Functional Plan does not address how Coquelin Run is to be protected. We do not think the Purple Line will necessarily improve access to jobs at the Walter Reed Annex and we need more information on the transition for passengers to and from the Purple Line and the Red Line in Bethesda. We are concerned about the proximity of the train to Rosemary Hills Elementary School. The general principles as outlined on page 10 of the plan are important. The Town expects the County and State to uphold the promise that the trail will be completed with the Purple Line. In summary, we do not like this transit mode on this alignment and have other serious concerns regarding specific issues raised in the Functional Plan.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Project Overall	12/10/2009	MTA has agreed to investigate the feasibility of shifting the Capital Crescent Trail to the west and aligning with Hanover St to have less of an impact on Rosemary Hills ES. This concept will be refined during the Preliminary Engineering phase. Walter Reed Annex is within 1/4 mile of the nearest station, generally considered a walkable distance. MTA believes it is possible that tracks will not extend more than 100 ft into Woodmont Plaza. It is appropriate to address environmental impacts to Coquelin Run in the FEIS, but not in the Functional Plan.

**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments**  
**Dec 10 through Feb 12**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTRAK #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
25	Pam	Browning	Save the Trail Coalition	Organization has over 18,000 signatures on petition opposing Purple Line on the trail. The Planning Board has received over 2,000 emails opposing the trail alignment for the Purple Line. The Draft Functional Plan is cursory in content - so much so that it is dishonest by failing to acknowledge the environmental degradation to the trail and adverse impacts to neighboring communities. Draft plan does not mention that double tracking is a change to current plan. Seventeen acres of forest along the trail will be destroyed. The draft plan fails to note County Council's recommendation that single tracking be studied. If we are to have a Purple Line along the trail, we urge the Planning Board to recommend that it be single tracked. Attachments included photos of trail, Analysis report of American Forests, and letter to Federal Transit Administrator Peter Rogoff.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Future Capital Crescent / Interim Georgetown Branch Trail	12/10/2009	The draft plan should be revised to state that the double tracking along the entire segment is a change to the currently adopted plan. The staff recommends that the following footnote be cited at the end of the background section and added to bottom of page 7: "All of the build alternatives examined in the AA/DEIS included a fully bi-directional transitway (two lanes or two tracks) from Bethesda to New Carrollton. This Functional Plan includes that design element. The Georgetown Branch Master Plan - January 1990 - included segments between Bethesda and Silver Spring that were single track segments. The MTA has begun working on mitigation efforts on the trail with the Town of Chevy Chase. Environmental impact and mitigation will also be the focus of the FEIS.
26	Arlene	Bruhn	Individual	Draft Plan does not discuss widespread ecological harm the preferred alignment will cause nor does the plan provide specific mitigation. The proposed alignment will require bulldozing three miles of existing trail and 17 acres of surrounding forest. Trees will not be replanted along a double tracked Purple Line. See page ES 4 of the DEIS. Grass and shrubs will not replace a work-engine forest of 100 year old specimen beech, sycamores, and tulip poplars. Put the Purple Line on or under the street.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Future Capital Crescent / Interim Georgetown Branch Trail	12/10/2009	See Comment #22 (item 2) regarding impacts to the trail. Placing the Purple Line on East West Highway was examined by the MTA and found to be not practicable because of right of way constraints and traffic volumes. Placing the Purple Line in a long tunnel was found to be cost prohibitive.
27	David	Salzman	Individual	The proposed plan works against the County's quality of life and should be modified. The trail should be located on the south side of the tracks. Between Bethesda and Connecticut Avenue, there are far more residences on the south side and they are (on average) closer to the right of way. The support columns carrying East West Highway over the right of way leave more room to the South. But there is no defensible reason derived from engineering why the two tracks cannot be split to pass the supports and still leave the trail to the South.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Future Capital Crescent / Interim Georgetown Branch Trail	12/10/2009	See Comment #24 (item 3) regarding location of the trail on the north side of the tracks to the west of Connecticut Avenue.
28	Mary Anne	Hoffman	Individual	The trail will be destroyed by an ill-conceived transit project. The Draft Plan is embarrassing in the extent it skims over serious issues of environment, safety and public opinion. The Purple Line plan is unsafe, damages the environment, and ignores public opinion. The State and County cannot afford the Purple Line. We need to remember the efforts of Justice Douglas on behalf of the C&O Canal towpath.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Project Overall	12/10/2009	See Comment #22 (item 2) regarding impacts to the trail. Environmental impact and mitigation will also be the focus of the FEIS.
29	John	Anderson	Individual	The safety of county residents should be a primary consideration before anything is done in this rush to build a Mass Transit Train Line so close to our homes and the Trail. This plan destroys our communities quality of life, safety and cohesion. Do not allow these amendments to the Master Plan. The ridership projections are based upon 2025 not 2012. Far more people would benefit from the Corridor Cities Transitway. Transportation links already exist to Silver Spring, College Park, and to New Carrollton. The Purple Line benefits the developers and not the citizens of the county.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Project Overall	12/10/2009	Safety has been and will continue to be a focus of the planning for the Purple Line. We think there are locations where additional information is needed and we believe the MTA is committed to work with the stakeholders to address the issues through PE and Final Design. Examples include the at grade crossing at Lynn Drive, widening the trail where possible, access at Rosemary Hills ES, Silver Spring International MS, and Sligo ES, and the Green Trail. We do not believe these issues - alone or in combination - form a basis for either rejecting or substantially modifying the current plan. Ridership estimates (for year 2030) indicate that more people will board the Purple Line than the Corridor Cities Transitway. FTA requires ridership estimates to be based on 20 year planning horizons. Residents will benefit from the Purple Line in many ways - one of which is more reliable and reduced travel times to reach major activity centers across the southern segment of the County.

**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments**  
**Dec 10 through Feb 12**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTRAK #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
30	Terri	Lukas	Chevy Chase West Neighborhood Association	The Association took a position against building the light rail on the trail for a variety of reasons but principally because it sacrifices the trail for an ill conceived mass transit project that will not reduce congestion in our community of Bethesda Chevy Chase. This functional plan does not resemble a plan but is another "PR" piece from the County. The aerial photos are not meaningful. The plan does not reveal how space is to be used to build this project. The trail being elevated in the tunnel over the train is a notorious engineering feature that will result in the trail becoming an obstacle course. The plan is one more deception by the County about this project.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Project Overall	12/10/2009	See Comment #22 regarding impacts to the trail. There are an estimated 19,200 new daily transit trips due to the Purple Line. Many of these trips would otherwise be vehicular trips on congested roadways. While MTA is still studying the vertical clearance in the Wisconsin Ave tunnel, there are likely to be a few locations where the vertical clearance is as little as 8 ft. In general, vertical clearance will be 9-10 ft. AASHTO recommends 8 ft. Regardless, staff acknowledges that this is not an ideal situation, but rather is a tradeoff between the trail user experience and the desire to eliminate an at-grade crossing at MD 355.
31	Peggy	Turnbow	Individual	My home is very close to the trail - the right of way extends into my back yard. That is the way the homes were built back then because no one thought there would be two trains coming through here. Trains running by here every three minutes will ruin my property values and I won't be able to get on the trail. There may be vibrations when the trains pass - in the yard and in the house. Attachment included photo of residence and back yard.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Project Overall	12/10/2009	While some residents living adjacent to the Capital Crescent Trail will no longer have direct access to the trail from their home, access to the trail will continue to be provided by a ramp located on the north side of the trail, just to the west of Edgevale Ct at Sleaford Rd. There is a proposed pedestrian tunnel that connects residents on the south side of the tracks to the Sleaford Rd ramp. Also, the Georgetown Branch right-of-way does not extend into residential property, though in a number of cases fencing has encroached on the public right-of-way. See Comment #22 (item 3) regarding double tracking.
32	Karen	Dietrich	Individual	My house is adjacent to the Capital Crescent Trail and I am opposed to the Purple Line Functional Plan. My opposition is based upon three concerns - the double track will destroy the trail, the cost does not result in any tangible difference in the lives of most County residents (l..e, it will not ease traffic congestion, will have no mitigating effect on the increasing congestion north of downtown Bethesda, at NIH and Naval Medical, and in the corridor along Wisconsin Avenue), and concern over safety.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Project Overall	12/10/2009	See Comment #22 regarding double tracking and Comment #19 regarding additional transit trips.
33	Robert	Curtis	Edgevale Civic Association	The Draft Plan is inconsistent with the single track approach of the adopted plan. Several of our houses are only 20 feet from the right of way. Our properties will loose value and there will be a huge loss of quality of life in our area. We will lose our gates and access to the trail if the train is on the south side of the trail. Architects have fought for centuries to find and design green spaces in dense urban areas. Once you take them out, you don't EVER get them back. People come from all over the region to use the trail. It seems irresponsible to put the Purple Line on the trail when it can be routed to the Medical Center Metro Station. We strongly oppose the Purple Line along the trail and even more as a double track.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Project Overall	12/10/2009	See Comment #18 regarding the preferred alignment, Comment #22 regarding double tracking and impacts to the trail, and Comment #24 regarding location of the trail on the north side of the tracks to the west of Connecticut Avenue.
34	Bonnie	Naradzay	Individual and Member of Carroll Knolls / McKenney Hills Citizens Association	The Draft Functional Plan bears no relation to the Master Plan. There is no room for the double track light rail system. Only private developers will gain from such an unreasonable concept. The trail is important to thousands of multigenerational users. The trail has a precious heritage and legacy. Double tracking will destroy this legacy. The Park and Planning Commission has a responsibility to prioritize preservation of green space for its citizenry. Moreover, the down county area is particularly vulnerable to developers encroachment and haphazard predatory development.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Project Overall	12/10/2009	See Comment #22 regarding double tracking.
35	Ajay	Bhatt	Individual	I oppose this new plan to destroy the Nature Trail and build two train lines. Like the plans before it, this plan revision fails to address many important community concerns and promotes the falsehoods that after repetition, have been accepted by facts by many. There are negative environmental impacts, negative economic impacts, and negative impacts on our quality of life. The two track approach is unacceptable and was not what was proposed when the County bought the land from the railroad. This plan fails to address any sincere mitigation of the environmental devastation that the train line will cause. The cooling effects of evapotranspiration cannot be ignored. This plan lacks a thorough review of the impact of development around the stations. The plan also does not consider the total cost of ownership for a new train system. There is no cost-benefit analysis in the plan. This approach is too costly. We cannot afford this plan. I do not want the county and federal government to use my tax dollars to build and pay for a system that will not pay for itself. Attachments include two pages depicting adjacent residences and trail users.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Project Overall	12/10/2009	See Comment #19 regarding costs and Comment #22 regarding impacts to the trail and double tracking. Environmental impact and mitigation will also be the focus of the FEIS.

**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments**  
**Dec 10 through Feb 12**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTRAK #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
36	Penina	Maya	Individual	I live with my family in East Bethesda and along with my neighbors are devastated to know that plans to build the Purple Line along the Capital Crescent Trail continue despite the terrible costs to local communities, the environment, and our state budget. The project will divide walkable communities and destroy this treasured park. The financial cost is not justified given the minor reduction in traffic and huge environmental costs - especially when the real need for transportation to Bethesda is a mile north at the expanded NIH/Medical Center campus. A more flexible approach is BRT along the Beltway or Jones Bridge Road. We can connect Prince George's and Montgomery Counties to Northern Virginia. We need to have the same foresight as Justice Douglas when he recognized that the towpath was worth preserving as a park.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Project Overall	12/10/2009	See Comment #18 regarding the preferred alignment, Comment #19 regarding costs and congestion, and Comment #22 impacts to the trail. Environmental impact and mitigation will also be the focus of the FEIS.
37	Rolf	Sinclair	Individual	There are serious shortcomings to the Purple Line plan as it now stands. The first is safety - running it on the surface along the future Capital Crescent Trail will introduce real hazards. Secondly - the MTA has focused on the light rail alternative to the exclusion of any proper study of the transportation requirements of the region. Former Commissioner Wellington questioned in September 2004 why the objectives could not be attained by an improved bus system at less cost and quicker. Thirdly - the plan to accommodate a double track and an adjacent trail is not practical. Neither is the plan to locate the trail over the train in the tunnel under Wisconsin Avenue. Fourth, the ridership estimates are suspect. They were suddenly increased by 50% and the MTA refuses to make public the reasoning and numbers behind this change.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Project Overall	12/10/2009	There will be adequate separation (and a fence) between the trail and the train. Most trail crossings will not be at-grade and those that are will be designed in a manner that - along with train operation - provides for safe crossing and train operation. MTA conducted a robust purpose and need analysis. Other alternatives were examined and found to be problematic from an operational and/or cost effectiveness standpoint - as well as overall project purpose and need. The functional plan and locally preferred alternative largely reflects a plan that is consistent with long standing County policy to develop the Georgetown Branch right of way as a transit facility. In the long term, buses are not the preferred mode for the Purple Line with its numerous connections with Metrorail and alignment that intersects with a high north - south travel demand. We need the increased capacity afforded by light rail cars in this environment. The double tracking and tunnel under Wisconsin Avenue are not without constraints but are doable and reflect trade-offs common in projects of this magnitude. The MTA has explained the basis for the change in the ridership estimate from a couple of years ago. When first published, they did not include passengers that were using both Metrorail and the Purple Line to complete a trip.
38	Bill	Schultz	Individual	I live in Martins Addition and from 1994 to 2000 served at the USDOT as Deputy Director, then Director Public Affairs. The plan for the Purple Line would destroy the trail as we know it today. To justify its \$1.7 billion cost, the supporters have cooked the ridership books. Among the Purple Line supporters is a development corporation for which the line will produce a huge windfall - but the for the neighborhood will result in a congestion nightmare. I cannot recall seeing such a questionable project.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Project Overall	12/10/2009	See response to Comment #22 regarding impacts to the trail. The ridership estimates were developed using land use forecasts provided by local agencies and a methodology approved by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). The MTA project team has been met with the FTA on numerous occasions throughout the Alternatives Analysis / NEPA process. Development proposals within the County are subject to the Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This project is competitive with other LRT projects in the FTA pipeline in terms of cost per mile and estimated ridership - especially when compared to other projects in inner suburb locations. The Purple Line is estimated to result in about the same number of new transit trips on an average weekday in 2030 (compared to the TSM alternative) as the Phase I extension (to Wiehle Avenue) of Metrorail to Dulles for the same year.
39	Julie	Standish	Individual	The Functional Master Plan is inconsistent with the 1990 Master Plan. There are two tracks and the trail is on the north side. I believe the relocation of the trail is retaliation against the Town of Chevy Chase for its opposition to the Purple Line along the Capital Crescent Trail. First we hear that workers from New Carrollton need access to jobs in Bethesda. Now we hear that there isn't enough funding to complete the light rail and that there isn't enough ridership to justify starting in New Carrollton. BRAC will bring increased workers and traffic to an already congested area. The Purple Line will not help the Red Line. The Purple Line is a transportation plan that asks the Bethesda Chevy Chase area to make all of the sacrifices with none of the benefits.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Project Overall	12/10/2009	See Comment #22 regarding double tracking, Comment #24 regarding locating the trail to the north of the tracks west of Connecticut Avenue, Comment #30 regarding a reduction in auto trips, and Comment #18 regarding BRAC.

**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments**  
**Dec 10 through Feb 12**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTRAK #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
40	Bette	Petrides	Individual	I live in West Bethesda, use the Georgetown Branch, and founder of Citizens for a Better Bethesda. Neither the Draft Functional Plan nor the DEIS adequately address the environmental harm caused by the Purple Line nor mitigation measures needed. The DEIS reference on page E22 (paragraph 10) stating that the Purple Line will take advantage of areas of lowered track and the existence of an embankment to reduce the need for retaining walls is difficult to believe. The potential for increased instability of embanked soil and sediment run-off is significant. I urge the Board to vote for the single track option. There are other problems with this plan - the double tracks extending into Woodmont East plaza, the lack of consideration of the BRAC initiatives, the trail above the train in the tunnel below Wisconsin Avenue, etc. The Purple Line is a train to nowhere for Bethesda and Chevy Chase. The Purple Line should be moved. Failing that, the Purple Line should follow the route of least harm and retain a single track.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Project Overall	12/10/2009	See Comment #19 regarding the preferred alignment, Comment #22 regarding impacts to the trail, Comment #22 regarding double tracking, and Comment #30 regarding the user experience in the Wisconsin Ave tunnel. Also, environmental impact and mitigation will also be the focus of the FEIS. See comment # 24 regarding impacts to Coquelin Run.
41	Susan	Ingram	Individual	I do not have the vision necessary for driving or navigating new or changing environments. The trail is the equivalent for me to a major road for people who drive as I can independently access my community. By moving the rail to the neighborhood side of the trail, I will no longer be able to access the trail safely. Crossing a double track with trains coming in both directions is out of the question for me. The manner in which the Functional Plan implements the project presents an insurmountable obstacle to my mobility. Please reconsider the changes you have made and don't force me to choose between independence and safety.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Future Capital Crescent / Interim Georgetown Branch Trail	12/10/2009	Access for persons with disabilities, including both vision and hearing impediments, is a priority for design of the Purple Line and the Capital Crescent Trail. Through the Preliminary Engineering phase of this project MTA will meet Federal ADA standards by identifying measures that enable persons with disabilities to safely cross the tracks. Potential design features to improve safety may include: yellow tactile strips, channelization, Z gates that force pedestrians to look in the direction of potentially approaching trains, and audible warning devices.
42	Stephen	Seidel	Individual	I am a long time resident of Chevy Chase with a Masters in City and Regional Planning and a law degree. Also have worked for over 30 years in various aspects of environmental protection. The Draft Plan is more public relations than substance. The history of the hearings on page 8 does not discuss the issues that were prominent at those hearings. The vision described on page 9 leaves problems unstated. The illustrations contain idealized caricatures of trains and people coexisting in blissful harmony. High schools kids will have to run across the tracks with a heavy backpack before dawn to get to class before the bell rings - a situation made worse by the unsubstantiated decision to move the tracks to the town-side of the path. Runners and bikers will be laboring along with the summer sun beating down on them because the tree cover has been eviscerated. The trail above the trains in the tunnel under Wisconsin Avenue is a totally unrealistic promise. The fiscal impact analysis should look closely at (1) the huge expense of the light rail system compared to the county-wide transportation needs that could be more cost-effectively served through an extensive bus rapid transit system and (2) the likely economic inefficiencies of operating a single light rail system in the county.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Project Overall	12/10/2009	See Comment #18 regarding the preferred alignment, Comment # 24 regarding the location of the trail to the north of the tracks and at-grade crossings, Comment #19 regarding cost and cost effectiveness, and Comment # 30 regarding tradeoffs in the Wisconsin Tunnel.
43	Veda	Charrow	Individual and MPAG Member	My family has lived in the Town of Chevy Chase for past 21 years. We love the Town because of the canopy of mature trees, especially the Capital Crescent Trail. The trees help protect the Town from the noise and danger of the traffic that surrounds us and they shut out views of the overdevelopment of lower Bethesda that began shortly after we moved in. Facts on the ground have changed radically since the Master Plan for Montgomery County was first created 20 years ago. A more practical western terminus for the Purple Line would be the Medical Center. In addition, the upper part of the Bethesda Business District is very close to the Medical Center and it needs to be developed. The ideas and needs of the residents of the Town were completely disregarded and disrespected. The plans do not take into account the width of the trail. The only vegetation to be planted along the new rail/trail would be shrubbery. Now we have a non-functional Functional Plan. The trains are double tracked and the trail has been moved to the north side without our knowledge. There is no reason for this yet it will increase dangers for the B-CC students and others that take short cuts across the trail. The trains will endanger an irreplaceable linear park. The Town and neighboring communities would bear the brunt of the Purple Line with little evidence that they would benefit, if at all, from its service.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Project Overall	12/10/2009	See Comment # 18 regarding the preferred alignment, Comment #22 regarding impacts to the trail, Comment # 24 regarding location of the trail to the north of the tracks and at-grade crossings, and Comment # 22 regarding double tracking. Based on policy direction provided by the County Council (see page 7 of the Functional Plan), we intend to seek opportunities to widen the trail to a minimum of 12 ft and a maximum of 16 ft through Preliminary Engineering, where existing right-of-way is available and the cost and loss of trees is not significant.

**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments**  
**Dec 10 through Feb 12**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTRAK #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
44	Harry	Sanders	Individual and MPAG Member	I live in Silver Spring and believe the Functional Plan Draft plan correctly reflects the position of the County Council's unanimous decision last winter as well as the Governor's August decision in favor of the Master Plan alignment and the light rail mode. I want to focus on best practices. I just returned from a trip to France and Spain where I utilized four tram systems. I wish everyone with doubts about the Purple Line could see these systems and realize some perceived issues just aren't problems. I feel we should seek out the affordable best practices when dealing with community and environmental issues. I think the Dale Drive stop should be implemented in the beginning but if not, definitely in a future stage. The Purple Line is a project that is part of a vision for transit friendly walkable neighborhoods with greater access to job and educational choices. It links Bethesda, Silver Spring, Takoma-Langley, and College Park. Attachments include tram photos from Europe with bikers and diners adjacent to tram and grass and tree lined right of way.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Project Overall	12/10/2009	The staff agrees that there are established light rail systems in the United States and abroad that clearly demonstrate the ability to compliment an urban or inter suburban setting characterized by high pedestrian activity, adjacent residential dwellings, and bike/trail users.
45	Yvonne	Finnegan	Individual	I live in Kensington and am here to testify against changing the Master Plan to build a double track light rail along the Capital Crescent Trail. I am a big fan of public transit and would support a project that makes sense like a heavy rail connection underground or along the beltway. The trail is an important component of a healthy lifestyle for many people all over the metropolitan region. The multi uses of the trail are incompatible with the presence of a double track light rail system. It is a given for conscientious urban planners that green space is an invaluable resource. We can put transit in many places. But we have very few beautiful continuous trails like the Capital Crescent Trail.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Future Capital Crescent / Interim Georgetown Branch Trail	12/10/2009	The staff has never questioned the trail as a valuable resource. The Purple Line project involves trade-offs and the plan as proposed is a reasonable approach to insuring east west connectivity down county while continuing to protect open space and agricultural land throughout the County over the long term. See Comment #22 regarding double tracking.
46	Mary	Rivkin	Individual	I live in Battery Park in Bethesda and am here to advocate for children having places to be outdoors. Children need to be outdoors and in nature. The State of Maryland has strongly supported this point with the Governor's 2008 Executive Order on Children in Nature. The Capital Crescent Trail is an irreplaceable contribution to this endeavor - an urban linear park connecting children and families to nature. Montgomery County - especially the lower County, already fails the State standard for open space. More density and infill argue against creating accessible nature places for children. Governor O'Malley has proclaimed an Outdoor Bill of Rights for children. I urge the Planning Board to conserve the Trail and safeguard these rights. Attachment included the Governor's Proclamation.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Future Capital Crescent / Interim Georgetown Branch Trail	12/10/2009	Improving and completing the trail through Silver Spring and connecting the trail to the Met Branch Trail in Silver Spring is a major component of the Purple Line project. Completing the trail and connecting it to a regional network of trails will improve recreational opportunities.
47	Lynda	Williams	Individual	My home abuts the Capital Crescent Trail in Columbia forest. When we bought our house about 18 months ago, many of the things we loved about our house revolved around the trail. All of this will be destroyed by the current proposal for the Light Rail system. Valuable green space will be lost, never to be adequately replaced. There have a lot of attempts to justify the proposed Purple Line in this location but it is simple to us - this is about developers wanting a dedicated rail stop to build the next Friendship Heights in downtown Bethesda and at Connecticut Avenue in Chevy Chase. The relocation of Walter Reed is upon us soon. The transportation needs of all the recovering soldiers and their attending families, not to mention all the jobs that are going to be created there, have been completely dismissed. Bus Rapid Transit would serve the area more effectively. They are less expensive and can be routed to serve targeted locations. It is time for policymakers to stop thinking purple and think green.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Future Capital Crescent / Interim Georgetown Branch Trail	12/10/2009	See Comment #22 regarding impacts to the trail, Comment #18 regarding the preferred alignment, Comment #18 regarding BRAC, and Comment #19 regarding cost and cost benefits. Environmental impact and mitigation will also be the focus of the FEIS. The Purple Line is being constructed for many reasons, including to improve mobility.
48	Aileen	Worthington	Individual	I am a DC resident and a cyclist. I often ride from the bike trail in Rock Creek Park and connect with the Capital Crescent Trail - sometimes continuing to cross one of the Potomac River bridges and connect with the Mt. Vernon Trail. What a treasure this regional trail system is! If the Purple Line takes the CCT route, a long section of the Trail will be unusable for recreational cyclists, runners, and walkers. Including cycling/walking paths fairly close to light rail makes sense when the purpose is to add a path through an existing urban area. With the CCT we are starting instead with a treasured tree lined recreational trail/linear park in an extremely narrow corridor and then actively planning to trash that park like trail when there are other options.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Future Capital Crescent / Interim Georgetown Branch Trail	12/10/2009	See Comment #22 regarding impacts to the trail. The primary advocacy groups for the bicycling community in Montgomery County (MoBikes and WABA) are in favor of the Purple Line because it will provide a minimum width of 10 ft and will provide a paved trail between Bethesda and Silver Spring.



