

## Worksession #3

Topic	Pages
General	2 – 4
Introduction	5 – 10
Vision	11 – 14
Determining BRT Treatments	15 – 23
Master Plan Phasing	24 – 25
Recommended Corridors	26 – 62
Setting Implementation Priorities	62 – 64
Bicycle Pedestrian Priority Areas	65 – 69
MARC Brunswick Line Expansion	69 – 70
Technical Issues	71 – 74
Benefits	75 – 78
Impacts	79 – 84
Transit Operations	85 – 86
Coordination	87 – 88
Process	89 – 92
Equity	93 – 94
Implementation	95 – 98
Other	98 – 104
Unsorted Comments	105 – 111

Topic	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
<b>General (pages 2 to 4)</b>					
Selection of Mode	Should plan look at more than one mode of transportation?	9-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The plan should have considered modes other than BRT, such as streetcar or driverless vehicles. Buses are antiquated, increase pollution. (Bienenfeld, McLachlen)</li> <li>• <u>Have modes other than BRT been considered? Buses with infrequent stops might not meet expectations and travel demand. (City of Rockville)</u></li> <li>• <u>Limiting the number of stops is needed to make the BRT system faster and more popular with riders. (Brian Ditzler)</u></li> <li>• LRT for routes with infrequent stops? (City of Rockville)</li> <li>• Streetcar for routes with frequent stops? (City of Rockville)</li> <li>• BRT may not be a viable form of transit because it offers little to attract potential riders that providing more frequent service and better information would not be sufficient for existing transit</li> </ul>	<p>The Scope of Work for this Plan is to facilitate the development of a bus rapid transit system; other modes were generally not considered however the transportation model attributes of BRT were similar to those of LRT and thus would be useful for the latter mode if considered during facility planning. The potential accommodation of the planned DC streetcar in the recommended dedicated lanes on Georgia Avenue south of the Silver Spring Transit center is noted in the Plan. In addition, shared accommodation of dedicated lanes by BRT and local bus must be determined as part of facility planning.</p> <p>Concur that express buses on Interstates can provide a valuable transit service, however this Plan is focused on the corridors in the original MCDOT feasibility study and additional segments recommended by the transit task force. The latter corridors have potential ROW impacts whereas express bus service</p>	

Topic	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
<b>General (pages 2 to 4)</b>					
			<p>service. (Zepp)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alternatives to BRT include express buses on shoulders of interstates, managed lanes, and HOV lanes. An express bus on an interstate will move twice as fast as a BRT vehicle moving through an urbanized area. (Zepp)</li> <li>• Travel demand management (TDM) can have sizeable impacts on congestion. Such measures can reduce traffic congestion rates by 27 to 38%. (Zepp)</li> <li>• Automated transit networks (ATNs) and self-piloting vehicles (SPV) are more efficient technologies that provide faster travel at a lower cost. BRT could be obsolete by the time Montgomery County over the life of the plan. (Zepp)</li> <li>• The Plan should have evaluated more effective, safer, and less costly alternatives, such as better timing for traffic signals and</li> </ul>	<p>in HOV lanes on Interstates do not.</p> <p>TDM is a valuable tool that can include good transit service such as BRT.</p> <p>The impacts of future transportation technologies must be considered by the Executive at the time of implementation.</p> <p>Traffic signal timing and the enforcement of parking restrictions are the responsibility of the Executive. The former must be considered during implementation; the latter has no effect on ridership forecasts.</p