**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments**  
**Dec 10 through Feb 12**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTrack #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
49	Barbara	Hankins	The League of Women Voters of Montgomery County, MD, Inc.	Transportation issues have been a focus of League research, study, discussion, and consensus since the early sixties. The League is committed to transportation systems that focus on regional solutions. We also favor transportation services which are made convenient and accessible by minimizing the time required for a trip and which provide frequent and reliable service. The Purple Line Light Rail option meets both of those criteria. We are please to see that the Draft Functional Plan does well in implementing the decision by the Governor to support the light rail option. The League has long been an advocate for strong stewardship of the environment. We recommend a best practices approach in design issues so that the rail and trail work together to benefit both and the neighboring community as well. We urge you to expedite approval of the Draft Functional Plan so that it continues on its path to adoption in the County's Master Plan.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Project Overall	12/10/2009	The staff agrees with these comments from the League of Women Voters.
50	Deborah	Ingram	Individual	I have lived in Chevy Chase since 1987 and my yard abuts the Capital Crescent Trail. I am here to testify against the proposed revision of the 1994 Master Plan as detailed in the Functional Plan which changes the Purple Line from single tracking to double tracking from Bethesda to Silver Spring and moves it from the south side of the right of way to the north side of the right of way between Bethesda and Rock Creek. My family and I use the trail daily for exercise and to navigate around our community. The proposed Purple Line has many problems - (1) selection of the wrong alignment if ridership and public transit is really the goal, (2) destruction of urban forest, (3) loss of irreplaceable urban green space, and (4) loss of the heavily used Capital Crescent Trail. The proposed double tracking has additional negative consequences that have not been adequately addressed in the proposal - safety being the most important. Students want to take the shortest route to cross the trail. Once the train is there, many will continue to cross where they now cross even if it means cutting through any fencing that is in the way. The Town's crossing at the Lynn path will remain open for crossing and it will be dangerous. It will be far more dangerous for these kids to cross two tracks, with trains bearing down at high speed from both directions, than to cross a single track. The trains will be running quietly and kids will not be paying attention. Double tracking makes this more dangerous. The right of way is narrow - too narrow to accommodate double tracks and the trail. Elevating the trail will result in a serious loss of privacy for residents along the upper portion of Elm Street as there will be a need to elevate the trail starting around 44th Street. Attachments include July 8, 2009 article on Baltimore Light Rail accident, May 5, 2009 article on Pedestrian Railway Deaths (as) Recurring Problem in Maryland, and summary of excerpts and links to articles on train accidents and resulting pedestrian deaths and injuries.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Project Overall	12/10/2009	See Comment # 22 regarding impact to the trail and double tracking, Comment #24 regarding the Purple Line travel speed at -grade crossings and location of the trail to the north of the tracks, and Comment #41 regarding provisions for safe at-grade crossings at Lynn Dr. In addition, we recognize that the Capital Crescent Trail is an important recreational and commuting path used by many pedestrians, bicyclists, and others and will make improvements to the trail as part of the Purple Line project. The trail will be paved between Bethesda and Silver Spring and will be a minimum of 10 ft wide.
51	Michele	Horwitz Cornwell	Chevy Chase Land Company and MPAG member	I am Senior Vice President of the Chevy Chase Land Company and a member of the Purple Line Advisory Group over the past two years. The history of transit in the region is entwined with the roots of the Chevy Chase Land Company. In 1890, Senator Francis Newlands of Nevada founded the Chevy Chase Land Company, assembled the land from DuPont Circle to Jones Bridge Road and established a village called Chevy Chase. The Company built the Rock Creek Railway to connect Chevy Chase with the Federal City. At the end of the 7 1/2 mile railway was Chevy Chase Lake where the Company built a power house to run the streetcars, light the streetlamps, and eventually power any homes that were built. It was a visionary investment and now, over 100 years later, we need to stand behind another visionary investment - better east - west transit in this region. The Land Company supports the recommendations of the Draft Purple Line Functional Master Plan as the guiding policy document for implementing the Purple Line. The Land Company still owns the fee simple interest in a substantial portion of the land that comprises the Georgetown Branch right of way. We fully support the use of this right of way, which was created for transportation purposes, for the light rail Purple Line. As well, the Land Company strongly advocates the completion of the hiker biker trail within this same right of way proposed for the Purple Line. The Land Company also supports the recommendation in the Functional Plan for a transit station at Chevy Chase Lake on Connecticut Avenue. How transit oriented redevelopment may occur for this area is not the subject of this Functional Plan but rather will be the subject of a sector plan study in 2010.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Project Overall	12/10/2009	The staff notes and agrees that establishing land use policy along the alignment is not part of a Functional Plan. The primary role of this Functional Plan is to protect the alignment from encroachment.

**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments**  
**Dec 10 through Feb 12**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTRAK #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
52	Anne	Martin	Greater Bethesda Chevy Chase Chamber of Commerce and MPAG member	I am appearing before you today as a past chairman of the Chamber - an organization that represents more 750 member businesses and their more than 45,000 employees. I am also the Chamber's representative on the Planning Board's Purple Line Master Plan Advisory Group. I am here to express our support for the Draft Purple Line Functional Master Plan and the alignment specified therein that was recommended unanimously by the County Council in January 2009 and was announced as the Governor's Locally Preferred Alternative in August 2009. The Chamber has long supported the alignment for transit and trail on the Georgetown Branch right of way as it was recommended in the B-CC Master Plan, Bethesda CBD Sector Plan, and the Georgetown Branch Master Plan for over 20 years, and the right of way was purchased for such purpose. In addition to supporting the vision of the Plan, the Chamber supports the objectives noted for the Bethesda and Chevy Chase stations, the trail, and the transit segments that will provide enhanced travel options and opportunities for targeted growth to prevent sprawl. B-CC has long been the economic engine of the County, however, the missing link for efficiency has always been the east-west transit between the population centers of Montgomery County and Prince George's County. As the Draft Plan states, the Purple Line is a critical long term investment in our master planned transportation infrastructure that will allow the County to remain economically competitive in the region.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Project Overall	12/10/2009	The staff generally agrees with this statement from the Greater Bethesda Chevy Chase Chamber of Commerce.
53	Tony	Hausner	Indian Springs Citizens Association and MPAG member	I am with Indian Springs Citizens Association (ISCA) and two countywide task forces - the Purple Line Bi-county Task Force and the Planning Board's Purple Line Master Plan Advisory Group. The ISCA has 800 homes just inside the Beltway. We voted last year 70 to 3 to support the Purple Line and prefer light rail over bus rapid transit. We support transit solutions rather than highway solutions and we oppose Beltway widening as it will be destructive to our neighborhood and to suburban Maryland. While we support the Purple Line, there are several other important planning considerations. Affordable housing needs to be maintained as best as possible at current levels at all locations along the route. We do not want to see overdevelopment, particularly in residential neighborhoods. The goal of the Purple Line from our view is to provide transportation and transit oriented development, but not to be an excuse to overdevelop the area. We strongly recommend that you support the current route adopted for a light rail system for the Purple Line. Attachment provided of written statement to Planning Board Hearing on Locally Preferred Alternative on January 8, 2009.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Project Overall	12/10/2009	The staff acknowledges that affordable housing has been - and will remain - a critical issue to be addressed in the various station area plans underway (Takoma Langley Crossroads and Long Branch) and planned (Chevy Chase Lake). Relatively recent research suggests that affordable (i.e., competitively priced) housing is an important factor in individuals choosing to reside in mixed use settings that ultimately result in shorter trip lengths and proportionally less trips by auto.
54	Webb	Smedley	Woodside Civic Association	The Woodside Civic Association strongly supports the light rail alternative for the Purple Line. WCA members have twice voted in unanimously in 2003 and 2008 to support joint use of the Georgetown Branch right of way for a light rail line and trail. WCA believes that completion of the Purple Line and Capital Crescent Trail should be the number one transit priority for the County. WCA represents homeowners and tenants living along the CSX right of way between Spring Street, 16th Street, and Georgia Avenue, an area immediately abutting the proposed Purple Line route and the Capital Crescent Trail. We see the project offering enormous benefits including: faster and easier access to destinations both east and west, a quality alternative to driving for Silver Spring residents, a critical new link in the regional rail transit network, and completion and improvements to the Capital Crescent Trail. We urge the Board to forward this functional plan to Council as quickly as possible so that the State will be one step closer to completion of this vital project.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Project Overall	12/10/2009	The staff agrees with these comments from the Woodside Civic Association
55	Kathy	Davies	Individual	I would like to note that the proposed route does not run by my house nor near the house of any of my relatives or close friends. My remarks today are those of a citizen of Montgomery County who is concerned with the common good. The original Master Plan which provided for a single track was bad enough in that it would destroy a much beloved trail and would run trains going 60 mph 30 feet from our citizen's back doors. The proposed amendments take all of the negative features of the Master Plan and builds on them. It takes the single track of the earlier proposal and makes it a double track. It proposes using a pedestrian walkway in the liveliest part of Bethesda as a parking lot for the trains. Transportation belongs on roads not trails. It seems to me there is a determination by this body to have the light rail on the trail without serious consideration of the impact on the community. I urge you to reject the double tracking and not to park trains in downtown Bethesda. I urge your to consider Bus Rapid Transit which would be less destructive, less expensive, and more flexible. Attachment provided of November 27, 2009 article by Charles Lemos on Bus Rapid Transit Systems.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Project Overall	12/10/2009	Staff examined the issue of proximity to the Georgetown Branch right-of-way between the Elm Street Park and Jones Mill Road by examining the number of parcels whose structure closest to the right-of-way fell within 30, 50, or 80 feet from the right-of-way centerline, ignoring for the moment where the train and trail are located relative to one another. The objective was to try and determine if there is any significant difference when comparing the north side and south side. There is no significant difference in the number of parcels when considering the entire segment from Elm Street Park to Jones Mill Road. Within the segment that includes the Town boundary to the south, there are two more single family homes on the south than on the north side but there are more residences (multi-family) on the north than the south and those residences are closer to the centerline.

**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments**  
**Dec 10 through Feb 12**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTRAK #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
56	Jim	Roy	Individual	I have been a resident of the County for 11 years and live in Chevy Chase. I have studied the Functional Plan and attended hearings over the last few years and have many simple questions and serious concerns. Where is the demand for this light rail? Is \$100 million a mile good use of our taxpayer money? I have not been able to find anyone - after an internet search - who has said they plan to use the Purple Line. I would like to know specifically what will happen at Elm Street Park with respect to access to the trail. Do we have enough money to build the Purple Line and a trail wide enough for 10,000 weekly users? The pictures I have seen show a trail, trains, a buffer zone between the trail and tracks, fully grown trees on either side of both, and no overhead wires. Is this accurate? How can this be when there is just enough room for the mature trees and trail at this point? The Functional Plan shows the trail on the north side of the tracks between East West Highway and Wisconsin Avenue. Residential zoning is on the south side and commercial zoning is on the north side. What prompted the change from the plan I saw months ago?	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Project Overall	12/10/2009	Direct access from the Elm Street Park to the Capital Crescent Trail will be provided. There will be a ramp from the Elm Street Park that will enter the tunnel above the tracks. This concept will be refined during the Preliminary Engineering phase. See Comment #24 regarding the location of the trail to the north of the tracks and Comment #19 regarding costs and ridership.
57	Wayne	Phyllaier	Individual	Those of us living in Woodside, North Woodside, Rosemary Hills, and also the many families living in the apartments and condominiums in the Silver Spring CBD are still waiting for the Capital Crescent Trail after all of these years. A M-NCPPC Department of Parks survey report of 2007 noted that the low use of the gravel trail at Grubb Road strongly supports the need to pave this portion of the trail and complete it to downtown Silver Spring. The Purple Line Functional Plan would give the Capital Crescent Trail to ALL neighborhoods between Bethesda and Silver Spring. The Functional Plan will us all a better Trail - AND better transit. Please endorse it!	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Project Overall	12/10/2009	The staff agrees that completion of the trail through Silver Spring is an important objective of the project.
58	Craig	Simpson	Purple Line Now!	We have reviewed the Draft Purple Line Functional Plan and find it consistent with the decisions of both the County Council and Governor O'Malley. Our organization represents a broad range of diverse interests including major businesses, labor, environmental, municipal, and community organizations. Now, more than ever, Montgomery County needs the Purple Line. Even during the current economic downturn, traffic on the beltway and East West Highway is often at a standstill and our citizens are suffering as a result. We have a great radial rail system. What we need is a quality, light rail line connecting the system. It would be nice if a tunnel could quickly and <u>affordably</u> be constructed for the 16 miles covered by the Purple Line. Unfortunately it can not. Modern light rail lines have proven to be community friendly in cities across the globe. There are now many examples of successful light rail lines operating on grass tracks alongside popular hiker biker trails. Light rail has been specified on the County's Master Plan since 1990 when the Georgetown Branch Master Plan was approved. The adopted plan also specifically states on page 49: "In the event future consideration is given to additional double track section, the existing right of way is generally sufficient with appropriate structural treatment to accommodate the necessary typical 56 foot trolley/trail cross section, except along the Metropolitan Branch section from Talbot Avenue to Silver Spring." PLN supports best practices when dealing with community and environmental issues and we feel grass tracks and the future examination of wireless LRT illustrates the State and County's commitment to addressing community concerns. The Purple Line will be good for Bethesda, good for Silver Spring, and especially good for the University Boulevard corridor where people are suffering as a result of the current recession. We urge you to move this plan forward to the County Council as quickly as possible.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Project Overall	12/10/2009	The staff notes and is in specific agreement with the statement regarding the unlikelihood of funding a tunnel for the entire (or any significant) length of the project as well as the reference to modern light rail having demonstrated its compatibility with community life in many locales.

**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments**  
**Dec 10 through Feb 12**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTRAK #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
59	Chris	Richardson	Individual, Park Hills Civic Association Officer, and MPAG Member	I am a 10 year resident of the neighborhood adjacent to Wayne Avenue and east of downtown Silver Spring. First with respect to the potential Dale Drive station on page 24, I ask that you <u>keep</u> the language that is in the draft master plan before you and <u>not</u> modify it in any way as to permit such an unnecessary station to be built in the initial construction of the Purple Line, if at all. Second, that you strike the language on pages 23 and 24 regarding the Green Trail, a trail which as it now reads would be a hiker-biker trail, with no separate sidewalk on the north side of Wayne Avenue. In January of this year, the County Council modified a prior Planning Board decision to say that perhaps a Dale Drive station could be built after the Purple Line was constructed and operational. However, now MTA is lobbying the County to permit a station at Dale to be built in the initial construction. In the four mile stretch between Bethesda and the Silver Spring Transit Center there is an average of one station per mile. However, if the Dale Drive station is built, there would be five stations in less than two miles, going east from the Silver Spring Transit Center. The proposed Dale Drive station is in the middle of a single family residential neighborhood with no high density apartment buildings within walking distance of the proposed station that not nearer to either the Fenton or Manchester Place station. Moreover, MTA's estimated boardings for a Dale station is twice what it projects for the Fenton station - number which would appear to be reversed. MTA's proposal to change what the Count previously decided and which earlier MTA has said it agreed with would have adverse impacts on the community: eventual transit oriented development at or near the station, greatly increased noise, greater widening of Wayne Avenue, and the closing of the Wayne Avenue access to the large parking lot of the elementary and middle schools at Dale and Wayne and pushing traffic onto Dale Drive and neighborhood side streets. Regarding the Green Trail, the Draft Plan states euphemistically that the Green Trail on the north side of Wayne Avenue would be "shared use". This means that the ling planned bicycle path would now be changed to hike and bike path with no separate sidewalk. This will change the previous decision of the Planning Board and County to build the Green Trail. Any decision to change this original conception of the Green Trail should happen only after a separate hearing. This is a matter of concern because of due process and safety.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Dale Drive Station and Silver Spring Green Trail	12/10/2009	See Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive Station and access and safety considerations at the Sligo Creek ES and International MS. As you have noted, the Countywide Bikeways Functional Plan indicates that an 8 ft shared use path and a 5 ft sidewalk will be provided on Wayne Ave between Spring St and Sligo Creek. Due to right-of-way constraints, this is being modified as part of the Purple Line Functional Plan process to be an 8 ft shared use path and a 5 ft buffer. Due process is being satisfied by considering this modification as part of the Purple Line Function Master Plan process. It is appropriate to closely space light rail stations in dense locations, such as Silver Spring.
60	Byrne	Kelly	Individual and MPAG Member	The Purple Line is in competition for Federal Funds and it is competitive! Is that all our MTA needs to consider and to design to, and for? At the intersection of New Hampshire Avenue and University Boulevard and at Georgia Avenue, in the heart of the Central Business District of Downtown Silver Spring, the <u>Aerial Alternative</u> has not been analyzed or included in the design and planning processes. We have looked at the tunnel option and found it to be not viable because of costs. When performing "Due Diligence", are we not compelled to by our laws and common sense to look for the most efficient and cost effective solutions to make mass transit rapid transit? The Planning Board and the County Council, and our County Executive must compel the MTA to perform studies of an Aerial Option along the entire Purple Line route.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Project Overall	12/10/2009	The staff does not believe an aerial alignment is feasible from a cost standpoint nor desirable from an urban design standpoint. The MTA examined the feasibility of an aerial crossing in the Takoma Langley Crossroads area (it was included as part of the Light Rail and BRT High Investment Alternatives) and found the dedicated lanes on University offered close to the same travel time benefits at much less cost. The City of Takoma Park supports an at-grade Purple Line.

**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments**  
**Dec 10 through Feb 12**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTRAK #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
61	Pat	Baptiste	Coalition for the Capital Crescent Trail and MPAG member	Pat Baptiste provided the oral testimony in place of Peter Gray, chair of the Coalition for the Capital Crescent Trail Board. The Coalition spearheaded the effort to have Montgomery County and the National Park Service build the current Capital Crescent Trail including the portion between Wisconsin Avenue and Stewart Avenue over which the Purple Line may one day run. We have also engaged in continuous advocacy efforts to ensure that the Trail is usable and safe for all users, including my personally representing the Coalition on the Purple Line Advisory Group meant to advise this very Board on the Purple Line itself. Unlike every other group on the MPAG, the Coalition did not come into the process advocating a certain outcome with respect to building the Purple Line. Our intent has been all along to represent the interests of all users of the Capital Crescent Trail, regardless of what the Board decides on the overall transportation project. We endorse the Plan recommendations with LRT as the preferred mode. The plan should incorporate the High Investment LRT design for the Capital Crescent Trail through the tunnel under Wisconsin Avenue. The plan should expand the Capital Crescent / Georgetown Branch Trail from the previously planned 10 foot to at least 12 foot paved width with two foot usable shoulders on each side ( as in the trail west of Bethesda Avenue) <b>IF</b> the Purple Line is built along that Trail corridor. The Purple Line must include a Capital Crescent Trail that is completed off directly connecting into the Silver Spring Transit Center and on to the Metropolitan Branch Trail with funding for the Trail assured. Further analysis should be conducted for the Final Environmental Impact Statement to developing design details, not currently included in the Functional Plan, for the Trail, including: detailed plans for all access points, retaining walls and fencing for safety, noise reduction, and privacy, loss of trees and landscaping along the Trail corridor, aesthetic treatments for the bridges crossing Rock Creek, signing and marking along the Trail, bicycle facilities at all Purple Line stations, and a public plaza at the Woodmont East terminus.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Future Capital Crescent / Interim Georgetown Branch Trail	12/10/2009	We recognize that a 10 foot wide trail is less than ideal for a facility that is as extensively used as the Interim Capital Crescent Trail. Based on policy direction provided by the County Council (see page 7 of the Functional Plan), we intend to seek opportunities to widen the trail to a minimum of 12 ft and a maximum of 16 ft through Preliminary Engineering, where existing right-of-way is available and the cost and loss of trees is not significant. In addition, the Locally Preferred Alternative does recommended using the High Investment LRT design for the Capital Crescent Trail through the tunnel under Wisconsin Ave. <b>2)</b> Staff agrees that a direct connection between the Capital Crescent Trail and the Metropolitan Branch Trail at the Silver Spring Transit Center is vital and that this connection should not require a dismount zone. The design of the connection at the Transit Center should avoid conflicts between trail users and transit passengers.
62	Casey	Anderson	Washington Area Bicyclist Association	WABA strongly supports the locally preferred alternative selected for the Purple Line, including use of the Georgetown Branch right of way for light rail as well as the Capital Crescent Trail. We have three concerns about the functional master plan as it relates to bicycling, primarily concerning the Metropolitan Branch Trail and the Silver Spring Green Trail. The routing of the CCT/Met Branch trails through the transit center is critical. The master plan draft does not address this issue. The functional master plan should make it clear that trail access should be accommodated in a way that avoids creating conflicts between transit passengers in the station area and trail users. In particular, the final design should not call for cyclists traveling on the trail through the station to dismount and walk their bikes for extended distances. If a dismount zone for cyclists is necessary during construction of the transit center, that's fine - but the master plan should make it clear that this is not an acceptable permanent solution. The Green Trail should be at least a full 10 feet in width per AASHTO standards for multiuse paths. It should include a separate bicycle facility (preferably a cycle track or at a minimum a striped bike lane) as contemplated by other master plan documents. The draft Purple Line master plan calls for a narrowing the trail to 8 feet and eliminating the separate bicycle facility. Again, this would invite conflicts between cyclists and pedestrians. It is also unacceptable to build substandard trails where, as here, the trail in question is being constructed from scratch and the right of way is being completely reconfigured. It is important for the Green Trail to be built to AASHTO standards because it will be a link to the Purple Line for residents of surrounding neighborhoods, it will provide a link to downtown destinations, it has been identified as a major regional trail in master plans for several years, and Silver Spring in general lacks a robust network of bike and pedestrian connections. The CCT, Met Branch, and Green Trail designs should incorporate appropriate design features to increase safety. Let's avoid the problems that happened with the Georgia Avenue bike/ped bridge crossing the beltway.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	CCT/Met Branch/ Green Trails	12/10/2009	Staff agrees that a direct connection between the Capital Crescent Trail and the Metropolitan Branch Trail at the Silver Spring Transit Center is vital and that this connection should not require a dismount zone. The design of the transit center should avoid conflicts between trail users and transit passengers. Staff agrees that a 10 ft width for the Green Trail is preferable and we will seek opportunities to increase the width from 8 ft when possible. Staff agrees that design considerations are an important part of providing a safe trail experience. This includes providing call boxes, adequate sight distance, and sufficient lighting. In addition, the Functional Plan should note that the Purple Line can leverage bicycle facilities to increase station "catchment areas" by providing secure bicycle parking at each station.

**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments**  
**Dec 10 through Feb 12**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTRAK #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
63	Joseph	Lavorgna	MCPS - Facilities Management	Mr. Lavorgna is Acting Director of the Montgomery County Public Schools Department of Facilities Management. With respect to Rosemary Hills Elementary School, MCPS staff is concerned that the Purple Line alignment will have a negative impact on the school site, as it will reduce useable area that is already constrained in size. The proposed alignment located the hiker/biker path on the south side of Talbot Avenue, necessitating the relocation of the street very close to the school building. To lessen the impact to Rosemary Hills Elementary School, we propose that the hiker/biker trail alignment be revised to show the proposed pedestrian bridge crossing the CSX railroad tracks further west towards the terminus of Hanover Street. With respect to Silver Spring International Middle School and Sligo Creek Elementary School, the plan calls for closing an entrance on Wayne Avenue that serves Sligo International Middle School and installing a new entrance on Schuyler Road. This proposal is unacceptable as drawn for it will concentrate all vehicular traffic, both private automobile and school bus traffic, to one location causing safety concerns for the 1,500 students and staff at both facilities. We request that alternative entrances be investigated to provide safe and improved traffic circulation. In addition, the proposal to locate a station near the intersection of Dale Drive and Wayne Avenue poses a possible safety concern as there is the probability that state and students will be tempted to cross mid-block to access the station platform. Consideration should be given to installing acceptable barriers along the hiker/biker trail along the Wayne Avenue frontage.	Letter to Chairman Hanson	2009-1108	School Access	12/14/2009	See Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive Station and access and safety considerations at the Sligo Creek ES and International MS and Comment #24 regarding at grade crossings. Also, MTA has agreed to investigate the feasibility of shifting the Capital Crescent Trail to the west of Rosemary Hills ES and aligning with Hanover St. This concept will be refined during the Preliminary Engineering phase.
64	Marilyn	Mazuzan	Individual	I decided not to testify as I was under the impression that this was an opportunity for general testimony. I would appreciate it if each Commissioner was given a copy of my testimony. I live in Bethesda. Since I do not live in the Town of Chevy Chase and do not play golf you cannot label me as a NIMBY. I am however a trail lover and have been for many years. My husband and I loved to walk the trail together and often took one of grandchildren with us. I still walk the trail as it is a place where I can be in touch with nature and still feel safe walking alone. I have concern for the owners of the properties I can see from the trail. The original BRAC intersections improvement plans took away a slice of my front yard to widen Oakmont Avenue. That part of the plans has been eliminated for which I am very grateful. Many trees will be lost because of this proposal to build the Purple Line. We need to give another look at bus rapid transit. There are new more efficient models out there such as the ones now serving Cleveland and Los Angeles. Given the economic conditions of all three governments involved, the least costly alternative needs to be given a through review. Attachment included - article by Lauren Gravitz from Onearth (winter 2010) on bus rapid transit.	Letter	N/A	Project Overall	Dated 12/10/2009 and Received 12/15/09.	See Comment #22 regarding impacts to the trail and Comment #18 regarding the preferred alignment.
65	Jonathan	Jay	Individual	I have served on the Planning Board's Purple Line MPAG and am also Vice President of Seven Oaks Evanswood Citizens Association which represents approximately 700 households directly to the northeast of the Silver Spring CBD. The majority of the community most directly impacted by the planning of Purple Line surface route through downtown Silver Spring and along Wayne Avenue through the residential neighborhood favored a tunneled route not a surface route for that segment. As serious as we believe those consequences area, we would hope that the County and State would not make any additional decisions which would compound rather than mitigate problems for the community. Therefore I ask that you consider this testimony in that context. The "potential" Dale station is addressed on page 24 of the Draft Plan you are considering. That draft retains the County's decision earlier in 2009 - namely, that a Dale Station, if built at all, would not be included in the initial construction of the Purple Line. I ask that you retain this language and resist any efforts to dilute it that in any way would permit a station to be built prior to the completion of the Purple Line and the initial operation of the 16-mile system. Only single family residences and a handful of small multi-family residences on the east side of downtown Silver Spring and east of Sligo Creek Park that are not nearer to another station (Fenton/Silver Spring Library and Manchester Place) are within reasonable walking distance (1/4 mile as defined by the MTA) of a Dale station. On pages 23 and 24 of the Draft it is stated that there will be a "shared use" Green Trail. nowhere does it state what 'shared use" is or that the separate sidewalk will disappear. The shared use refers to what will be a hiker biker trail. This will be one of the few, if any, hiker / biker trails on a major residential road that is also used to access downtown. It will create major safety hazards for both pedestrians and bikers. I urge you to strike all mention of the Green Trail in the Functional Master Plan or at least take out anything which would mean that it is clearly going to be merged with the sidewalk into a hiker/biker trail.	CTRAK	2009-1109	Dale Drive Station and Silver Spring Green Trail	Dated 12/16/2009 and Received 12/21/09	Staff disagrees that the Green Trail should be eliminated due to safety concerns. While it is preferable for shared-use paths to be located along roadways that have a low density of intersections and driveways, most of the driveways are single-family residences that will generate only sporadic conflicts with bicyclists. We recommend amending the text on page 24 as follows: "The Silver Spring Green Trail is a shared use path on the north side of 2nd Avenue and Wayne Avenue, accommodating bicyclists, pedestrians, and other users on a path that is separated from vehicular travel lanes by a landscaped panel." See the staff memo for the 03/04/10 work session for additional discussion on the Silver Spring Green Trail. The staff's position on the Dale Drive station is that the MTA has not to date presented enough compelling data to recommend a change in the County Council position. We question whether the station would actually have double the boardings of a Fenton Street station. We also think the MTA needs to continue to work with the community and MCPS on access issues to the school property - both with and without and with a potential station. From the staff's perspective, the community remains divided on this issue.



**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments**  
**Dec 10 through Feb 12**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTRAK #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
66	Kristin	Schneeman	Individual	I and my family are residents of East Bethesda and we are passionately concerned about preserving the environmental resource that is at the heart of our neighborhood, the Georgetown Branch Trail. The stated purpose of this Functional Plan is to update the 1990 Master Plan. That is no minor matter, considering how significantly the scope and scale of the project have grown over the last nearly twenty years, and the detail provided in this Functional Plan does not remotely seem to do the task justice. The Plan does not make clear the trolley was originally intended to run on a single track, an egregious omission in my view. The right of way in many places where I live in East Bethesda is simply too narrow to accommodate two trains and the promised trail. The Functional Plan table describing the right of way requirements in my area are completely unenlightening as to whether additional right of way will be required, which as a homeowner abutting the trail is of serious concern. The state has insisted in all the community briefings that I have attended that additional right of way will not be required; this document appears to hint that that may not be entirely accurate. I was dumbfounded by the Plan's accounting of the environmental benefits of the project, which essentially consisted of grass tracks. As the costs of the project continue to escalate many of us in the community fully expect the things being offered up as benefits go by the wayside, including the grass tracks, the attractive landscaping and fencing. Perhaps even the trail itself. The state claims this project is important for smart growth. An absolutely ironclad principle of smart growth in urban area is the preservation and enhancement of green space for environmental benefits, recreation, community space, and habitat for plants and wildlife. This project will result in the permanent loss of thousands upon thousands of mature trees and wreck a precious environmental resource.	CTRAK	2009-1105	Future Capital Crescent / Interim Georgetown Branch Trail	Dated and Received 12/17/09	The draft plan should be revised to state that the double tracking along the entire segment is a change to the currently adopted plan. The MTA has begun working on mitigation efforts on the trail with the Town of Chevy Chase. Environmental impact and mitigation will also be the focus of the FEIS. The staff has reviewed the plans developed by the MTA and believes some limited amount of additional right of way will be required to construct pedestrian access ramps at Pearl Street and near the Riviera Apartments. The staff has never questioned the trail as a valuable resource. The Purple Line project involves trade-offs and the plan as proposed is a reasonable approach to insuring east west connectivity down county while continuing to protect open space and agricultural land throughout the County over the long term.
67	Carol	Roberts	Individual	I hope in light of the dire financial deficits of METRO, to say nothing of the millions of dollars the County and State need for crucial services, plans for the most expensive alternative to solving east-west traffic will be abandoned. If ever there was a time to ignore the plea for more offices and stores it is now.	CTRAK	2009-1113	Project Overall	Dated 12/20/2009 and Received 12/23/09	See Comment #19 regarding cost. The most expensive alternative (LRT High) was not selected.
68	Pamela	Kurland	Individual	I am writing to urge you to minimize the damage to the Crescent Trail - it is an invaluable resource to our community and the drawings of the Purple Line that have seen thus far would severely limit our family's and community's ability to use the trail.	CTRAK	2009-1113	Future Capital Crescent / Interim Georgetown Branch Trail	Dated 12/17/2009 and Received 12/23/09	See comment #22 regarding impacts to the trail.
69	Catherine	Pickar	Individual	I am in favor of having mass transit on the trail, beginning in Bethesda and traveling to College Park and beyond. In addition to the advantages of having mass transit (other than buses on our already crowded roads) having a way to get to University of Maryland other than in a car would open up an invaluable cultural and academic resource to the citizens and students, both high school and college. Although it is true that the character of the trail would change, we would still have a trail. I am a biker and a walker and I love the trail.	CTRAK	2009-1113	Project Overall	Dated 12/17/2009 and Received 12/23/09	We agree.
70	Nancy	Ridgway	Individual	I am a Montgomery College nursing student who lives in Kensington and attends classes at the Takoma Park campus. I have been attending classes part time at Takoma Park for almost three years. I drive the East West Highway back and forth between Takoma Park and Bethesda at all times of the day and evening. I wish I could bring all of you with me on my commutes. I have no problem driving East West Highway at any time because there is so little traffic! The thought of spending all that money and ripping down all those trees is extremely surprising to me. I would be really interested in seeing the projected ridership for the Purple Line. Please reconsider the Purple Line.	CTRAK	2009-1113	Project Overall	Dated 12/17/2009 and Received 12/23/09	See Comment #22 regarding impacts to the trail, Comment #19 regarding congestion and ridership projections. There is a high volume of vehicles traveling on East-West Highway (MD 401). Approximately 27,000 vehicles used East-West Highway per day in 2008. This is projected to increased to 33,000 by 2030.
71	John	Mutzberg	Individual	I live next to the trail in Bethesda and consider it a valuable asset to our county. While I recognize the need for mass transit and offering ways to connect the municipalities in our vast area, I also see the green spaces disappearing faster and faster. I am also concerned that the cost will far outweigh any benefit to the citizens other than to a few developers who will gain zoning exemptions to expand their properties. Please consider the expanded bus routes for Bethesda at least in the short term until it can be proven that destroying the trail is really justified.	CTRAK	2009-1113	Project Overall	Dated 12/17/2009 and Received 12/23/09	See Comment #22 regarding impacts to the trail, Comment #19 regarding cost benefits, and Comment #18 regarding the preferred alignment.
72	Reid	Lewis	Individual	I strongly favor mass transit so it pains me to say that I strongly oppose the Purple Line as proposed. As I told roger Berliner a few years ago "there are many roads - there is only one Crescent Trail - put the Purple Line on a road!" My favorite route is elevated down the middle of the beltway or perhaps down the middle of 410.	CTRAK	2009-1113	Project Overall	Dated 12/18/2009 and Received 12/23/09	See Comment #22 regarding impacts to the trail and regional benefits and Comment #18 regarding the preferred alignment.

**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments**  
**Dec 10 through Feb 12**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTRAK #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
73	Lloyd and Diane	Eisenburg	Couple	This lovely setting (Crescent Trail) is threatened to become a bus/train line to satisfy the rapid movement of east-west Montgomery County travelers. First the cost to destroy and secondly, the cost to construct ugliness - all this dressed in the guise of moving people from east to west and west to east. In 20 years when the rusted remains of the purple line is torn up to create playgrounds and parks, another act of foolish planners will be pondered by those in the third quarter of the 21st century. The second thing that most Americans want after a home is a car - any thought that a rapid transit line running between College Park and Bethesda will replace this American dream is the city planners constant fantasy.	CTRAK	2009-1113	Project Overall	Dated 12/18/2009 and Received 12/23/09	See Comment #22 regarding impacts to the trail.
74	Barry	Miller	Individual	I wish to register my strong opposition to the Current Purple Line Master Plan for installing light rail along the popular Capital Crescent Trail. Add bus rapid transit to Jones Bridge Road and/or a Purple Line route along the beltway. Do not bulldoze this valuable green, quiet corridor that is peacefully used by bike commuters, pedestrians, and for recreation.	CTRAK	2009-1113	Project Overall	Dated 12/18/2009 and Received 12/23/09	See Comment #22 regarding impacts to the trail and Comment #18 regarding the preferred alignment.
75	Debra	Turkat	Individual	My husband and I are frequent users of the Crescent Trail. Every week, more than 10,000 walkers, runners, and bikers from all over the region use the Capital Crescent Trail. Hundreds of children and teens use the Trail every week to get to Bethesda Chevy Chase High School, Westland Middle School, the Jane Lawton Community Center, and to visit friends, for exercise, recreation, and to hang out. It's easy to see that the Purple Line doesn't belong 10 feet from the Capital Crescent Trail and a few feet from homes along the Trail. Please act wisely - put transit elsewhere to preserve the Capital Crescent Trail as this region's Central Park - so that we and generations to come will be able to enjoy this beautiful, safe, irreplaceable green space, regardless of the growth and development that takes place around us.	CTRAK	2009-1122	Future Capital Crescent / Interim Georgetown Branch Trail	Dated 12/24/2009 and Received 12/28/09	See Comment #22 regarding impacts to the trail and Comment #18 regarding the preferred alignment.
76	Jay	Nijjer	Individual	Signed e-mail above from Debra Turkat	CTRAK	2009-1122	Future Capital Crescent / Interim Georgetown Branch Trail	Dated 12/24/2009 and Received 12/28/09	
77	Judy	Tso	Individual and MPAG Member	These plans are in theory designed to make sure we have a well thought out transportation project that would meet the area's transportation needs, adequately assess benefits and costs and prove to be wise investment of limited funds. Unfortunately, this plan does not meet these criteria. It does not openly and accurately address the implications of changing from one track to two tracks. It does not address the implications of preserving the trail along the light rail and what that actual cost will entail and who will pay for the construction costs. If the cost of the trail is not included in the total cost of the project, then the costs underestimated and therefore are inaccurate.	CTRAK	2009-1099	Future Capital Crescent / Interim Georgetown Branch Trail	Dated 12/10/2009 and Received 12/11/09	See Comment #22 regarding impacts to the trail, Comment #22 regarding double tracking, and Comment #19 regarding costs. Please note, the cost of constructing the Capital Crescent Trail are included in the cost current estimates for the Purple Line (\$1.57 billion in 2009 dollars).
78	Richard	Ullman	Individual	I do not see explicit accommodation for the present pedestrian use of the trail. Pedestrians enter the current path from several points between Connecticut Avenue and Jones Mill Road. When light rail is installed, these entryways will likely be cut off by safety fencing. In Chevy Chase Lake, a supplement/alternative to the Purple Line route for pedestrian and bicycle use could be developed using existing wooded conservation areas. The Bethesda/Chevy Chase Master Plan shows an <b>20-year old proposal for a sidewalk or path in parcel C10</b> . Indeed there exist unofficial and untended trails that follow parts of this route today. These paths would be cut off by the Purple Line plans. A route through C10 with enough width for a walking and bicycle use would indeed provide the benefits noted in the 1990 plan and also could provide the start of a reasonable alternative to the existing Capital Crescent Trail use. Such a route could be <b>extended parallel to Chevy Chase Lake Drive through the existing woods, perhaps along the stream banks in parcel C9. A wide sidewalk along the southern side of Chevy Chase Lake Drive right-of-way could connect to the Georgetown Branch (Capital Crescent) trail at Connecticut Avenue</b> . A trail could reasonably link to the Rock Creek trail. The current walking and biking facilities along Jones Mill Road are quiet unpleasant and unsafe. A safe path could be installed in the parkland on the east side of Jones Mill Road.	CTRAK	2009-1120	Future Capital Crescent / Interim Georgetown Branch Trail	Dated 12/24/2009 and Received 12/28/09	Some of the access points will be cutoff when the Purple Line is constructed. The proposed path is more appropriate for the Chevy Chase Lake Master Plan that is slated for FY11.

**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments**  
**Dec 10 through Feb 12**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTRAK #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
79	Gary	Stith	County Executive	As noted in the February 2, 2009 joint letter , the draft should specifically list these additional analyses and identify the right-of-way issues associated with each as something to be accomplished during preliminary engineering: <b>(1)</b> Examine the feasibility of using hybrid light rail vehicles that do not require wires, poles, and electrical substation. <b>(2)</b> Identify more access points to the Capital Crescent trail. <b>(3)</b> Maximize the retention of existing trees in the corridor. <b>(4)</b> Investigate surface LRT operations in Silver Spring to ensure safe operation with respect to pedestrians and vehicular traffic. <b>(5)</b> Study pedestrian, vehicular, LRT operations in Silver spring, including vehicle queuing, on-street parking operations, and the design for the Green Trail. <b>(6)</b> Develop detailed designs for the Capital Crescent Trail that include access points, retaining walls, security and fencing, landscaping, aesthetic treatments for new bridges, signing and markings, bicycle facilities at station, and the public plaza at the Woodmont East terminus. <b>(7)</b> Prepare a phasing plan along University Blvd. that identifies how LRT implementation will be coordinated with he wider master plan typical section. <b>(8)</b> Provide continuous sidewalks and/or shared use paths on both sides of roadways that carry the Purple Line alignment; and <b>(9)</b> Include mitigation strategies for wetland, parkland, wheel squeal locations, historic resources, and Parks Department Brookfield Road Maintenance site. Please consider the following comments to include in the plan.	CTRAK	2010-0001	Overall Project	Dated 12/20/2009 and Received 1/04/10	The staff agrees and will add these nine items identified in the joint letter.
79	Gary	Stith	County Executive	<b>Department of Transportation:</b> The Plan should identify feasible locations for electrical substations along the LRT route and specifically how they will accommodated along the Capital Crescent Trail and the East Silver Spring segments. How will kiss-and-ride be accommodated such as size, location, traffic concerns, pedestrian safety, and quality of sidewalks, and bicycle facilities? Remove operational issues from the plan such as one-way street and on-street parking. Can identify potential cross-section issue may exist and will have to be coordinated with appropriate agencies. <b>Department of Police:</b> Interagency Working Group is needed especially to coordinate handling vehicular/pedestrian conflicts and training for first responders. <b>Department of Libraries:</b> Bonifant Street one way eastbound with parking on south side to be reviewed before a final decision is made to include this recommendation. If Bonifant is to be one-way, it should be studied by MCDOT to see what is the most appropriate direction for making it safe and convenient for the public. <b>Department of General Services:</b> The impacts on parking and driveway access in the commercial areas are of critical importance to the businesses in Silver Spring. The Plan should emphasize the need for these details to be addressed in the final design of the Purple Line. If parking must be removed from a commercial street, then it may be necessary for off-street public parking to be provided. Loss of parking can have severe economic impacts on businesses that depend on public parking. Need to address the importance of maintaining access to businesses for loading and parking via drives and alleys. this access should be maintained for left turns, particularly into high-volume entrances such as the Whole Foods Market off of Wayne Avenue. The impact of parking by transit riders on neighborhood streets should be reviewed around stations located in residential areas.	CTRAK	2010-0001	Overall Project	Dated 12/20/2009 and Received 1/04/10	The staff does not agree that the Functional Plan should identify locations for electrical substations or other specific facility supporting infrastructure unless the MTA can identify that need at this time. We will review this issue with the MTA to determine if there is any reason at this stage in the planning to believe that additional area outside of the already identified right of way requirement will be needed. The Functional Plan includes right of way requirement for the track, trail, trail access, immediately adjacent pedestrian paths, station platforms, and yard and shop facility. The Functional Plan does not identify specific areas for kiss and ride locations, bicycle storage, etc. In many station locations, this detail of planning is being undertaken as part of related development applications, on-going facility planning or supplemental studies, station area master planning, etc. The staff believes it is important to provide as much flexibility as possible in the planning of specific supporting infrastructure and design elements. Identifying specific features and locations beyond that already known could introduce constraints to better design in the future. One example is in Bethesda where DOT and WMATA have a study underway on access at Elm Street . There are active station area planning efforts underway in Takoma Langley and Long Branch and there will be another effort underway at Chevy Chase Lake. There has been considerable progress in coordinating key design features with development applications (Woodmont East as an example) and mandatory referrals (Silver Spring Transit Center). There are some station areas (Lyttonsville, 16th Street, and Manchester Place) where additional general narrative on the station area amenities could be included. Finally, the staff agrees that any references to operational issues (traffic flow, etc.) should be highly qualified and clearly identified as being subject to review by the respective operating agencies.
80	Wayne	Phyllaier	Individual	Having a single track section will have an almost insignificant benefit for users of the future CCT. But it would severely hurt the performance of the Purple Line. Please do not allow the Master Plan and the Purple Line preliminary design be disrupted by this bad idea. (1) The near track impacts the trail user and not the second track. (2) Single-track will not provide a wider separation distance between the trail and the near track. (3) Two tracks and the trail must fit through the Bethesda Tunnel, regardless of any decision about single tracking between stations. (4) The single-track would only be along a short part of the trail. Single-track would spare only a few trees. Even one short single-track section will put severe constraints on the operation of the transit system. Trail users do not want to cripple transit for insignificant trail benefits.	CTRAK	2010-0002	Future Capital Crescent / Interim Georgetown Branch Trail	Dated and Received 1/04/10	The staff does not support single tracking for the Purple Line. The scope of the project is different now than it was when the Georgetown Branch Master Plan was adopted. The project now extends east of Silver Spring along a segment that does not have an exclusive right of way and is subject to conflicts with north - south traffic and other potential delays. The alignment now connects with Metrorail in four locations - not two and also serves the Takoma Langley Crossroads area. We believe double tracking is necessary in this environment for operational and capacity reasons.
81	Leeann	Irwin	Individual	Endorse the use of "best practices". The inclusion of the Rail and Trail is also a positive addition to plans.	CTRAK	2010-0003	Project Overall	Dated and Received 1/04/10	We agree.

**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments**  
**Dec 10 through Feb 12**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTRAK #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
82	Pat	Baptiste	Individual and MPAG Member	(1) It would be useful if each illustration in the Plan had a caption—either as to what part of the country/world the light rail illustrations come from, or where exactly along the alignment each illustration lies. Also, many of the illustrations are duplicate (compare pp 10 & 25, 4 & 19, 2 & 11). (2) Every change to an existing Master Plan or Sector Plan should be specifically stated. For example where this plan calls for double track but the Bethesda-Chevy Chase Plan and the Georgetown Branch Master Plan Amendment call for single track, the change and its implications should be addressed and necessary changes to language in each should be spelled out. Similarly, this plan has the trail twice cross over the track to achieve the placement on the north side of the tracks but the Georgetown Branch Master Plan Amendment does not, this plan needs honestly to explain the change from the earlier Plan’s call for a south-side track and this Plan needs to discuss the significant implications of this change. (3) There needs to be a glossary of terms to avoid confusion. For example, the Plan should explain the distinction between a shared right of way, dedicated lanes, and exclusive lanes for the rail tracks.	CTRAK	2010-0007	Project Overall	Dated and Received 1/06/10	The staff agrees that captions and the source or credit for each illustration should be added and that duplicate illustrations should be eliminated. Staff also agrees that the plan should state the alignment includes double tracking and that this is a change from the adopted plan where certain segments between Bethesda and Silver Spring were single track segments. The staff does not agree that the Functional Plan needs to include a discussion of implications or impacts of changes. The detailed discussion of the impacts is included as part of the DEIS and FEIS. Staff agrees that the existing Glossary is not really a Glossary and one should be added that includes definitions for technical terms used in the Draft Plan.
82	Pat	Baptiste	Individual and MPAG Member	Specific suggestions: (1) Page 5: the first paragraph should be removed. It is unnecessary, meaningless and untrue as the Plans’ recommendations violate the unique character of the “local community” between Bethesda and the CSX main line, and between Silver Spring via Wayne Avenue to Sligo Creek. (2) Page 7: paragraph one—change “parallel” to “on top of” and in paragraph two—amend the language to reflect the fact that this functional plan amends both the B-CC Master Plan, the Georgetown Branch Master Plan Amendment and the East Silver Spring Master Plan. Also, the Plan should make clear that its recommendations set the stage for additional density in both existing and future plans when read in conjunction with the Growth Policy and the pending CR Zone. (3) Page 7: Under <i>Background</i> add language to show that the County purchase of the Georgetown Branch was from the DC Line to the CSX Main Line and that the potential of a trolley-trail was not limited to the Bethesda to Silver Spring portion of the Georgetown Branch now serving as the interim Capital Crescent Trail. (4) Page 7: Under <i>Background</i> add language to show that the County purchase of the Georgetown Branch was from the DC Line to the CSX Main Line and that the potential of a trolley-trail was not limited to the Bethesda to Silver Spring portion of the Georgetown Branch now serving as the interim Capital Crescent Trail. (5) Page 7: Under <i>County Council Policy Direction</i> , bullet 4, clarify that the 12 foot paved trail must also have, on either side, two-foot soft shoulders clear of benches or plant material. (6) Page 8: In discussing the MPAG, please include the information that the Group was deeply divided with the majority of the Chevy Chase and Silver Spring community representatives strongly opposed to the staff position on the recommended alignment. (7) Page 9: Under <i>Vision</i> , change “by building on” to “drastically altering the character of” (8) Page 9: Under <i>Diversity</i> include the affordable housing element under every link; add access to recreation centers (Lawton Center, Caufield Center, other?) where appropriate; add housing access at Lyttonsville; add shopping and entertainment to both Bethesda and Silver Spring.	CTRAK	2010-0007	Project Overall	Dated and Received 1/06/10	Staff does not agree that the introductory paragraph on page 5 should be eliminated. This paragraph simply defines a plan in its broadest context and informs the reader who may not be familiar with planning or the planning process. Staff would recommend changing the description to adjacent to the trail or within the Georgetown Branch right of way. We do not recommend "on top of" as that descriptive phrase would be more applicable to the segment in the tunnel under Wisconsin Avenue where the trail is "on top of" the train. Staff agrees that in the second paragraph on page 7 that the additional plans should be listed. The staff agrees that a general statement on setting the stage for additional density or Transit Oriented Development at selected station areas is something that could be added to Table 1 for segments where that is known to be the case. Staff does not agree that there is a need to document that the potential for a trolley trail extended west and south of Bethesda to the DC line. There is no adopted County plan that contemplated a trolley on this segment. Staff agrees that the bullet 4 statement on page 7 should be changed to include reference to the two foot shoulder on either side of the 12 feet of pavement. Staff does not agree that a summary of the various positions of the members of the MPAG on any of the many issues examined should be included in the Functional Plan. The staff has in the past noted in staff memos that the MPAG was unable to reach consensus on a number of issues. Staff does not agree that "drastically altering the character of" should be inserted into the first paragraph under the "vision" section on page 9. The Purple Line is consistent with adopted plans. The staff agrees that the proposed changes (comment 8) on page 9 should be made.

**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments**  
**Dec 10 through Feb 12**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTRAK #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
82	Pat	Baptiste	Individual and MPAG Member	(9) Page 9: Under <i>Design</i> remove reference to Woodmont East as the tail tracks in the Plan actually reduce the amount of open space that will be available there. (10) Page 9: Under <i>Environment</i> : o Remove reference to sprawl prevention. There is no basis for this statement as growth promoted in Bethesda by the Purple Line is not linked to reduced development in any other area. o Consider the negative environmental impact of grass tracks. Recently the Zoning Advisory Panel was advised that pesticides and nutrient load make urban grass plots no longer desirable. o The maintenance yard location has negative environmental implications—this area is next to the Rock Creek and there have been chemical and oil spills from other industrial uses there in the recent past. o The rail alignment east of Silver Spring, where there is no exclusive lane for the rail, has negative effects on the traffic capacity of all roads sharing the rail right of way. The plan should admit this impact. (11) Page 10: Last paragraph, first section: change “updates prior planning efforts” to “amends existing Master Plans” (12) Page 10 <i>Under Light Rail as the Mode</i> section, eliminate the first three bullets and add at the end of the first sentence “it was chosen by the Governor” (13) Page 10: There is no reason to limit the length of the platform for the rail line. If such impacts were important then the BRT would have been selected. (14) Pages 12 and 13: Additional illustrations are necessary to show the trail over the light rail line in the tunnel, crossover of the trail over the rail line at the east end of the tunnel, the passage of the rail and trail under the overpass supports at East-West Highway, the Lynn Drive at grade crossing, and the crossing of the trail over the rail line and under Jones Bridge Road. (15) Page 14 Under <i>Capital Crescent Trail</i> : Bullet three: the width of the paved trail should be a minimum of 12 feet at all points. The next bullet should keep the trail on the south side of the tracks as required in the Georgetown Branch Master Plan Amendment and by reference in the Bethesda-Chevy Chase Master Plan.	CTRAK	2010-0007	Project Overall	Dated and Received 1/06/10	Staff agrees that the wording under "Design" related to Woodmont East should be deleted. The staff does not agree that the statement referring to the prevention of sprawl should be removed. We believe well designed and affordable TOD does help reduce sprawl. The staff is proposing revised wording when referring to grass tracks. See Comment #12. The staff does not agree that wording related to the yard and shop environmental impact and traffic flow east of Silver Spring are issues to be addresses in the Functional Plan. These are issues that are addressed in the DEIS and FEIS. Staff does not agree that the first three bullets under Light Rail as the mode should be eliminated. These are some of the generally accepted major reasons that the Planning Board, Council, and Governor endorsed light rail. The staff does not agree that reference to the platform length is not needed. One of the reasons for selecting LRT was the increased capacity that is afforded by the trains that are longer than a bus. The staff generally agrees that additional illustrations at key locations would be beneficial. We are working on developing additional images that might be useful. Staff agrees that wording on the trail width should be consistent with the wording as approved by Council. Staff has conducted an inventory of the parcels along the trail and has determined that there is not a compelling reason to revisit the issue of which side of the right of way the trail should be located on in the area between Bethesda (Pearl Street) to the County Club (see Comment #55). The staff will also review this issue with the MTA Project Team and MDOT.
82	Pat	Baptiste	Individual and MPAG Member	(16) Page 14 &15: All ramp access points should be illustrated and identified on the maps as to location. (17) Page 17 The Plan calls for a separate rail bridge and trail bridge over Connecticut Ave with an elevated station platform on the east side of Connecticut Ave (illustration needed here) but it is silent as to the connection between the platform and the elevated trail section. The plan needs to make clear that there will be a connection between the two at the station platform level.	CTRAK	2010-0007	Project Overall	Dated and Received 1/06/10	The staff agrees that trail access points should be generally identified on the maps in some fashion.
83	Nelson	Zaldivar	Individual	Save the trail. Do not put the Purple Line beside the Capital Crescent Trail.	CTRAK	2010-0029	Future Capital Crescent / Interim Georgetown Branch Trail	Dated 1/08/10 and Received 1/11/10	The selected Locally Preferred Alternative is along the Master Plan alignment. This is consistent with the County Council and Planning Board recommendations. One improvement will be to pave the Capital Crescent Trail.
84	Hans	Riemer	Individual	Support the Purple Line Functional Master Plan as it has been drafted. Happy about choices to optimally integrate the Purple Line into existing neighborhoods and downtowns as well as the Metropolitan Branch and Capital Crescent Trail. I have reviewed so many intriguing photos of existing LRT here in the US and globally, and I am always inspired to see the trains running at grade at right amidst pedestrians and shoppers, hikers and bikers, seniors and families with strollers, trees and grass, and of course cars. LRT can activate the street and provide a real boost to community life. The Purple Line ROW along the Georgetown Branch train corridor was purchased by the County explicitly for use as a transportation corridor that could serve pedestrians and hikes, bikes <i>and</i> transit -- together. A high quality LRT is indisputably the best transit option to balance the interests of these different users. It will also significantly improve the safety of the trail on the Silver Spring side, where today the trail is only a bike lane on busy streets, including street-light crossings at several dangerous state-highway intersections. While I am an advocate of bus transit and bus rapid transit, I do not think it is appropriate for the Purple Line and have no room to grow. There is also a powerful economic argument for using the highest-quality LRT. A few generations ago, planners looked decades down the road and built a Metro system that could foster stronger communities and a sustainable growth strategy for the region. It has worked, masterfully. But it also is near its limits in terms of capacity, and adding Metro lines to all of the routes where high-capacity transit is needed would be cost-prohibitive. LRT (with some supplements from BRT) is the answer.	CTRAK	2009-0060	Project Overall	Dated 1/17/10 and Received 1/19/10	Staff agrees that light rail provides users with a high-quality experience.

**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments**  
**Dec 10 through Feb 12**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTRAK #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
85	Veronique	Kessler	Individual	As you can see from the article in the Baltimore Sun, the dangers of bisecting communities with a double traced Purple Line will be very significant. You need to know that like this teenage girl that was killed lately, the young people from my town and from Bethesda on the other side of the Capital Crescent Trail are very used to cross the trail to go to their school (Bethesda Chevy Chase High School for example), to visit their friends on the other side of the trail, to go to the Sport and Health Club which stands along the trail, to go to Church on East West Highway. My own boys, my husband, and myself are walking along the trail for our pleasure as well as for our many errands and weekly activities in the neighborhood. We are crossing the Trail all the time, and have been doing it for a very long time. The Purple Line project, if it materializes, will force young people and adults like me to cross train tracks to go back and forth to schools, community centers, stores, the metro, fitness centers, churches and friends homes. If the Purple Line project is maintained and implemented, it will without any doubt significantly increase the risks that our community face in our daily lives and errands. Sooner or later our community will be hurt by these risks. They will materialize and may easily turn into deadly casualties given the heavy vicinity traffic that has existed and will persist along and across the trail. Make no mistake. We will resent that responsible representatives for ever for having supported the LRT Purple Line project because we feel that will terribly affect the daily lives in our quiet, friendly, peaceful, green community.	CTRAK	2009-0060	Future Capital Crescent / Interim Georgetown Branch Trail	Dated 1/18/10 and Received 1/19/10	See Comment #24 (item 1) regarding at-grade crossings.
86	Noel	Guerrero	Individual	I currently reside in the Calverton subdivision of Silver Spring. I am glad the deadline for public comments have been extended as I would like to provide my feedback on the Purple Line. The current plan does not include an option for those who reside off the Route 29 corridor. Currently, the only option available to residents and commutes alike it he Park and Ride lot off of Tech Road and Old Columbia Pike intersection, with limited spaces of up to 130. By 7:30 am on a regular weekday is already filled to capacity. The commute from as far back as Briggs Chaney Road to downtown Silver Spring can take up to 1 hour. This is preposterous considering the distance between downtown Silver Spring and Cherry Hill Road is a grand total of 6 miles. The current buses that service the area, also become caught up in traffic, hence discouraging the use of transportation as the detour to service apartments in the White Oak subdivision. I feel a stop at this Park N' Ride would be most beneficial and use for all county and state tax payers, as quite a bit of people commuting from far beyond Baltimore utilize this route.	CTRAK	2010-0064	Parking	Dated and Received 1/19/10	We will be conducting a corridor study that evaluates transit needs in the US 29 corridor.
87	Craig	Simpson	Purple Line Now!	Additional comments related to the Planning Board hearings regarding the use of double tracking along the Georgetown Branch ROW and its effects on transit operations since this was an issue raised during the public hearing. At issues is a 4.4 mile ROW commonly known as the Georgetown Branch. The original plan for returning this railroad ROW to rail service called for single-track trolleys to run between Silver Spring ad Bethesda. The use of double tracking is consistent with the 1990 Georgetown Branch Master Plan, which states in part, " <i>In the event future consideration is given to implementing additional double track sections, the existing ROW is generally sufficient with appropriate structural treatment to accommodate the necessary typical 56-foot trolley/trail cross section...</i> ". At the time, Montgomery County Councilmember Isiah Leggett opposed the use of single track because, " <i>It would have taken forty-three minutes with single-track [there] and back. If you're on the platform in Silver Spring the train just left, that's forty-three minutes you have to wait.</i> " While one could quibble with Leggett's figures, the point is that delays while waiting for one train to pass through the single track section are inevitable - particularly when train spacing is fairly tight. Most single track systems have operated at headways of 15 minutes or greater. In the 20 years that have passed since LRT was first selected to run along the alignment, the concept for a transit line has been extended from Silver Spring to New Carrollton and the number of passengers anticipated has also increased by growth in population and density along the corridor. The line would provide vital transportation connection between the two spokes of the Metrorail Red Line and the Metrorail Green and Orange Lines. In examining the single track issue for the Montgomery County Council, the MTA finds that, " <i>Current projects indicate that Medium Investment LRT alternative would have a peak hour, peak direction load of some 2,200 to 2,300 passengers per hour while operating on a headway or minimum interval of 6 minutes with two-car trains.</i> " <i>The Transportation Research Board notes: "Single-track sections with two-way operation will typically be the capacity constraint when they are present."</i> The same paper analyzed the impact of single tracking along a 3,500 foot section between the Columbia Country Club and Pearl Street:	CTRAK	2010-0070	Double Tracking	Dated and Received 1/20/10	Staff agrees that double-tracking is necessary to accommodate forecast demand, provide reliable service to passengers, reduce cascading delays due to operations in mixed traffic, and to permit track maintenance during daylight hours.



**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments**  
**Dec 10 through Feb 12**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTRAK #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
87	Craig	Simpson	Purple Line Now!	<i>"With a top speed of 45 mph, the one-way running time between Bethesda and Connecticut Avenue would take two minutes. To this must be added a minimum allowance of 60 seconds in order to clear the interlocking, throw the track switch over and verify its position, and clear the interlocking for operation in the opposing direction. Based on this, train intervals shorter than seven minutes would be precluded, higher than the planned six-minute peak headways. Even with this seven-minute headway, there would be o margin for error. This would be true even if the train ready to enter the single track had its doors closed, ignored intending passengers wanting to board, and left the instant that the signals cleared. With a minimum headway or seven minutes, only eight trains would run between Bethesda and Connecticut Avenue in the peak hour. This would be a reduction in passenger-carrying capacity of 20% from the planned six-minute headway." The MTA analysis also noted that service delays elsewhere on the line would have further impact to the single track segment. The MTA analysis also noted that maintenance on a single track section would required shutting down operations on the section of the ROW. MTA further concluded that few trees would be saved in the corridor by the narrower ROW used by single track because of the need for construction equipment mobility would remain largely the same. Other systems that implemented single tracking usually did so to cut initial construction costs by eventually ended up installing double tracks for most of the systems at a greater cost with more disruption than it would have to install a double track system initially. The MTA paper says, "Four cities in the United States, San Diego, Portland, Sacramento, and Baltimore, constructed their original LRT lines with single-track segments. This was done to save construction funds because of then - existing budgetary limits. In each of these cases, the headways originally operated were in the range of 15 minutes. Indeed, Baltimore was required to lengthen its headways to 17 minutes to accommodate the operating limitations of its multiple single-track sections. In all four cases the operational and service limitations of single-track were recognized early. These limitations are: 1. Longer travel times - this is due to the need to wait for trains in the opposing direction 2. Less frequent service -</i>	CTRAK	2010-0070	Double Tracking	Dated and Received 1/20/10	We agree.
87	Craig	Simpson	Purple Line Now!	<i>Eventually in all four cities, funding was provided to add the second track for most of their route mileage. The additional cost required to double-track those portions was greater than the amount saved initially. In addition, the service disruption had significant adverse impacts to passengers. In the case of Baltimore, the decision was made to close the entire line to allow for faster reconstruction despite the inconvenience to passengers. Because of additional neighborhood impacts along the alignment (since the new tracks were closer to residences) the project created strong community opposition. New environmental analysis was required, further adding to the time and the expense. The closing service resulted in substantial loss of ridership that was not recovered for several years. The closing of the service created a perception of unreliability that was hard for the MT to dispel. The additional cost was far higher due to the escalation of costs, including the not insubstantial mobilization cost. During the closing of the service the MTA still had infrastructure maintenance costs for the tracks and overhead wire system despite the fact the project generated no revenue." In closing, there is overwhelming evidence that single tracking along the Georgetown Branch ROW would cause significant service issues. The draft Purple Line functional plan addresses the treatment of issues surrounding double tracking in a fundamentally sound way and should be approved.</i>	CTRAK	2010-0070	Double Tracking	Dated and Received 1/20/10	We agree.
88	Carole	Brand	Individual	We are residents of the Bethesda-Chevy Chase area writing in support of passage of the Purple Line Functional Master Plan as drafted. We are all supporters of the broad vision approved by the Planning Board, adopted by the County Council, and submitted by the Governor as the LPA to the FTA. We support the LRT mode along the Metropolitan Branch alignment. The LPA will preserve the Capital Crescent Trail as a local resource, allow 60,000 to 70,000 riders to use the Purple Line daily, and reduce pollution such as greenhouse gases from car emissions. The Functional Master Plan is an important document because it sets out many of the details necessary to making the Purple Line work as intended. The details include: establishing specific stations locations; setting goals for the types of vehicles to be used, including a long term vision for trains without overhead wires; and setting the specific ROW available and needed for each sub-segment of the line. As residents from the Bethesda-Chevy Chase area, we are particularly interested in the sub-segments in our communities. We believe the Functional Master Plan does a good job of balancing the needs of the Purple Line and the surrounding areas, including a minimal impact on downtown Bethesda by restricting tail tracks extending into Woodmont Plaza and using the planned Bethesda South Metro Entrance. We also commend the Planning Board for supporting use of tow separate crossings at Connecticut Avenue, allowing safe trail access, efficient rail travel, and not adversely affecting traffic flow on Connecticut Avenue.	CTRAK	2010-0071	Project Overall	Dated and Received 1/20/10	Staff agrees that the Purple Line Functional Plan requires many trade-offs. We will continue to look for opportunities to mitigate the concerns of residents through the use of best practices.
88	Mark	Brown	Individual	See Carole Brand comments 88	CTRAK	2010-0071	Project Overall	Dated and Received 1/20/10	See response to Comment # 88.

**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments**  
**Dec 10 through Feb 12**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTRACK #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
88	Harry	Freeman	Individual	See Carole Brand comments 88	CTRACK	2010-0071	Project Overall	Dated and Received 1/20/10	See response to Comment # 88.
88	Lucy	Freeman	Individual	See Carole Brand comments 88	CTRACK	2010-0071	Project Overall	Dated and Received 1/20/10	See response to Comment # 88.
88	Margaret	Greene	Individual	See Carole Brand comments 88	CTRACK	2010-0071	Project Overall	Dated and Received 1/20/10	See response to Comment # 88.
88	Eliot	Greenwald	Individual	See Carole Brand comments 88	CTRACK	2010-0071	Project Overall	Dated and Received 1/20/10	See response to Comment # 88.
88	Judith	Hallett	Individual	See Carole Brand comments 88	CTRACK	2010-0071	Project Overall	Dated and Received 1/20/10	See response to Comment # 88.
88	Sally	Hart	Individual	See Carole Brand comments 88	CTRACK	2010-0071	Project Overall	Dated and Received 1/20/10	See response to Comment # 88.
88	Matt	Herrmann	Individual	See Carole Brand comments 88	CTRACK	2010-0071	Project Overall	Dated and Received 1/20/10	See response to Comment # 88.
88	Alminia	Khorakiwala	Individual	See Carole Brand comments 88	CTRACK	2010-0071	Project Overall	Dated and Received 1/20/10	See response to Comment # 88.
88	Sarah	Morse	Individual	See Carole Brand comments 88	CTRACK	2010-0071	Project Overall	Dated and Received 1/20/10	See response to Comment # 88.
88	David	Kathan	Individual	See Carole Brand comments 88	CTRACK	2010-0071	Project Overall	Dated and Received 1/20/10	See response to Comment # 88.
88	Marc	Korman	Individual	See Carole Brand comments 88	CTRACK	2010-0071	Project Overall	Dated and Received 1/20/10	See response to Comment # 88.
88	Rebecca	Korman	Individual	See Carole Brand comments 88	CTRACK	2010-0071	Project Overall	Dated and Received 1/20/10	See response to Comment # 88.
88	Adam	Luecking	Individual	See Carole Brand comments 88	CTRACK	2010-0071	Project Overall	Dated and Received 1/20/10	See response to Comment # 88.
88	Tom	Manatos	Individual	See Carole Brand comments 88	CTRACK	2010-0071	Project Overall	Dated and Received 1/20/10	See response to Comment # 88.
88	Dennis	McGuire	Individual	See Carole Brand comments 88	CTRACK	2010-0071	Project Overall	Dated and Received 1/20/10	See response to Comment # 88.
88	Milagros	McGuire	Individual	See Carole Brand comments 88	CTRACK	2010-0071	Project Overall	Dated and Received 1/20/10	See response to Comment # 88.
88	Cathy	Pickar	Individual	See Carole Brand comments 88	CTRACK	2010-0071	Project Overall	Dated and Received 1/20/10	See response to Comment # 88.
88	Fred	Sand	Individual	See Carole Brand comments 88	CTRACK	2010-0071	Project Overall	Dated and Received 1/20/10	See response to Comment # 88.
89	Amy	Finnegan	Individual	I am writing as one of the many thousands of gravely concerned trail users and Montgomery County citizens who stand in the firm opposition to destroying the beautiful and environmentally critical Capital Crescent Trail in order to make it part of the Purple Line. As an environmentalist, I support public transportation and smart growth -- but NOT at the price of deforestation, noise pollution, and loss of precious -- forever irreplaceable -- green space in urban communities. It has been demonstrated that the best, most economically feasible and all-round constructive way to address our public transportation needs are to create a metro loop tunneled underground, or a LRT along the Beltway from Silver Spring to Bethesda Medical Center. This approach is the one recommended by WMATA staff. Transit can be replotted and planned -- by these 17 acres of wildlife habitat, and century old trees, that sustain the physical, emotional, even spiritual health of hundreds of thousands of people -- cannot be "redone". Once destroyed, it is gone forever. "Growth" that destroys is not smart. A plan to help the environment by destroying the environment does not make sense. A plane to provide public transport (train) by sacrificing less - impact public transport (feet and bikes) does not make sense.	CTRACK	2010-0073	Future Capital Crescent / Interim Georgetown Branch Trail	Dated and Received 1/22/10	See response to Comment # 22 regarding impacts to the trail. We disagree that LRT along the Beltway or a metro loop tunnel would be the best way to address the stated purpose and need of the project. MTA conducted a robust evaluation of alternatives in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments**  
**Dec 10 through Feb 12**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTRAK #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
90	Joanne	Rood	Individual	The County's Master Plan currently calls for a rail on the north side of the Capital Crescent Trail (CCT) ROW and a trail on the south side. The MTA has proposed placing the Purple Line rail on the south side of the ROW and a trail on the north side from Bethesda to some point east of Connecticut Avenue, at which point the proposed rail would be back on the north side of the County's ROW. The MTA's proposal, thus, would require amending the County's Master Plan. For the reasons set forth below, the Planning Board needs to closely scrutinize the MTA's proposal and should take a position on the alignment issue that balances the interests of future trail users with those of individuals and organizations owning property near the ROW. The MTA's current position on trail alignment is based solely on the interests of future trail users, each of whom will use the trail no more than a few hours a week, and gives absolutely no regard to property owners who will have to live with the rail/trail 24 hours a day, seven days a week. The MTA's reasoning for placing the trail on the north side of the ROW is to maximize the trail-user experience. The natural topography of the ROW allows a trail on the north side to be higher than the rail bed, which the MTA claims would create an enhanced trail experience. It also claims that placing the trail on the north side permits more separation between the trail and the rail, thus allowing more plantings between the two than if the trail is on the south side of the ROW. The MTA's proposed is based solely on concerns for trail users, and it totally ignores the concerns of homeowners who reside along the ROW. The ROW's topography is such that is the trail were placed on the north side of the ROW, the homes to the north of the ROW would have a natural buffer between them and the train (i.e., essentially an earth berm) and the homes to the south would have the trail as a buffer. If the rail is placed on the south side of the ROW, the homes to the north would have both a natural buffer and a trail between them and the rail, while the homes on the south side have no buffer. The only thing the MTA plans to do to protect these homes tot he south is to create a four-foot sound wall -- period. The MTA claims that noise is not an issue because they have a report stating that the train noise will be between only 46 and 54 decibels. Unfortunately, the MTA's noise report does not withstand even a modicum of scrutiny.	CTRAK	2010-0073	Future Capital Crescent / Interim Georgetown Branch Trail	Dated and Received 1/22/10	The Purple Line Functional Plan is the process by which the County's master plan is amended. However, we will state that the trail location to the west of Jones Bridge Rd is a change from previous master plans. We recommend adding the following footnote to the bottom of page 14: "The Capital Crescent Trail is located on the north side of the Georgetown Branch right of way between Bethesda and a point just west of Jones Mill Road. This is a change from the Georgetown Branch Master Plan Amendment of 1990 where the trail was on the south side of the right of way along this segment." Our analysis shows that the there is not much difference between the number of residential structures that are affected by locating the trail to the north or south of the tracks. At a 30 ft distance it appears that more dwelling units would be affected if the tracks were located to the north of the trail, given the location of the Riviera apartment building and the adjacent townhomes. In addition, see Comment #24 regarding the location of the trail. MTA's noise evaluation was based on guidelines from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). See response to Comment #125 for additional responses regarding noise.
90	Joanne	Rood	Individual	First, it does not take into account noise from brakes and wheel squeaking as trains round bends, and it assumes each train will always be in mint condition. Second, it does not take vibrational noise into account, which cannot be controlled by wheel guards or four-foot sounds walls. Such noise can be controlled only by structural amenities, such as earth berms or the trail, being placed between the trains and adjacent property. Third, the noise report measures the ambient noise in my neighborhood at 60 decibels. According to witnesses, this noise reading was taken during the middle of the day, from the top of poles, with construction noise going on nearby. The ambient noise in my neighborhood during the day, at ground level, typically is lower than 60 decibels, and it is significantly lower than 60 decibels late at night. I think federal guidelines require noise from transportation projects to be no more than 15 decibels greater than the ambient noise when the projects run near places in which people sleep. If that is the criteria, the ambient noise needs to be measured during sleeping hours, and the true noise from the trains (including the vibration noise) needs to be compared to the sleeping-hour ambient noise. The State and the County want to run a high speed rail up to 22 hours a day within a few feet of people's bedrooms. You MUST perform a high quality noise study to determine the noise level these ridents will be subjected to at all hours of the night. Such a study also should consider the noise affect on adjacent properties for both a trail on the north side of the ROW and a trail on the south side of the ROW. Only if such a study is done, can you truly understand the effect of the trail alignment on the adjacent property owners. Also, trail users still can have an enhanced trail experience with the trail on the south side of the ROW. In fact, the MTA originally designed the trail on the south side. Such a trail would be elevated above the trains, as dirt would be moved to create an earth berm on top of which the trail would sit. The only "detriment" (if you want to call it a detriment) to the trail users is there would be less separation between the trail and the trains than there would be with a north side of the trail, thereby allowing for fewer flowers and shrubs to be planted.	CTRAK	2010-0073	Capital Crescent / Georgetown Branch Trail	Dated and Received 1/22/10	See above.

**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments**  
**Dec 10 through Feb 12**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTRAK #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
90	Joanne	Rood	Individual	Such a solution would benefit all concerned -- it would allow the trains to run between the earth berms on each side, thereby protecting ALL property owners, and would allow trail users to walk on an elevated trail. There is another alternative, which would allow the trail to be on the north side of the ROW and yet still protect the south side residents. That alternative is to build an earth berm between the rails and the south side residents. Such an earth berm likely would mean eliminating a couple of feet of width from the north side trail, but it would provide much needed protection for the south side residents. Again, though, everything is a balancing act -- the future trail users are not the only stakeholders here. This alignment issue is a policy issue to be made by the Montgomery County planning Board. It is not a decision to leave to engineers and other technical professionals. The engineers and the technical professionals, left with no policy guidance, will create a plan that considers only the rail and trail users. It is up to those individuals who are directly answerable to the public to make this important policy decision and to weigh the concerns of all stakeholders. I would think the last thing you would want to do is needlessly erode your lucrative tax base in these well-established neighborhoods through which the trains will pass. You would be derelict in your duties not to attempt to preserve, through minor concessions to trail users, these quiet, family-oriented neighborhoods that make our County so livable. Construction costs would be marginally higher because dirt would be moved to build up the trail on the south side, but such a construction maneuver is extremely common in the building of transportation infrastructures.	CTRAK	2010-0073	Capital Crescent / Georgetown Branch Trail	Dated and Received 1/22/10	See above.
91	Jennifer "Saraswati"	Moulden	Individual	Please preserve the CCT and Georgetown Branch Trails. At this point, the Trail is public transportation. Many bikes use it daily to commute to and from work. I personally use it to commute to a class I teach at Georgetown University. Putting a trail next to the Purple Line LRT is not a viable solution. The point of using the trail is to be in nature, and to not have to be on the street with cars and pollution that endanger our safety. It provides valuable green space in a place where there is overpopulation and pavement everywhere. No one will want to use a trail next to a LRT, with most of the trees cut down. If we wanted to go alongside moving vehicles, we would walk or bike along the street. There are plenty of streets for us to take that lead directly to the city (Bethesda or DC). I live with a 2 year old and her mother, and the child loves to walk on the trail. It gives her access to nature which she would not otherwise have, living in East West Highway. The trail is important to our mental health. we live in a high stress, urban environment and having green space provides the relaxation and improved health for Bethesda Chevy Chase, and DC residents. Please save the trail, and consider putting the Purple Line on Jones Bridge Road where the natural environment will not be destroyed. This is not an issue of NIMBY; it is an environmental, public health and safety issue.	CTRAK	2010-0078	Future Capital Crescent / Interim Georgetown Branch Trail	Dated and Received 1/25/10	See the response to Comment #22 regarding impacts to the trail. We understand that the trail experience will be different but also believe that usage of the trail will remain, especially as the surface will be paved.

**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments**  
**Dec 10 through Feb 12**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTRAK #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
92	Susan	Andrea	Individual	Lives in downtown Silver Spring along Wayne Avenue. The majority of our residential neighborhood favored a tunneled route, not a surface route, for that segment. I hope that the County and State will not make any additional decisions that will exacerbate, rather than mitigate, problems for the community. Don't build a stop at Dale Drive. The most sweeping and irrevocable adverse impact of building a stop at Dale Drive could be nothing less than a total change in the character of our quiet, single-family home neighborhood. I believe the so-called "smart growth" strategy of encouraging denser development near transit stops would be used to justify zoning changes that would radically alter our currently viable and desirable neighborhood. Why else would a stop at Dale Drive be proposed if not to promote new and denser development? It certainly cannot be justified in terms of ridership from the neighborhood as it exists today. MTA projects that there would be 1,400 daily boardings at a Dale Drive station. That number would mean twice as many riders as MTA has projected for the Fenton Street/Silver Spring Library station, which is very unlikely. The number of Purple Line daily station boardings at Dale Drive is more likely to be between 200 and 300 - much too small a number to justify a stop in an area where there will be another nearby stations. Only <u>four</u> passengers board the Ride On #15 bus at Dale Drive on Wayne Avenue during morning rush hour, and there are very few boardings at nearby stops. The neighborhood near Dale Drive is one of the <u>least</u> densely populated residential neighborhoods along the entire Purple Line. Most of the relatively few multi-family dwellings in this area are closer to either the Fenton/Silver Spring Library station or the Manchester Place station than to the proposed Dale Drive stop. MTA has projected that there would be several hundred more daily boardings at a Dale Drive station than at the Manchester Place station just to the east of Sligo Creek Parkway. Since Manchester Place is in an area that has many high-rise apartment and condo buildings, unlike the Dale Drive neighborhood, surely there would be far <u>more</u> passengers boarding at Manchester Place than at Dale Drive. Even without a Dale Drive station, there will be five stations in the just more than two-mile stretch of Silver Spring from the Silver Spring Transit Center to Gilbert Street in Long Branch (near Piney Branch and University Boulevard). This is more than in any other comparable segment of the 16-mile route.	CTRAK	2010-0094	Dale Drive Station	Dated 1/28/10 and Received 1/29/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.
92	Susan	Andrea	Individual	Some other impacts of a Dale Drive station on the community would be: <b>1)</b> Widening of Wayne Avenue at Dale Drive even more than the proposed widening without a station, and for a significant section Wayne would be as wide as Colesville Road. This greatly widened segment of road would be directly in front of both an elementary school and a middle school. <b>2)</b> Closure of Wayne Avenue entrance to the large parking lot of Sligo Creek Elementary School and Silver Spring International Middle School, with traffic diverted to Dale Drive and neighborhood side streets behind the schools. <b>3)</b> Westbound traffic on Wayne going toward downtown Silver Spring would be prohibited from turning left onto Dale Drive (toward Piney Branch Road) while a train is in the Dale Drive station. This will hinder residents' access to their neighborhoods. <b>4)</b> More impervious surfaces (hardscaping) will increase the threat to Sligo Creek from storm water runoff and erosion. In light of the lack of ridership and the negative impacts on the neighborhood, I must ask why a Dale Drive stop is even being considered. The only reason I can see is an unstated, unacknowledged, undiscussed, and undeclared plan to greatly increase the density of this area in the name of "smart growth". Such a far-reaching change should be discussed openly, not put into effect through the back door by building a Dale Drive station, then using it as the justification for radically changing the character of the surrounding neighborhoods. What is your position on building a Purple Line stop at Dale Drive?	CTRAK	2010-0094	Dale Drive Station	Dated 1/28/10 and Received 1/29/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.
93	Sylvana	Ehrman	Individual	Susan Andrea's message (above) echoes my views as well as my wife's. Please copy us on any response you send Ms. Andrea, as we (along with other neighborhood residents) intend to follow this issue closely.	CTRAK	2010-0104	Dale Drive Station	Dated 1/28/10 and Received 2/2/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.

**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments**  
**Dec 10 through Feb 12**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTRAK #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
94	Andy	O'Hare	East Bethesda Citizen Association	<p><b>1) Location of the Trail:</b> The trail should run along the north side of the ROW, as presented in the Plan as proposed by the MTA in the AA/DEIS, released for comment on Oct. 17, 2008. The placement of the trail on the north side of the ROW will facilitate a grade separation between the trail and the adjacent transitway, significantly enhancing the safety of persons using the trail and providing for a much more satisfying trail experience, generally. EBCA is strongly opposed to any suggestions for moving the trail to the south side of the ROW (as has been discussed by the Town of Chevy Chase). Such a move would sacrifice the very important safety features provided by the grade separation, which is much desired by EBCA residents, and all trail users for that matter. <b>2) Trail Access from East Bethesda:</b> EBCA strongly supports the construction of the two trail access points proposed in the Plan, including access points from the north and south sides of the ROW at Sleaford Road and the access point at Kentbury Way/Kentbury Drive. <b>3) Width of the Trail:</b> The Plan envisions a trail ten feet wide with two foot soft shoulders on each side. EBCA does not believe that this design will be adequate to accommodate the complex mix of trail users. Alternatively, we recommend a paved trail surface width of at least twelve feet. <b>4) Funds for Construction and Long-term Maintenance of the Trail:</b> While not a specific design feature outlined in the Plan, EBCA remains concerned generally about the lack of clear sources of funding (from either the county of the state of Maryland) for either the construction or perpetual maintenance of the trail surface and associated landscaping, lighting, access paths, among other features. <b>5) Transit Surface:</b> EBCA endorses the proposal to use grass for the transitway surface. We note, however, that the funds necessary to maintain the surface in perpetuity needs to be incorporated into any final operating plan for the Purple Line (see trail funding concern above). <b>6) Catenary Wires:</b> Overhead catenary wires should be avoided at all costs. The electric supply for the rail cars should be placed underground or at the surface, if such an arrangement can be designed safely.</p>	CTRAK	2010-0127	Capital Crescent / Georgetown Branch Trail	Dated and Received 2/9/10	These comments are generally consistent with the Draft Plan. The staff acknowledges the importance of identifying the specific funding sources. It is expected that the MTA will be providing additional information on project funding as part of the "New Starts" submittal to FTA later this year.
95	Harry	Sanders	Individual	<p>Extended comments from Dec. 10, 2009 hearing. <b>Myth 1:</b> The Georgetown Branch ROW has become a park. You can move the PL rail elsewhere or make it bus. <b>FACT: 1)</b> The Georgetown Branch ROW was purchased by Montgomery County with \$10 million of our tax dollars, for the specific purpose of using the Bethesda to Silver Spring segment for recreation and transit. The ROW was used for trains decades before the Columbia Country Club was established alongside it. <b>2)</b> The interim trail is fenced off from most of the 100' wide ROW through the Club, which is using Montgomery County property rent-free while perpetuating the misconception that this ROW is not big enough for a 25' transitway and 10' hiker-biker trail. Do the Math! That leaves 65' for landscaping and buffering! <b>3)</b> There is no viable or cost effective alternative to a trolley-trail project plan to complete the Capital Crescent Trail into Silver Spring. Purple Line opponents argue that the 10,000 weekly interim trail users should trump sharing the corridor with any other uses. But a closer look at the trail traffic survey shows interim trail use is limited mostly to Chevy Chase neighborhoods, with very little trail use east of Rock Creek. We believe that if the trail is completed through Silver Spring neighborhoods into downtown Silver Spring, trail use will increase to be much higher than it is now. <b>4)</b> There will be 6 times as many uses of the Purple Line in one day as there are uses of the interim trail in an entire week. Over 62,000 uses of the Purple Line are expected each day, vs. the only 10,000 uses now seen on the interim trail in an entire week. The trail will be rebuilds as a full width trail with safe separation from transit and with grade separated crossings of all major roadways. It will be completed into downtown Silver Spring. Trail users are being asked to make a reasonable accommodation and can not fairly refuse to share the corridor with transit users. <b>5)</b> The Capital Crescent Trail between Bethesda and Georgetown will not be altered by the Purple Line. Neither the State, County or Purple Line <i>NOW!</i> propose using that section of the Georgetown Branch ROW for transit. The 4 mile Georgetown Branch segment between Bethesda and Silver Spring is a precious public corridor that can be shared by walkers, bikers and transit users. As WABA put it: <b>"A public ROW such as the Georgetown Branch is a community asset that should be designed to serve the broadest population possible. It will take commitment and creativity to make sure that this valuable transportation corridor will serve everyone: transit users, cyclists, and</b></p>	CTRAK	2010-0130	Capital Crescent / Georgetown Branch Trail	Dated 2/11/10 and Received 2/12/10	The staff generally agrees. We think there is room for the train and trail in the Georgetown Branch right of way and are interested in soliciting input from interested residents, organizations, etc. - all of the community.



**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments**  
**Dec 10 through Feb 12**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTRAK #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
95	Harry	Sanders	Individual	<b>Myth 2:</b> The PL trains will kill or injure pedestrians who don't pay attention while crossing the tracks. <b>FACT:</b> The Purple Line will make the Capital Crescent Trail (CCT) safer. The CCT will be a far safer recreational trail alongside the Purple Line than is the existing Interim CCT and Georgetown Branch Trail. Any risk to future CCT users from transit vehicles is small compared to the risk trail users face today of being run over by motor vehicles while using the existing Interim CCT and Georgetown Branch Trail between Bethesda and Silver Spring. The Interim CCT has dangerous at-grade crossings of Connecticut Avenue and Jones Bridge Road. The Georgetown Branch Trail is on roadways for two miles in Silver Spring, and has six street crossings at traffic lights including at-grade crossings of 16th Street and of Colesville Road. Trail users must cross 3 six lane state highways at-grade between Bethesda and Silver Spring. Purple Line opponents want us to ignore this risk. Plans for the Purple Line call for the CCT to be rebuilt as an uninterrupted off-road trail from downtown Bethesda to downtown Silver Spring, with grade-separated crossings on bridges or underpasses of <b>all</b> major roadways. The trail will be paved and will be at least 10 feet wide over its entire length. Trail users will be separated from light-rail tracks by fences, retaining walls or plantings. Purple Line opponents try to convince people that the trail not be safe with the Purple Line. But organizations with a proven commitment to expanding walking and bicycling opportunities by completing the trail, like the <u>Coalition for the Capital Crescent Trail</u> , the <u>WABA</u> , and the <u>Montgomery County Bicycle Action Group</u> , refuse to support the so called "Save the Trail" effort.	CTRAK	2010-0130	Capital Crescent / Georgetown Branch Trail	Dated 2/11/10 and Received 2/12/10	While completion of the Capital Crescent Trail will improve safety by removing grade-separated crossings of major roadways, the LPA includes an at-grade crossing of the tracks at Lynn Dr. See Comment 24 regarding the Lynn Dr at-grade crossing.
95	Harry	Sanders	Individual	<b>Flipping rail and rail within ROW:</b> The following text is taken from the Silver Spring Trails blog of Wayne Phyllaier. I feel the analysis presented on the blog was so good that I could not add to it and wanted to make sure a portion was included in the public record. Would the future CCT be a better trail if it is moved south? To be on the south side of the Purple Line LRT in the Georgetown Branch Corridor instead of on the north side as is now proposed. The issue was raised by residents of the Town of Chevy Chase and Edgevale at the Purple Line Master Plan public hearing on 12/10/09. They argued that having the trail on the south side would give them easier access to the trail. They live on the south side of the corridor, and they want to keep their back yard gates that open directly onto the trail. If the rail is on the south side of the corridor, it will block their private access to the trail. They want the Master Plan draft to be changed to have the trail on their side, or at least to have the issue be seriously studied. The part of the trail that could be "flipped" from the north side to the south side of the corridor is between Bethesda and Jones Mill Road. The remainder of the trail in the Georgetown Branch is already planned to be on the south side. <b>THE BOTTOM LINE: The trail will be better overall, by a small margin, if on the north side as now planned. The small differences do not merit disrupting the design process to open a new study.</b> MTA has been briefing the community regularly for over 2.5 years to show their plans to have the trail on the north side, those who are just now coming late in the process to demand we reconsider have not met their burden to show substantive reasons to delay the design to study this yet again... <u>Finally, why is this trail north-south side issue being raised now?</u> MTA has presented their plans to build the trail on the north side at public meetings, and specifically to the Bethesda-Chevy Chase Focus Group, numerous times over 2.5 years since then. They presented these plans to the Coalition for the CCT members and board at the March 2008 CCCT meeting, and the north-south side issue was not among the issues that drew attention from the trail supporters according to the <u>meeting report</u> . Now, after remaining silent on the issue for 2.5 years until the Master Plan is being finalized and preliminary design is beginning, a number of Chevy Chase residents are asking for Master Plan changes or more study that could delay the project. They fail to show how more study will show any significant information that <del>has not been available to be last 2.5 years</del> .	CTRAK	2010-0130	Capital Crescent / Georgetown Branch Trail	Dated 2/11/10 and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment 24 regarding the location of the Capital Crescent Trail on the north or south side of the tracks.
96	Kathy	Jentz	Individual	I wanted to write to you that I definitely do want a Purple Line stop at Wayne and Dale, which would be convenient station in our neighborhood. It will encourage people to use transit, get more cars off the road, and be a boost to our air quality. I hope that you will include the Wayne and Dale station in the initial construction of the Purple Line.	CTRAK	2010-0130	Dale Drive Station	Dated 2/11/10 and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.
97	Jonathan	Gilbert	Individual	Support for a Purple Line stop at Wayne and Dale in Silver Spring. I live about a block from that intersection and believe that such a stop will add to the quality of life in our neighborhood. It will help reduce traffic and provide a great convenience especially to the elderly and people with disabilities, who might not walk to one of the other planned stops. I hope you will include a station at that location in the initial construction of the line, rather than waiting to some later date.	CTRAK	2010-0130	Dale Drive Station	Dated 2/11/10 and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.
98	Suzanne	Mintz	Individual	Include a stop at Wayne and Dale. This is an ideal location for those who work in the downtown Silver Spring neighborhood and for those of use who need to travel to Bethesda. Surely, it would encourage more people to ride the Purple Line because of the Wayne and Dale intersection's accessibility and convenience. Furthermore, it would help reduce traffic while improving the environment. Include a Wayne and Dale station in the initial construction of the Purple Line.	CTRAK	2010-0130	Dale Drive Station	Dated 2/11/10 and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.

**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments**  
**Dec 10 through Feb 12**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTrack #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
99	Rebecca	Tanner	Individual	Support for a Purple Line stop at Wayne and Dale in Silver Spring. I live about in the Park Hills neighborhood of Silver Spring, just a couple of blocks from the proposed stop. Having a nearby stop will be good for the community. It will permit many households like mine to easily access public transportation for commuting purposes. With public schools, a few businesses, and several bus routes already at the intersection, a stop at Wayne and Dale does not risk changing the character of the intersection. If anything, it could help enhance the community and make it more neighborhood-friendly place.	CTrack	2010-0130	Dale Drive Station	Dated 2/11/10 and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.
100	Kyle	O'Connor	Individual	It has come to my attention that some folks have been writing to you opposing a Purple Line stop at Wayne and Dale. My family and I have lived on Dartmouth Avenue between Wayne and Cedar for 18 years. Rest assured that I, and many of my neighbors, most definitely DO want a convenient station in our neighborhood. My kids will be able to get around that much more easily, it will encourage people to use transit, get more cars off the road, and improve our air quality. Also, the thought of a trolley just blowing by such an obvious stop for our neighborhood is the utmost in aggravating. <i>Please</i> include the Wayne and Dale station in the initial construction of the Purple Line.	CTrack	2010-0130	Dale Drive Station	Dated 2/11/10 and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.
101	Michael	Ussery	Individual	We live on Dale Dr and we are definitely in favor of a Purple Line station at Wayne and Dale. It will encourage people to use transit, get more cars off the road, and be a boost to our air quality. I hope that you will include the Wayne and Dale station in the initial construction of the Purple Line.	CTrack	2010-0130	Dale Drive Station	Dated 2/11/10 and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.
101	Susan	McCauley	Individual	We live on Dale Dr and we are definitely in favor of a Purple Line station at Wayne and Dale. It will encourage people to use transit, get more cars off the road, and be a boost to our air quality. I hope that you will include the Wayne and Dale station in the initial construction of the Purple Line.	CTrack	2010-0130	Dale Drive Station	Dated 2/11/10 and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.
102	Mark	Posner	Individual	Support to place a Purple Line stop at Wayne and Dale. This is an ideal spot for another stop given the number of people who live within walking distance of this corner, and the distance that otherwise would exist between stops in the near-downtown area if the Wayne/Dale stop is not included (i.e., the distance between the stop just north of Sligo Creek and the Wayne/Fenton stop). I live about 5 blocks from Wayne and Dale, and know that I would use this stop frequently. Some of my neighbors oppose the stop because they claim that it would lead to high density development nearby. This is a clear misreading of the current county policy, which applies to development <u>near subway stops</u> . I don't believe that there is any possibility that this neighborhood, county planners, or the county council would support rezoning for greater development based on a PL stop being at Wayne and Dale. Some of my neighbors also may be concerned because of two schools would be adjacent to this stop; but the state, clearly, would take that into account in constructing the stop. Please support the placement of a PL stop at Wayne and Dale.	CTrack	2010-0130	Dale Drive Station	Dated 2/11/10 and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.
103	Nancy	Schwiesow	Individual	Wants a Purple Line stop at Wayne and Dale, which would be a convenient station in our neighborhood. It would encourage people to use transit, get more cars off the road, and be a boost to our air quality. I hope that you will include the Wayne and Dale station in the initial construction of the Purple Line.	CTrack	2010-0130	Dale Drive Station	Dated 2/11/10 and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.
104	Charmaine	Foltz	Individual	I am writing to express my sincere and enthusiastic support of a Wayne/Dale stop for the proposed inner purple line. There are many in the neighborhood who support a stop at that location and I am confident that it would reduce traffic. I would love to have access that close to my home and would use it daily.	CTrack	2010-0130	Dale Drive Station	Dated 2/11/10 and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.
105	Martin	Crane	Individual	Thank you for considering our comments on this issue. We wholeheartedly support the Purple Line, and our daughter attends Sligo Creek Elementary at Wayne and Dale. Please know that we and many of my neighbors definitely do want a convenient station in our neighborhood. We would certainly get on and off the Purple Line at that intersection, and believe it will encourage people to use transit, get more cars off the road, and be a boost to our air quality. We hope that you will include the Wayne and Dale station in the initial construction of the Purple Line.	CTrack	2010-0130	Dale Drive Station	Dated 2/11/10 and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.
105	Sonia	Rodriguez-Crane	Individual	Thank you for considering our comments on this issue. We wholeheartedly support the Purple Line, and our daughter attends Sligo Creek Elementary at Wayne and Dale. Please know that we and many of my neighbors definitely do want a convenient station in our neighborhood. We would certainly get on and off the Purple Line at that intersection, and believe it will encourage people to use transit, get more cars off the road, and be a boost to our air quality. We hope that you will include the Wayne and Dale station in the initial construction of the Purple Line.	CTrack	2010-0130	Dale Drive Station	Dated 2/11/10 and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.

**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments**  
**Dec 10 through Feb 12**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTRAK #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
106	Tina	Slater	Individual	As the deadline for the public comment draws near, I'd like to urge you to include a stop at Wayne and Dale in the plans for the Purple Line. Some in our community do not want it, as they are afraid it will open us up to Transit Oriented Development. My take on this is that the County is due to see a lot more TOD [how else will we keep from encroaching on the Ag. Reserve?] and that we will come to appreciate TOD, much as we have come to appreciate the conveniences of downtown Silver Spring with its coffee shops, restaurants, grocery stores, bookshops, specialty shops and movie theaters. That *is* what makes a "neighborhood" -- people out and about, meeting neighbors on the street, walking and shopping and working close to home. Further, I'm quite certain that we are not too far away from rising gasoline prices, once this world-wide recession is over. Four-dollar-a-gallon gasoline drove many drivers to transit, and once on transit they discovered they liked it. During this decade I feel sure that we'll see \$4, \$6, possibly \$8 a gallon gas ---- and when this happens, everyone will be clamoring for more public transit. At that point, our neighborhood will be kicking itself (or more likely screaming a the County Council) for its decision to eliminate the potential stop at Wayne and Dale. The earliest the Purple Line would be up and running is 2017 -- a lot will be different in the landscape by then. Please look ahead into the future, realize that we'll all be needing transit more and wanting to drive less (commuting is stressful now -- just wait until the population grows and we have <u>more</u> cars on the road!). Please include the Wayne and Dale station in the <u>initial construction</u> of the Purple Line.	CTRAK	2010-0130	Dale Drive Station	Dated 2/11/10 and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.
106	Don	Slater	Individual	As the deadline for the public comment draws near, I'd like to urge you to include a stop at Wayne and Dale in the plans for the Purple Line. Some in our community do not want it, as they are afraid it will open us up to Transit Oriented Development. My take on this is that the County is due to see a lot more TOD [how else will we keep from encroaching on the Ag. Reserve?] and that we will come to appreciate TOD, much as we have come to appreciate the conveniences of downtown Silver Spring with its coffee shops, restaurants, grocery stores, bookshops, specialty shops and movie theaters. That *is* what makes a "neighborhood" -- people out and about, meeting neighbors on the street, walking and shopping and working close to home. Further, I'm quite certain that we are not too far away from rising gasoline prices, once this world-wide recession is over. Four-dollar-a-gallon gasoline drove many drivers to transit, and once on transit they discovered they liked it. During this decade I feel sure that we'll see \$4, \$6, possibly \$8 a gallon gas ---- and when this happens, everyone will be clamoring for more public transit. At that point, our neighborhood will be kicking itself (or more likely screaming a the County Council) for its decision to eliminate the potential stop at Wayne and Dale. The earliest the Purple Line would be up and running is 2017 -- a lot will be different in the landscape by then. Please look ahead into the future, realize that we'll all be needing transit more and wanting to drive less (commuting is stressful now -- just wait until the population grows and we have <u>more</u> cars on the road!). Please include the Wayne and Dale station in the <u>initial construction</u> of the Purple Line.	CTRAK	2010-0130	Dale Drive Station	Dated 2/11/10 and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.
106	Jessica	Slater	Individual	As the deadline for the public comment draws near, I'd like to urge you to include a stop at Wayne and Dale in the plans for the Purple Line. Some in our community do not want it, as they are afraid it will open us up to Transit Oriented Development. My take on this is that the County is due to see a lot more TOD [how else will we keep from encroaching on the Ag. Reserve?] and that we will come to appreciate TOD, much as we have come to appreciate the conveniences of downtown Silver Spring with its coffee shops, restaurants, grocery stores, bookshops, specialty shops and movie theaters. That *is* what makes a "neighborhood" -- people out and about, meeting neighbors on the street, walking and shopping and working close to home. Further, I'm quite certain that we are not too far away from rising gasoline prices, once this world-wide recession is over. Four-dollar-a-gallon gasoline drove many drivers to transit, and once on transit they discovered they liked it. During this decade I feel sure that we'll see \$4, \$6, possibly \$8 a gallon gas ---- and when this happens, everyone will be clamoring for more public transit. At that point, our neighborhood will be kicking itself (or more likely screaming a the County Council) for its decision to eliminate the potential stop at Wayne and Dale. The earliest the Purple Line would be up and running is 2017 -- a lot will be different in the landscape by then. Please look ahead into the future, realize that we'll all be needing transit more and wanting to drive less (commuting is stressful now -- just wait until the population grows and we have <u>more</u> cars on the road!). Please include the Wayne and Dale station in the <u>initial construction</u> of the Purple Line.	CTRAK	2010-0130	Dale Drive Station	Dated 2/11/10 and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.
107	Mary Lou	Foy	Individual	I definitely want a Purple Line stop at the intersection of Dale and Wayne. Additionally, it will be good for the schools at that location.	CTRAK	2010-0130	Dale Drive Station	Dated 2/11/10 and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.

**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments**  
**Dec 10 through Feb 12**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTRAK #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
108	Laura	Smail	Individual	Support of the proposed Purple Line station at Wayne Avenue & Dale Drive. I believe metro station at this location would make our neighborhood more accessible for residents who do not own vehicles. I also believe it would encourage residents who do own cars to leave them at home and use public transportation more often than they normally would. A metro stop here would benefit everyone.	CTRAK	2010-0130	Dale Drive Station	Dated 2/11/10 and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.
109	Ty	Christensen	Individual	Support including a Purple Line stop at Wayne Avenue and Dale Drive. It would be a wonderful addition to our neighborhood, just 2 blocks from my house. This would be a "neighborhood" stop, and would encourage people to use transit, get off the road, and cut down on car pollution. I know that many of my neighbors feel the same.	CTRAK	2010-0130	Dale Drive Station	Dated 2/11/10 and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.
110	Meg	Clabault	Individual	I live in the Park Hills neighborhood of Silver Spring. I really think building a Purple Line stop at Wayne and Dale is very important. I actually think it would be a shame for there not to be a stop at much a major crossroads. <b>*Side note</b> , thank you for providing such fabulous street plows today. Those 3 guys working the diggers are awesome at their jobs.	CTRAK	2010-0130	Dale Drive Station	Dated 2/11/10 and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.
111	Martine	Brizius	Individual	While some neighbors have been writing to you opposing a Purple Line station at Wayne and Dale, please know that many of my neighbors definitely do want a convenient station in our neighborhood. It would encourage people to use transit, get more cars off the road, and be a boost to our air quality. I have put too much energy into the redevelopment of this area over the last 17 years to want to lose out now on one of the prime benefits of revitalization. I hope that you will include the Wayne and Dale station in the initial construction of the Purple Line.	CTRAK	2010-0130	Dale Drive Station	Dated 2/11/10 and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.
112	Debora	Thompson	Individual	Although some neighbors are probably writing to you opposing a Purple Line station at Wayne and Dale, please know that many of my neighbors definitely do want a convenient station in our neighborhood. It would encourage people to use transit, get more cars off the road, and be a boost to our air quality. I hope that you will include the Wayne and Dale station in the initial construction of the Purple Line.	CTRAK	2010-0130	Dale Drive Station	Dated 2/11/10 and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.
113	Lisa	Goldberg	Individual	While some neighbors have been writing to you opposing a Purple Line station at Wayne and Dale, please know that many of my neighbors definitely do want a convenient station in our neighborhood. It would encourage people to use transit, get more cars off the road, and be a boost to our air quality. I hope that you will include the Wayne and Dale station in the initial construction of the Purple Line.	CTRAK	2010-0130	Dale Drive Station	Dated 2/11/10 and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.
114	Melissa	Bannett	Individual	While some neighbors have been writing to you opposing a Purple Line station at Wayne and Dale, please know that many of my neighbors including our family of five definitely do want a convenient station in our neighborhood. It would encourage people to use transit, get more cars off the road, and be a boost to our air quality. It will also make it much safer for my middle school children to travel independently in the neighborhood. Lastly, it is an essential part of planning for a more environmentally sound lifestyle for this wonderful neighborhood. It is vitally important to the quality of life in our neighborhood and to a vision of greener future that the Wayne and Dale station in the initial construction of the Purple Line.	CTRAK	2010-0130	Dale Drive Station	Dated 2/11/10 and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.
115	Matt	McKeever	Individual	While some neighbors have been writing to you opposing a Purple Line station at Wayne and Dale, please know that many of my neighbors definitely do want a convenient station in our neighborhood. It would encourage people to use transit, get more cars off the road, and be a boost to our air quality. I hope that you will include the Wayne and Dale station in the initial construction of the Purple Line.	CTRAK	2010-0131	Dale Drive Station	Dated 2/11/10 and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.
116	Jerry	Withers	Individual	While some neighbors have been writing to you opposing a Purple Line station at Wayne and Dale, please know that many of my neighbors definitely do want a convenient station in our neighborhood. It would encourage people to use transit, get more cars off the road, and be a boost to our air quality. Having to cope with construction, having a rail line pass by and not being able to use the service is ludicrous. Particularly in an area with Blair Schools and an aging population. I hope that you will include the Wayne and Dale station in the initial construction of the Purple Line.	CTRAK	2010-0131	Dale Drive Station	Dated 2/11/10 and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.
117	Jia	Jiang	Individual	Please know that it is crucial for us to have a Purple Line stop at the Wayne and Dale junction as that is one the many things we can do to encourage people to make full use of the new transit system, get more cars off the road, and be a boost to our air quality. As you know, Dale leads to Georgia and in turn all of the residents on the Wheaton side, which is a fairly sizable population that could have made use of the Purple Line just like those of us on this side. It is only sensible that we do so to ensure greater access.	CTRAK	2010-0131	Dale Drive Station	Dated 2/11/10 and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.

**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments**  
**Dec 10 through Feb 12**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTRAK #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
118	Nare	Ratnapala	Individual	I live just off of Wayne and Dale. I live just off of Wayne and Dale. Like most of my neighbors I like to add my support for this stop. It would certainly make it attractive for me to use the Purple Line to commute to work at the University of MD. I know this is true for most of my neighbors as well because I know that many of them will opt to take the public trans transportation for work. As you very well know this is a very central location and many residents find this an invitation to use the train. Hope you will consider my request favorably.	CTRAK	2010-0131	Dale Drive Station	Dated 2/11/10 and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.
119	Anne	Spielberg	Individual	I am writing to urge you to oppose any and all efforts that would allow a Purple Line station to be constructed at Dale Drive, either immediately or at some future point in time. As a resident that lives within three blocks of where a Dale Station would be constructed, I know first hand that such a station is both unnecessary and would have devastating impacts on the surrounding neighborhood in which I have lived for 17 years. The decision to allow the Purple Line to be built at surface on Wayne Ave., rather than as a tunnel route, will already cause serious problems for our neighborhood. Both the County and the State have obligation not to further exacerbate those problems by allowing construction of a Dale Station. <b>1)</b> There is simply no need for a station at Dale Drive. MTA's projection that there would be 1,400 daily boardings at a Dale Dr station is simply not credible. That number substantially exceeds MTA's projections at two nearby stations that are already slated for construction: the Fenton St/Silver Spring Library station and the Manchester Place station. Both these stations are near a number of high rise residences with much denser development than that surrounding the proposed Dale Dr stations, which is comprised primarily of single family homes and is one of the least densely populated residential neighborhoods along the entire Purple Line. Yet MTA projects ridership figures twice as high for Dale Dr as for Fenton St and several hundred more daily boardings at Dale Dr than at Manchester Place. The number of Purple Line daily station boardings at Dale Dr is more likely to be between 200 and 300, a number that does not justify the expense and adverse impacts of a station when others are so nearby and easily accessible for those who live in the area. Only <u>four</u> passengers board the Ride On #15 bus at Dale Dr on Wayne Ave during morning rush hour, in contrast to the substantial number of bus boardings east of Sligo Creek Park, and there are very few boardings at nearby stops. These kind of numbers cannot justify adding a sixth station to the five already planned for the just more than 2 mile stretch from the Silver Spring Transit Center to Gilbert Street Long Branch (near Piney Branch and University Blvd). This number of stops is more appropriate for express bus service, than for LRT which is supposed to have limited and more sparsely placed stops. Most of my neighbors and I, who live closest to this proposed stop, feel no need for it, even though we would	CTRAK	2010-0131	Dale Drive Station	Dated and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.
119	Anne	Spielberg	Individual	<b>2)</b> The development and adverse impacts a Dale Dr station would bring to our neighborhood are unacceptable. At a time when our county is supposedly promoting walkable neighborhoods and livable spaces, a Dale Dr station would result in even further widening of Wayne Ave, making a significant section as wide as Colesville Rd. It is at best ironic that while there is talk of making a road like Rockville Pike more pedestrian friendly, there are these efforts to make Wayne Ave, which now is pedestrian friendly, just the opposite. Widening Wayne Ave further to accommodate a Dale Dr station will exacerbate the effect of the Purple Line as a huge bisecting barrier in the neighborhood. This further widening will occur directly in front of an elementary and middle school, to which large numbers of children, including my own, regularly walk. The station's adverse impact on the school population is increased because the Dale Dr station would require closing the Wayne Ave entrance to the large parking lot of Sligo Creek Elementary School and Silver Spring International Middle School, and traffic will be diverted to Dale Dr and my neighborhood's side streets near the schools. The station will also hinder my neighbors' access to their homes because westbound traffic on Wayne going toward downtown Silver Spring would be prohibited from turning left onto Dale Dr (toward Piney Branch Rd) while a train is in the Dale Dr station, especially for children walking from our neighborhood to the schools, will be horrific. Given our close proximity to downtown Silver Spring, our neighborhood also does not need the commercial and denser development that will flow from planting an unnecessary station in our small, quiet, long-standing community. That kind of development is appropriately confined to the CBD. Please oppose any Purple Line station at Dale Dr. It is not needed and it will only further harm our wonderful community, which already will suffer with a Purple Line at surface through the only single family residential community along the line.	CTRAK	2010-0131	Dale Drive Station	Dated and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.
120	Shiv	Chopra	Individual	I support having a Purple Line stop at Wayne and Dale. While some neighbors have been writing to you opposing a Purple Line station at Wayne and Dale, please know that many of my neighbors definitely do want a convenient station in our neighborhood. It would encourage people to use transit, get more cars off the road, and be a boost to our air quality. I hope that you will include the Wayne and Dale station in the initial construction of the Purple Line.	CTRAK	2010-0131	Dale Drive Station	Dated and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.

**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments**  
**Dec 10 through Feb 12**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTRAK #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
121	Edward	Clabault	Individual	I am writing to express my support for the plan to place a Purple Line station at the corner of Wayne Ave and Dale Dr. As a resident of Mansfield Rd, which is right around the corner, I would use this stop regularly. The failure to put a stop at this intersection would severely limit our neighborhood's ability to take advantage of the Purple Line. For a number of years I have lived on Bacon St in Brookline Massachusetts. Down the middle of Beacon St runs the "C" Line to work and to other places throughout the Boston area. The distances between the stops were small enough so that any station was a short walk away, but far enough apart that it made more sense to take the train than to walk. I fear that if no station is built at Wayne and Dale, the distance between the stop at the new Library and the next stop, at Manchester Place, would be far too distant to make riding the Purple Line something my family would regularly do.	CTRAK	2010-0131	Dale Drive Station	Dated and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.
122	David	McPherson	Individual	I understand that some of my neighbors have been writing in opposition to a Purple Line stop at Wayne and Dale. While some may have legitimate concerns regarding a stop in the neighborhood, I believe much of the opposition is either a hangover from their previous general opposition to the Purple Line at grade on Wayne or is simply ill informed. I am writing to let you know that many in the community including my family strongly support a stop at Wayne and Dale - a stop conveniently located in the neighborhood would encourage use the line, reduce traffic in the neighborhood and would be a nice amenity to receive in return for the inevitable disruption and inconvenience caused by the construction of the line through our neighborhood. I hope you will aggressively support a stop at Wayne and Dale, including doing the necessary neighborhood outreach that could sway some in the no camp who are currently there <del>primarily due to lack of understanding the issue</del> .	CTRAK	2010-0131	Dale Drive Station	Dated and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.
123	James	Wallace	Individual	Although some neighbors are probably writing to you opposing a Purple Line station at Wayne and Dale, please know that our family and many other neighbors definitely do want a convenient station in our neighborhood. It would encourage people to use transit, get more cars off the road, and be a boost to our air quality. We hope that you will include the Wayne and Dale station in the initial construction of the Purple Line.	CTRAK	2010-0131	Dale Drive Station	Dated and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.
123	Barbara	Pequet	Individual	Although some neighbors are probably writing to you opposing a Purple Line station at Wayne and Dale, please know that our family and many other neighbors definitely do want a convenient station in our neighborhood. It would encourage people to use transit, get more cars off the road, and be a boost to our air quality. We hope that you will include the Wayne and Dale station in the initial construction of the Purple Line.	CTRAK	2010-0131	Dale Drive Station	Dated and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.
124	George	Rathbone	Individual	With two public schools at Wayne and Dale it would make a lot of sense to put a stop there. I know that folks with houses right there may not be crazy about the idea; that is to be expected. The traffic around here is getting crazy, and without local stops it will only get worse. The walk to Silver Spring Metro is too long for old folks and too long to be safe for kids. We need mass transit that is convenient enough that people will actually use it. Please don't let NIMBY obstruct sensible community planning and progress.	CTRAK	2010-0131	Dale Drive Station	Dated and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.

**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments**  
**Dec 10 through Feb 12**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTRAK #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
125			Town of Chevy Chase	<p><b>ROW:</b> While recognizing that the Town is only one of several communities that border the 16-mile transit line, the segment of the line that abuts the northern boundary of the Town is unique and thus bears additional scrutiny. <b>1)</b> The ROW is exceptionally narrow (32' ) near several Town homes on Elm St. where it then enters a tunnel; the rest of the ROW is only 66'. The southern portion of this has a very steep grade and drop-off along a large percentage of the ROW and a creek that is part of the Chesapeake Bay Watershed is at the base of that drop-off. Near Lynn Dr, the 66' ROW is tightly wedged between commercial buildings and an apartment complex on one side and Town homes within feet of the ROW boundary on the other. In general, there are only single family residential properties to the south of the ROW while a large part of the north side is commercial. <b>2)</b> Into that narrow ROW, the State proposes to place two LRT tracks, catenary wires and poles, a pedestrian paved trail with safety buffers on both sides, an extensive ADA compliant ramped portion of the Trail that will be approximately two blocks long, and plantings, sound barriers, and retaining walls. The State has acknowledged that all trees will be removed within the ROW and that the canopy trees cannot be replaced. Finally, they have noted they will need easements on Town properties to accommodate the areas of disturbance associated with the construction of the rail line (i.e., more trees and plantings will be removed on private property to allow for construction). <b>3)</b> The State also proposes running the trains at maximum speeds of 50 mph within this ROW at 6-minute headways during rush hour (as a consequence, trains will pass through the ROW every 3 minutes). There are homes (not just yards, but actual houses) in the Town that will be literally within feet of trains running at those speeds; the same is true of Edgevale east of the Town. <b>4)</b> Additionally, one of the two access points for the Town to the Trail is proposed at Lynn Dr. The State's current proposal calls for an at-grade crossing to the Trail on the north side and to Montgomery Avenue and East-West Highway beyond. Unlike areas where the LRT will run on streets, following posted speed limits and traffic signage, <i>State engineers have stated that trains will be passing this access point at 45 mph.</i> That means that people will have to first traverse tracks with trains going that speed every 3 minutes to access the Trail or to make this crossing. That includes the numerous teenagers who use this crossing to get to Bethesda Chevy Chase High School, often in the dark morning hours.</p>	CTRAK	2010-0132	Capital Crescent / Georgetown Branch Trail	Dated and Received 2/12/10	See Comment #30 regarding tradeoffs in the Wisconsin Ave tunnel. See Comment #55 regarding the number of residential structures that are located within a close proximity of the Georgetown Branch right-of-way centerline. See Comment 24 regarding Coquelin Run. See Comment #22 regarding impacts to the Capital Crescent Trail. See comment #24 regarding the Lynn Drive at-grade crossing.
125			Town of Chevy Chase	<p><b>Comments on the State's Rationale:</b> MTA states that the primary reason for placing the Trail on the north side is to maximize the vertical and horizontal separation between the Trail and the trackbed, which MTA says would provide a better "trail experience". The decision seems not to be based on specific engineering or cost analyses. MTA says that locating the Trail to the north of the trackbed better follows the existing elevation of the surrounding land and keeps the Trail three to four feet above the trackbed, where possible. But it is counterintuitive to locate a recreational trail close to a barren commercial strip instead of alongside a leafy residential community. Many Trail users have contacted the Town on this issue, in unanimous agreement that walkers, bikers, baby strollers leashed dogs all prefer some semblance of the shaded trail they have enjoyed for years. Only a southern alignment for the Trail would provide that. Likewise, it is unclear why the State couldn't/wouldn't provide an elevated Trail on the south side. Major re-grading of the area will occur in any event. We wholeheartedly agree with the planners' desire to provide a good and safe Trail experience, yet we conclude that a well-designed Trail alignment on the south side is capable to making the Trail experience better than or at least as good as a northern Trail alignment and is cost-comparable and a better environmental choice. The MTA contractor's recommendation acknowledged that the Trail location on the north side of the ROW in Chevy Chase would cause the residents to lose the direct access to the Trail and would place the transitway closer to the residences on the south side. The Town believes that losing a more direct (and thus safer) access and placing the transitway closer to the residences will cause materially different safety and environmental consequences without substantially reducing the cost of construction. Denying the Town's 1,020 residences along with the residences of Edgevale direct access to a treasured recreational Trail and placing a transitway closer to those residences is hardly in line with the new federal policy of funding major transit projects that make communities more "livable".</p>	CTRAK	2010-0132	Capital Crescent / Georgetown Branch Trail	Dated and Received 2/12/10	The staff disagrees. The staff believes the MTA was responding in part to stakeholder concerns about the need to provide as much separation as possible between the trail user and the train. The staff also believes that the topography on the south side along the Town boundary is such that additional costs would be incurred to construct the trail on the south side – relative to the costs of the trail on the north side (all other considerations being equal).



**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments**  
**Dec 10 through Feb 12**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTRAK #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
125			Town of Chevy Chase	Additional Town Concerns: Along with the safety and access issues above, the Town has significant concerns regarding noise and vibrations. The Noise and Vibration Technical Report of the AA/DEIS and the information provided to date does not provide sufficient data to allow the County or the Town to understand the noise impacts of the Purple Line on the Town. A south Trail alignment would be inherently quieter and is key to mitigating noise and vibration impacts. But the Town has serious concerns about the State's noise study; an attachment to this report details these concerns.1) It appears MTA understates the Purple Line's noise and vibration levels along the Trail in the Town and mislabels a "severe impacts" as a "negligible impact". 2) It appears MTA did not take a single sound measurement within the Town of Chevy Chase, but simply assumed the Town is ordinarily as noisy as East-West Highway near Montgomery Avenue and Jones Bridge Road near Connecticut Avenue. 3) It appears MTA assumed that trains will run down the center of the ROW rather than on a track, which understates noise reaching the Town. 4) The Technical Report appears to assume single-tracking where MTA now proposes double-tracking. The Report states that a headway of 6 minutes means 10 trains per hour, not 20 trains per hour, which would occur with double tracking and therefore understates the noise reaching the Town by a further 3dB(A). Since the noise model has not been made available to the Town, this simple error cannot be ruled out. 5) It also appears the MTA underestimates noise emission from light-rail trains. It counts on the trains being quieter than the manufacturers themselves specify. MTA's analysis also appears to not fully account for all of the ways trains produce noise, including the location of the rails, the number of trains per day, maintenance of wheels and tracks, the presence of real-world dust/grit/leaves/imperfections, turns and crossovers, braking, decelerating, accelerating, reflections, canyon effects, and focusing effects when entering the tunnel. The Town of Chevy Chase therefore requests that the State conduct new studies of noise and vibration using alignments individually optimized for the Trail being north or south of the tracks adjacent to the Town. The Town will need these noise studies and more complete engineering details in order to determine the mitigation it will request during the preliminary engineering details to make an informed decision on whether to amend the <del>Purple Line Functional Master Plan</del> .	CTRAK	2010-0132	Capital Crescent / Georgetown Branch Trail	Dated and Received 2/12/10	The noise effects of the LRT are not expected to be significant from an acoustical perspective but noise effects will be considered in developing screening techniques. Staff concurs with the MTA evaluation that the location of the trail has no significant effect on the noise impact from light rail vehicles on adjacent properties to either side of the right-of-way.
125			Town of Chevy Chase	<b>Additional Town Concerns:</b> While the primary objectives of the Town of Chevy Chase are to ensure that the transit project in its entirety, the rail and the Trail, provides our Town residents (and Trail users) with a safe and environmentally benign transit alternative, we are cognizant and respectful of the goals for the entire 16-mile line. We firmly believe, however, that switching the alignment for this area and putting the Trail on the south side of this narrow ROW will not impact the functionality of the entire line - but it does have significant impact on the "livability" of our community. <b>In summary</b> , the Town of Chevy Chase asks that at this time the County deny the State's request to amend the Purple Line Functional Master Plan to change the alignment of the train and Trail in the ROW adjacent to the Town until the State conducts sufficient preliminary engineering on <b>both</b> alternatives with the Trail fully optimized and elevated on both alignments. This preliminary engineering will give the County, the State and the Town the information we all need to compare the consequences, costs and trade-offs of each alignment.	CTRAK	2010-0132	Capital Crescent / Georgetown Branch Trail	Dated and Received 2/12/10	See Comment #24 regarding location of the trail on the north side of the tracks to the west of Connecticut Avenue.
126	Adam	Daniel	Individual	My wife, my son and I live at 8416 Queen Annes Drive, around 100 yards from the site of a proposed Purple Line station at the corner of Wayne Avenue and Dale Drive. I am told that some of my neighbors are writing to express opposition to the station. I am writing to let you know that my wife and I are members of a large group in the neighborhood who are generally quieter but who very much support the station. A station at this location will provide access to the new mass transit infrastructure to a great many homes that will otherwise be outside reasonable walking distance of a Purple Line station. It will make access to jobs and amenities in College Park, Bethesda and other locations that much faster and more convenient. There are more reasons we support the station, but in short, it would help make our densely-populated, inner suburb smarter and more efficient, and a better place to live. I will add that outside the hard-liners, neighbors I chat with say that as long as there is going to be a train on Wayne Ave., they feel strongly that we should have this nearby station.	CTRAK	2010-0133	Dale Drive Station	Dated and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.
127	Lynn	Rhinehart	Individual	We urge you to include a Purple Line stop at Wayne and Dale. It will greatly increase the utility and usage of the Purple Line, and will put a stop where it is needed - near a school and other recreational centers. Without a stop, our neighborhood will get all the traffic of the Purple Line and none of the benefits, which is really defeats the purpose of the project.	CTRAK	2010-0137	Dale Drive Station	Dated 2/12/10 and Received 2/16/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.
127	Neil	Gladstein	Individual	We urge you to include a Purple Line stop at Wayne and Dale. It will greatly increase the utility and usage of the Purple Line, and will put a stop where it is needed - near a school and other recreational centers. Without a stop, our neighborhood will get all the traffic of the Purple Line and none of the benefits, which is really defeats the purpose of the project.	CTRAK	2010-0137	Dale Drive Station	Dated 2/12/10 and Received 2/16/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.

**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments**  
**Dec 10 through Feb 12**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTRAK #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
128	Janet	Ishimoto	Individual	While some neighbors have been writing to you opposing a Purple Line station at Wayne and Dale, please know that many of my neighbors definitely do want a convenient station in our neighborhood. It would encourage people to use transit, get more cars off the road, and be a boost to our air quality. I hope that you will include the Wayne and Dale station in the initial construction of the Purple Line.	CTRAK	2010-0137	Dale Drive Station	Dated 2/12/10 and Received 2/16/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.
131	Mier	Wolf	Individual	<b>1)</b> I do not understand support for light rail over bus when bus is one half the cost. Has no one seen the design of modern buses currently in use on city streets around the U.S.? Why take down thousands of trees that won't come back because of overhead lines when if you had the chance, you could implement a plan that would allow successful tree replanting. We will be left with a too narrow bicycle speedway instead of the incredible, summer shaded, hiker/biker amenity. <b>2)</b> Even with BRAC receiving additional funds for traffic adjustments, I still think public transportation on Jones Bridge Road is an option that has not been satisfactorily addressed. <b>3)</b> I am amazed that State MTA goes back and forth on considerations of putting the proposed Purple Line tracks on first the south side of the route and now the north side of the route between Bethesda and Connecticut Avenue. It's a disaster for residents of the Town of Chevy Chase both for homeowners along the trail and for trail users who will have more complicated access to the trail. At the time the state revised its decision about tracks location, it seemed to me it was a sop to Riviera Apartment residents who didn't want the tracks on their side of the trail. <b>4)</b> I attended a planning board hearing during all this controversy at which the state said it could NOT justify a system built between Bethesda and New Carrollton. They said there wasn't sufficient ridership. I thought "game over". But know they sharpened their pencils or pressed more computer buttons to try to generate more ridership statistics by adding approximately 10 new stations in the system to seek intra system ridership.	Email		Overall Project	Dated and Received 2/2/10	See Comment #19 regarding costs. See Comment #18 regarding BRAC. See Comment #24 regarding the decision to locate the trail to the north or south of the tracks. See Comment #19 regarding ridership forecasts.
131	Mier	Wolf	Individual	<b>5)</b> The business development possibilities as a result of this project are illusory. Only Chevy Chase Land Company at Manor Road and Connecticut Avenue might benefit from this plan. I'm not aware of any major economic planning from Bethesda to New Carrollton otherwise. And the PG County advocates are whistling in the wind if they think their portion of this system will do anything but blight the environment. The economy and development trends are such that plopping a rail system into a not in economic demand part of the metropolitan area won't bring any positive results for residents there. <b>6)</b> Trail users of what has become a linear park between Bethesda and Silver Spring have been ignored in the process of planning this project. With the trees gone, they will be offered a too narrow bike path instead of an ambient walk or ride through a beautiful area. We need botanical beauty down county as well as upcounty. We have the agricultural preserve and a number of verdant, large parks there, too. The state has drawn some childlike bush renditions for the trail which do nothing to protect the character built there through maturation of the botany along the route. With over 500,000 uses of the trail a year, it seems negligent to me that you would tear down the trees and put a train down the middle of a route enjoyed by so many people.	Email		Overall Project	Dated and Received 2/2/10	See Comment #22 regarding impacts to the trail.

**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments**  
**Dec 10 through Feb 12**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTRAK #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
132	Richard	Ullman	Individual	<p>I recently moved into the Chevy Chase Lake Area and have lived here for a year. Of course the most important planning hope and fear for the area is the question of the impact of the purple line.</p> <p>When I look at the plans for the Purple Line in this area (from purplelinemd.com maps LPA07, LPA08) I do not see explicit accommodation for the present pedestrian use of the trail. Pedestrians enter the current path from several points between Connecticut Avenue and Jones Mill Road. When light rail is installed, these entryways will likely be cut off by safety fencing. Residents use the trail for exercise for themselves, their children and their pets and also for transportation to the community retail center. For the residents along the path in this area, the Purple Line, even with the proposed walking/biking trail along side will degrade present pedestrian use.</p> <p>In the Chevy Chase Lake neighborhood, a supplement/alternative to the Purple Line route for pedestrian and bicycle use could be developed using the existing wooded conservation areas. In the Master Plan for the Bethesda/Chevy Chase Master Plan posted on the montgomeryplanning.org website and dated as "Approved and Adopted 1990" there is a 20-year old proposal for a sidewalk or path in parcel C10. Indeed there exist unofficial and untended trails that follow parts of this route today. These paths would be cut off by the purple line plans. A route through C10 with enough width for walking and bicycle use would indeed provide the benefits noted in the 1990 plan and also could provide the start of a reasonable alternative to the existing Capital Crescent Trail use.</p> <p>Such a route could be extended parallel to Chevy Chase Lake Drive through the existing woods, perhaps along the stream banks in parcel C9. A wide sidewalk along the southern side of Chevy Chase Lake Drive right of way (the parcel zoned R-20) could connect to the Georgetown branch (Capital Crescent) trail at Connecticut Avenue. In the other direction, the trail could reasonably link to the Rock Creek trail. The current walking and biking facilities along Jones Mill Road are quite unpleasant and unsafe. A safe path could be installed in the parkland on the east side of Jones Mill Road.</p>	Email		Capital Crescent / Georgetown Branch Trail	Dated and Received 12/24/09	One of the tradeoffs with the Purple Line is that some residents will have reduced access to the Capital Crescent Trail. Comment #78 is similar to this comment. See response to Comment #78.



Town Council  
Kathy Strom, *Mayor*  
Linna Barnes, *Vice Mayor*  
Patricia Burda, *Secretary*  
David Lublin, *Treasurer*  
Al Lang, *Community Liaison*

**Testimony of Patricia Burda, Councilmember**

**On Behalf of the Town of Chevy Chase**

**To the Montgomery County Parks and Planning Board Regarding the Purple Line Functional Plan**

**December 10, 2009**

---

Chairman Hanson and Members of the Board:

I am Patricia Burda, Councilmember for the Town of Chevy Chase. This is the Town's first testimony since the passing of Commissioner Jean Cryor and we'd like to take this opportunity to say how saddened we were to hear of her death. She was a pleasure to testify before – asking insightful and perceptive questions – and we appreciate her many, many years of service to the community. She will be missed. On a happier note, it is also the first time we've testified since Commissioner Wells-Harley has joined the Planning Board and to her we extend our sincerest welcome.

Since Ms. Wells-Harley is new, I would like to just briefly review the Town's position on the project before making specific comments on the Functional Plan.

While the Purple Line as an east-west connector is a worthy project, we believe that the region has other equally important transit needs. Choosing the light rail Purple Line with its huge price tag and limited flexibility, we believe limits the State's ability to meet other pressing transit needs in the area. Instead, the region will be stuck with an orphan mode with a unique set of operational costs and limited interconnectivity with other transit modes. So the Town of Chevy Chase does not believe the project as currently being developed will effectively and efficiently serve the entire region. In particular, the light rail route chosen will completely miss an area already identified as an upcoming traffic quagmire -- The 2005 Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) recommendations moved to establish the new Walter Reed National Military Medical Center at Bethesda (WRNMMC). Soon a larger, more robust medical facility will provide care for our military patients from all services.<sup>1</sup> We are told BRAC's WRNMMC will see 4,000 new trips per day when it opens in 2012.

The Town has submitted formal comments on the State's Draft Environmental Impact Statement citing inaccuracies with its analysis of the only alternative that would directly serve the BRAC-mandated

---

<sup>1</sup> See generally [http://www.bethesda.med.navy.mil/professional/public\\_affairs/BRAC/Overview\\_Stats.aspx](http://www.bethesda.med.navy.mil/professional/public_affairs/BRAC/Overview_Stats.aspx).

relocation with a one-seat ride – the Jones Bridge Road Bus Rapid Transit alternative. This alternative would likewise save over \$1 billion dollars of taxpayer's money, would allow interconnectivity with other bus rapid transit projects being proposed throughout the region, and would prevent the environmental destruction and use for multiple types of recreational and commuting purposes along the Capital Crescent Trail into Bethesda. This urban park currently sees over 10,000 uses per week. The narrow right of way into Bethesda will require the clear cutting of over 17 acres of mature trees. A 10' bike path is planned alongside two trains running every 3-6 minutes at 45 mph in some places.

While some have suggested that only the Town of Chevy Chase disagrees with the Governor's locally preferred alternative, during the public comment period over 1,200 people and more than a dozen community groups from our area wrote in or testified to the State that light rail on the Trail was unacceptable. You'll hear more tonight about the 18,000 signers of the Save the Trail petition who let the Governor know how much they value saving this important urban park – particularly in light of anticipated increased development in the down-county area. Density must be balanced by open green space.

Before turning to specifics of the Functional Plan, I would like to point out that in the Town's DEIS comments<sup>2</sup>, the Town also calls attention to problems and inconsistencies with MTA's choice of this alignment based on its reliance on the County's Master Plan<sup>3</sup>. Yet, in anticipating transit on this right of way, the Master Plan in many ways had it right: it specifically recommended single tracking because it deemed the hiker/biker trail to be an equally critical use of the right of way (pg. 14) and because it sought to "ensure that existing trees along the trolley/trail route are preserved wherever possible and that replacement of trees is of a sufficient quantity and quality to preserve and enhance the environment" (pg. 3). The County has since recognized that there are issues regarding "adequate trail width and safety" (pg. 3) and potential "user conflict" on the trail (pg. 53) in their 2007 Capital Crescent Trail/Georgetown Branch Trail Survey Report. Unfortunately, the Functional Plan sets out now to further undermine the issues recognized in both these documents, even though the circumstances have not changed, except to further support them, in the ensuing years.

I would like to say that the Town's comments today on the Functional Plan assume the project will receive the federal funding that is required in order for it to move beyond the planning stage. However, even if this funding eventually materializes, the Town would like to underscore its view that the Purple Line as outlined is an ill-conceived response to the region's public transportation needs. Our comments therefore are made without prejudice to any future actions on our part.

- 1) Alignment: In the Plan, the tracks for the light rail are located on the south side of the right of way immediately adjacent to the Town, with the trail to the north. In initial designs, that was reversed and the trail was adjacent to the Town. We have requested information from the State about why that change was made and now ask the same question to the County. There are many reasons to keep the

---

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.townofchevy Chase.org/assets/documents/pdfs/purpleline/TownFinalCommentstoMTA01-13-09.pdf> (see section 1A-C).

<sup>3</sup> *Georgetown Branch Master Plan Amendment*, Approved and Adopted, January 1990.

initial design: access on the north side is closer to businesses along Montgomery Avenue and allows easier and safer crossing for students traversing the trail to schools in Bethesda and to County residents who use the Trail from the south. We ask that this alignment be seriously reconsidered.

- 2) **Safety of the Planned At-Grade Crossing at Lynn Drive:** We are very concerned about the workability of the at-grade crossing proposed at Lynn Drive in the Town. This is a potentially very dangerous crossing for students walking to both Bethesda Chevy Chase High School and Our Lady of Lourdes School which are located on East West highway. These students cross in the dark in many months to get to school in the morning. Many have i-Pods and are generally distracted. Trains coming by every 3-6 minutes at an average of 31 mph could be a disaster waiting to happen without thorough safety planning. We suggest it may be necessary to construct an overpass at this location. We ask for the County's commitment to assure proper mitigation at this location.
- 3) **Width of Trail:** As detailed in the Functional Plan, in the 66 foot right of way, adjacent to the Town, the paved trail cannot meet the County's stated standards of 12' with 2' shoulders on each side without taking away the buffer between the trains and trail. Yet, as stated above, in this right of way the trains will be going an average of 31 mph. That is an *average* with speeds up to 45 mph in some places in the right of way. Because this is a heavily used chokepoint on the trail, we are very concerned about safety for all types of trail users. While we will be working with the State to address this issue, we feel it is imperative that the County be very involved in the discussion and design. We understand the State is not contemplating taking any property at this time, yet we do not understand how the safe coexistence of trains and trail can work as planned. In fact, we feel that both the State and the County should reconsider the issue of single tracking which is part of the original master plan. Safety should be paramount over speed.
- 4) **Trail through Tunnel:** We appreciate that the current plans include completing the trail through the tunnel. However, the issue of safety and usability of this passage will require careful design. Clearance both from the ceiling of the tunnel and above the wires makes this, as the State and County know, difficult, but are critical for safety reasons. Also, there is concern about the width of the trail through the tunnel and the ability of multiple types of users to traverse the area safely. It will also need to be very clearly lit, marked and monitored for the possibility of crime or assault.

We would also like the County and State to provide meaningful assurances that the trail will indeed continue to extend through the tunnel under Wisconsin Avenue and that this amenity will not be dropped from the project due to costs. As you are probably well aware, the number of pedestrians hit on in this immediate stretch of Wisconsin Avenue is still high. During the period 2003 to 2007 there were *twenty-nine* vehicular collisions with pedestrians/bicyclists at the five Wisconsin Ave. intersections south of East West Highway (Montgomery Ave., Hampden Ln., Elm St. Bethesda Ave.-Willow Ln. and Leland St.), to say nothing of the *one hundred eight* vehicle to vehicle collisions at these same

intersections during the same period.<sup>4</sup> It will be much worse if the tunnel does not remain open to trail users. We are concerned that because the dynamics of building the trail through the tunnel will be so costly and difficult and because they do not add to the “rider” cost/benefit analysis in any way, the trail through the tunnel may be dropped. This would be unacceptable not only to the Town but to the many groups who have testified in favor of this alignment and who advocate on behalf of other trail users.

- 5) Woodmont East Plaza: On page 9 of the Functional Master Plan, it says the Bethesda terminal design will “contribute to Woodmont East area open space needs”. As planned, open space in this downtown Bethesda area will be reduced from what we see today while building density will multiply. Add to that trail tracks excavated 15 feet or so below grade extended into the area by perhaps 100 feet. We applaud Roger Berliner’s attempt to keep the tail tracks less than 100 feet west of the Apex Building Portal and the State’s commitment to explore this limitation. We feel a distance under 100 feet is imperative if the terminal design is to meet the goal of “contributing to the . . . open space needs”.
- 6) Grass Tracks: We support the County’s proposal for grass tracks for the trains. This feature will be important not only for the look and character of the environment adjacent to the trail, but also for essential storm water management and as a sound barrier. Again, however, because this is a more costly alternative both in installation and maintenance, we fear this will be dropped. We ask for the County and the State’s commitment to realizing this feature.
- 7) Coquelin Run: The Functional Plan does not outline how this creek into the Rock Creek Watershed will be protected, as required by law. Protection of this creek is an environmental imperative that must be addressed.
- 8) Chevy Chase Lake: Page 9 of the Functional Plan also states that on the segment from Chevy Chase Lake to Lyttonsville, the Purple Line will create “access to Walter Reed Annex . . . jobs.” We are skeptical of this assertion, since there is no connection to the new Walter Reed Annex at Chevy Chase Lake. In answer to the Town’s concerns about meeting the imminent east-west transportation needs of the new Walter Reed facility, the State said there will be an easy transition in Bethesda from the Purple Line to the Red Line for workers heading up to National Naval Medical Center. What does the Functional Plan’s statement mean and how will it be addressed?
- 9) Rosemary Hills Elementary School: We are concerned about the proximity of the train tracks to the school’s playground and potential danger for these young children.
- 10) General Principles: The “general principles related to the procurement that should be considered by the MTA” as outlined on page 10 are important– particularly regarding safety and mitigating environmental impacts, including through the use of vehicles that would not require overhead wires.

---


<sup>4</sup> *Wisconsin Avenue (MD 355) Pedestrian Road Safety Audit, Bethesda, Maryland* at 3-4 (Vanassee Hangen Brustlin, Inc. 2009 (draft)).



- 11) And, finally, we know we speak for many, many people when we state that the County and State have pledged to the greater community that the trail will be completed along with the Purple Line. We will hold you to that promise. It is understood that this means both the trains and the revised trail will be completed at the same time, so that the County's commitment to health, safety and recreation – quality of life issues – will be realized at the same time as its commitment to enacting this particular transportation mode.

In summary, we don't like this transit mode on this alignment, and we trust we've been clear about our serious concerns regarding specific issues raised in the Functional Plan.

Thank you.



Town Council  
Kathy Strom, *Mayor*  
Linna Barnes, *Vice Mayor*  
Patricia Burda, *Secretary*  
David Lublin, *Treasurer*  
Al Lang, *Community Liaison*

**Supplemental Comments on the County's  
Proposed Changes to the Purple Line Functional Master Plan  
Submitted by the Town of Chevy Chase  
February 12, 2010**

---

The potential advent of the Purple Line light rail poses particular mitigation challenges to the Town of Chevy Chase due to the extremely narrow right of way adjacent to the Town's northern border.

The Town's Mitigation Advisory Group, made up of nine residents of the Town, has carefully reviewed and considered the State's proposal to put the light rail tracks on the south side of the right of way adjacent to the Town's northern boundary. Based on this review, we conclude that the State itself does not have sufficient or convincing data to recommend such a change. The results of the conceptual engineering that MTA is presenting and on which it urges the County to base its amendment of the Functional Master Plan are flawed. Therefore, we believe it is imperative that the County delay any action to amend the Functional Master Plan to accommodate the change of the light rail/Trail alignment at this time.

We submit these comments today to explain our position to the County and to supplement our earlier comments submitted on December 10, 2009.

**Background:** For the area adjacent to the Town's northern border, the County's Purple Line Functional Master Plan as amended in January 1990 calls for a pedestrian trail, easily accessible to residential properties on the south side of the right of way, which would safely co-exist with a single track trolley line on the northern, more commercial side of the right of way. The State is now asking that the Master Plan be amended again to include double-tracking and has proposed moving the Trail to the north side of the right of way, putting the light rail vehicles closer to the Town and its Edgevale neighbors. There is no proposal to change the alignment in other parts of the line between Bethesda and Silver Spring; the Trail will stay to the south side of the right of way further to the east of the Town where a crossover is proposed to occur.

The Town's Mitigation Advisory Group has met with Purple Line project manager Mike Madden and State consulting engineers to discuss the State's rationale for this proposal. The Advisory

Group then spent considerable time reviewing all reports and technical amendments recommended by the State. Our comments are based on the Advisory Group's findings following this careful review.

**The Right of Way Adjacent to the Town:** While recognizing that the Town is only one of several communities that border the 16-mile transit line, the segment of the line that abuts the northern boundary of the Town is unique and thus bears additional scrutiny.

- The right of way is exceptionally narrow (32 feet) near several Town homes on Elm Street where it then enters a tunnel; the rest of the right of way is only 66 feet. The southern portion of this has a very steep grade and drop-off along a large percentage of the right of way and a creek that is part of the Chesapeake Bay Watershed is at the base of that drop-off. Near Lynn Drive, the 66 foot right of way is tightly wedged between commercial buildings and an apartment complex on one side and Town homes within feet of the right of way boundary on the other. In general, there are only single family residential properties to the south of the right of way while a large part of the north side is commercial.
- Into that narrow right of way, the State proposes to place two light rail train tracks, catenary wires and poles, a pedestrian paved trail with safety buffers on both sides, an extensive ADA compliant ramped portion of the Trail that will be approximately two blocks long, and plantings, sound barriers, and retaining walls. The State has acknowledged that all trees will be removed within the right of way and that the canopy trees cannot be replaced. Finally, they have noted they will need easements on Town properties to accommodate the areas of disturbance associated with the construction of the rail line (i.e., more trees and plantings will be removed on private property to allow for construction).
- The State also proposes running the trains at maximum speeds of 50 mph within this right of way at 6-minute headways during rush hour (as a consequence, trains will pass through the right of way every 3 minutes). There are homes (not just yards, but actual houses) in the Town that will be literally within feet of trains running at those speeds; the same is true of Edgevale east of the Town.
- Additionally, one of the two access points for the Town to the Trail is proposed at Lynn Drive. The State's current proposal calls for an at-grade crossing to the Trail on the north side and to Montgomery Avenue and East-West Highway beyond. Unlike areas where the light rail will run on streets, following posted speed limits and traffic signage, *State engineers have stated that trains will be passing this access point at 45 mph.* That means that people will have to first traverse tracks with trains going that speed every 3

minutes to access the Trail or to make this crossing. That includes the numerous teenagers who use this crossing to get to Bethesda Chevy Chase High School, often in the dark morning hours.

**Comments on the State's Rationale:** MTA states that the primary reason for placing the Trail on the north side is to maximize the vertical and horizontal separation between the Trail and the trackbed, which MTA says would provide a better "trail experience." The decision seems not to be based on specific engineering or cost analyses. MTA says that locating the Trail to the north of the trackbed better follows the existing elevation of the surrounding land and keeps the Trail three to four feet above the trackbed, where possible.

But it is counterintuitive to locate a recreational trail close to a barren commercial strip instead of alongside a leafy residential community. Many Trail users have contacted the Town on this issue, in unanimous agreement that walkers, bikers, baby strollers and leashed dogs all prefer some semblance of the shaded trail they have enjoyed for years. Only a southern alignment for the Trail would provide that.

Likewise, it is unclear why the State couldn't/wouldn't provide an elevated Trail on the south side. Major re-grading of the area will occur in any event. We wholeheartedly agree with the planners' desire to provide a good and safe Trail experience, yet we conclude that a well-designed Trail alignment on the south side is capable of making the Trail experience better than or at least as good as a northern Trail alignment and is cost-comparable and a better environmental choice.

The MTA contractor's recommendation acknowledged that the Trail location on the north side of the right of way in Chevy Chase would cause the residents to lose the direct access to the Trail and would place the transitway closer to the residences on the south side. The Town believes that losing a more direct (and thus safer) access and placing the transitway closer to the residences will cause materially different safety and environmental consequences without substantially reducing the cost of construction. Denying the Town's 1,020 residences along with the residences of Edgevale direct access to a treasured recreational Trail and placing a transitway closer to those residences is hardly in line with the new federal policy of funding major transit projects that make communities more "livable".

#### **Additional Town Concerns:**

Along with the safety and access issues addressed above, the Town has significant concerns regarding noise and vibrations. The *Noise and Vibration Technical Report* of the AA/DEIS and the information provided to date does not provide sufficient data to allow the County or the Town to understand the noise impacts of the Purple Line on the Town. A south Trail alignment

would be inherently quieter and is key to mitigating noise and vibration impacts. But the Town has serious concerns about the State's noise study; an attachment to this report details these concerns. In short:

- It appears MTA understates the Purple Line's noise and vibration levels along the Trail in the Town and mislabels a "severe impact" as a "negligible impact."
- It appears MTA did not take a single sound measurement within the Town of Chevy Chase, but simply assumed the Town is ordinarily as noisy as East-West Highway near Montgomery Avenue and Jones Bridge Road near Connecticut Avenue.
- It appears MTA assumed that trains will run down the center of the right-of-way rather than on a track, which understates noise reaching the Town.
- The *Technical Report* appears to assume single-tracking where MTA now proposes double-tracking. The *Report* states that a headway of 6 minutes means 10 trains per hour, not 20 trains per hour, which would occur with double tracking and therefore understates the noise reaching the Town by a further 3 dB(A). Since the noise model has not been made available to the Town, this simple error cannot be ruled out.
- It also appears the MTA underestimates noise emission from light-rail trains. It counts on the trains being quieter than the manufacturers themselves specify. MTA's analysis also appears to not fully account for all of the ways trains produce noise, including the location of the rails, the number of trains per day, maintenance of wheels and tracks, the presence of real-world dust/grit/leaves/imperfections, turns and crossovers, braking, decelerating, accelerating, reflections, canyon effects, and focusing effects when entering the tunnel.

The Town of Chevy Chase therefore requests that the State conduct new studies of noise and vibration using alignments individually optimized for the Trail being north or south of the tracks adjacent to the Town. The Town will need these noise studies and more complete engineering details in order to determine the mitigation it will request during the preliminary engineering phase of the project. The County also needs these studies and more complete engineering details to make an informed decision on whether to amend the Purple Line Functional Master Plan.

### **Conclusion:**

While the primary objectives of the Town of Chevy Chase are to ensure that the transit project in its entirety, the rail and the Trail, provides our Town residents (and Trail users) with a safe and environmentally benign transit alternative, we are cognizant and respectful of the goals of the entire 16-mile line. We firmly believe, however, that switching the alignment for this area

and putting the Trail on the south side in this narrow right of way will not impact the functionality of the entire line – but it does have significant impact on the “livability” of our community.

In summary, the Town of Chevy Chase asks that at this time the County deny the State’s request to amend the Purple Line Functional Master Plan to change the alignment of the train and Trail in the right of way adjacent to the Town until the State conducts sufficient preliminary engineering on *both* alternatives with the Trail fully optimized and elevated on both alignments. This preliminary engineering will give the County, the State and the Town the information we all need to compare the consequences, costs and trade-offs of each alignment.

Sent via email

February 10, 2010

Mr. Michael Madden  
Project Manager  
Maryland Transit Administration  
[mmadden@mtamaryland.com](mailto:mmadden@mtamaryland.com)

Dear Mike –

The Town's Mitigation Advisory Group has carefully studied the *Noise and Vibration Technical Report* of the AA/DEIS and other information provided to us by the State in the context of the train/trail alignment question. Because so many of the State's conclusions about noise and vibration seem to us to be unsubstantiated or unclear, we ask that the State undertake additional noise studies on both alignments. The following issues illustrate the need for further noise studies:

1. **Not a single sound measurement was taken within the Town of Chevy Chase.** The 60 dB(A) of ambient noise attributed to the Town was synthesized from two uncharacteristic points elsewhere: the intersection of Montgomery Avenue with East-West Highway ("B") and near Connecticut Avenue at the intersection of the Columbia Country Club with Jones Bridge Road ("N-10A"). The interpolation within the Town was justified because of "similar traffic and geographic conditions" that prevail both along the Capital Crescent Trail within the Town and at these two sampled points. We do not believe that this is correct. If measured in accordance with the *FTA Handbook*, ambient day-night Ldn noise in the Town of Chevy Chase would be less than 50 dB(A), not 60.
2. **The 24 hour Ldn values cited for parks are suspiciously loud.** The lowest residential value measured, an Ldn of 53 dB(A), is remarkably high. We therefore have concerns about the calibration of the microphones employed by the contractor providing the noise analysis.
3. **The Technical Report appears to assume single-tracking, where MTA assumes double-tracking.** A headway of 6 minutes means 10 trains per hour, not 20 trains per hour. The noise reaching the Town would thereby be +3 dB(A) higher than claimed in the *Technical Report*. Since the noise model has not been available to the Town, we would appreciate your ruling out the possibility of this simple error.
4. **The Technical Report confuses a noise mitigation strategy** (walls next to the train) **with eliminating noise per se**, ignoring oblique reflections and diffraction from walls, thus understating noise emissions by 4dB(A) and overstating noise suppression by 1 or 2 dB(A).
5. **The Technical Report assumes markedly quieter trains than the manufacturers themselves specify.** We could not tell what model and vendor of light rail vehicle was assumed for the source of noise emissions, but noise



levels cited by the report are far lower than light-rail manufacturers (Bombardier FLEXITY, Kawasaki LRV Series 100) provide in their specification data.

6. **The *Technical Report* does not appear to account for noise from** braking, decelerating, accelerating, cross-overs, turning, canyon effects from Bethesda buildings, and focusing effects from entering the tunnel. In aggregate, these emissions will add several decibels unaccounted for in the Technical Report.
7. **The *Technical Report* assumes that trains run down the center of the ROW rather than on a track, which understates noise reaching the Town** by 3 to 4dB(A) if the tracks are aligned South and the Trail North.
8. **The treatment of vibration and low-frequency noise is insufficient.**

We would appreciate your response to these concerns and, even more important, the State's commitment to completing more thorough noise studies on both alignments.

Mary Anne Hoffman  
Chair, Purple Line Mitigation Advisory Group

Pat Burda  
Councilmember



## ATTACHMENT D

### DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES

Isiah Leggett  
County Executive

David E. Dise  
Director

December 30, 2009

RECEIVED  
0001  
JAN 04 2010

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN  
THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL  
PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

Dr. Royce Hanson, Chairman  
Montgomery County Planning Board  
8787 Georgia Avenue  
Silver Spring, Maryland 20910

Dear Dr. Hanson:

The Draft Purple Line Functional Plan reflects the County Executive and County Council February 2, 2009, joint letter with recommendations for the locally preferred alternative and closely follows the Maryland Department of Transportation locally preferred alternative.

The February 2, 2009, joint letter requested additional analyses be undertaken during preliminary engineering. The Draft Purple Line Functional Plan should specifically list these additional analyses and identify the right-of-way issues associated with each of the following additional analyses:

- (1) Examine the feasibility of using hybrid light rail vehicles that do not require wires, poles, and electrical substation
- (2) Identify more access points to the Capital Crescent Trail
- (3) Maximize the retention of existing trees in the corridor
- (4) Investigate surface LRT operations in Silver Spring to ensure safe operation with respect to pedestrians and vehicular traffic
- (5) Study pedestrian, vehicular, LRT operations in Silver Spring, including vehicle queuing, on-street parking operations, and the design of the Green Trail
- (6) Develop detailed designs for the Capital Crescent Trail that include access points, retaining walls, security and fencing, landscaping, aesthetic treatments for new bridges, signing and markings, bicycle facilities at stations, and the public plaza at the Woodmont East terminus
- (7) Prepare a phasing plan along University Boulevard that identifies how LRT implementation will be coordinated with the wider master plan typical section
- (8) Provide continuous sidewalks and/or shared use paths on both sides of roadways that carry the Purple Line alignment; and
- (9) Include mitigation strategies for wetlands, parkland, wheel squeal locations, historic resources, and Parks Department Brookfield Road Maintenance site

In addition to the foregoing areas for study, please consider the following comments from Executive Branch departments.

Office of the Director  
101 Monroe Street, 9th Floor, Rockville, Maryland 20850  
[www.montgomerycountymd.gov](http://www.montgomerycountymd.gov)

Design of the Green  
Capital Crescent

### **Department of Transportation**

The Draft Purple Line Functional Plan should address a few critical components needed to preserve right of way and to develop station area plans. The LRT system will require electrical substations perhaps every mile or two for the length of the corridor. These electrical substations typically are one-story buildings with space for maintenance vehicle parking and for servicing. These buildings need to have road access and a secured perimeter. The Plan should identify feasible locations for these substations along the LRT route and specifically how they will be accommodated along the Capital Crescent Trail and the East Silver Spring segments.

The Plan does not develop comprehensive station area plans and leaves out how formal and informal kiss-and-ride will be accommodated. This is especially critical for all of the proposed stations except for Bethesda, Silver Spring, and Takoma Park Transit Center. The Plan needs to identify the size and location of the kiss-and-ride areas and needs to investigate in preliminary engineering traffic issues and pedestrian safety. The Plan should also identify the location and condition of sidewalk and bicycle access to each of the stations and identify facilities that need to be built or reconstructed to accommodate the Purple Line stations.

The Plan delves into operational issues (proposed restrictions to existing on-street parking, adding left-turn lanes at existing signalized intersections, etc.) where the Purple Line is intended to be located on existing streets. DOT opposes having such details in a planning document and urges their removal. Operational decisions to include the decision to create a one-way street and whether to allow or remove on-street parking are DOT and SHA determinations, and should not be addressed in this functional Master Plan as they require traffic analyses. These specific references should be removed from the document, and merely identify that a potential cross-section issue may exist and will have to be coordinated with the appropriate agency to develop a solution. The lack of detail in this Plan makes it difficult to analyze the appropriateness or feasibility of implementing such recommendations. If those suggestions are retained in the document, it should provide more detailed drawings of the proposed restrictions and modifications which can be reviewed by MCDOT.

### **Department of Police**

The Police Department recommends that an interagency working group similar to the Interim Operations Working Group for the Silver Spring Transit Center Project construction be created to deal with and plan for traffic patterns and coordination during the construction of the Purple Line.

A light rail system will add a new dimension to the approach for handling vehicular/pedestrian conflicts and keeping both safe and moving smoothly. For example, the investigation of crashes involving vehicles/pedestrians/trains will raise issues related to disruption of schedules and the moving of disabled trains from the track/road will have to be addressed. Management of these issues will be multijurisdictional and the police and MTA and appropriate training for first responders will need to be developed and implemented.

### **Department of Public Libraries**

Libraries would like the recommendation to make Bonifant Street one way eastbound with parking on the south side to be reviewed before a final decision is made to include this recommendation. This decision would make for a very awkward access path to Libraries' drop off/bookdrop location. This will also require wayfinding. If Bonifant is to be one way, the Department of Public Libraries strongly

Office of the Director

101 Monroe Street, 9th Floor, Rockville, Maryland 20850  
[www.montgomerycountymd.gov](http://www.montgomerycountymd.gov)

Dr. Royce Hanson  
December 30, 2009  
Page 3 of 3

recommends that the one-way direction for Bonifant Street be studied by MCDOT to see what is the most appropriate direction for making Bonifant Street safe and convenient for the public.

#### **Department of General Services**


The impacts on parking and driveway access in the commercial areas are of critical importance to the businesses in downtown Silver Spring. The Purple Line Functional Plan should emphasize the need for these details to be addressed in the final design of the Purple Line. If parking must be removed from a commercial street, then it may be necessary for off-street public parking to be provided. Loss of parking can have severe economic impacts on businesses that depend on public parking for their customers.

The Plan should also address the importance of maintaining access to businesses for loading and parking via drives and alleys. This access should be maintained for left turns, particularly into high-volume entrances such as the Whole Foods Market off Wayne Avenue.

The impact of parking by transit riders on neighborhood streets should be reviewed around stations located in residential areas as a design issue to ensure that it is addressed in the final design and location of these transit stations.

The Executive Departments appreciate the hard work of the Planning Staff and of the Advisory Committee in preparing the Plan. We will continue to work with Planning Staff and the Maryland Transit Administration to develop a Plan that preserves the right of way needed for the Purple Line and identifies transportation issues that need to be addressed in the preliminary engineering phase of the Purple Line.

Sincerely,

  
Gary Stith  
Deputy Director

GS/sa

cc: Rollin Stanley, Planning Director  
Art Holmes, Director, Department of Transportation  
Tom Manger, Chief, Department of Police  
Parker Hamilton, Director, Department of Public Libraries  
David Dise, Director, Department of General Services  
Ken Hartman, Director, Bethesda Chevy Chase Regional Center  
Reemberto Rodriguez, Director, Silver Spring Regional Center

the pre-m  
Bonifant Street  
safe and convenient

**Office of the Director**  
101 Monroe Street, 9th Floor, Rockville, Maryland 20850  
[www.montgomerycountymd.gov](http://www.montgomerycountymd.gov)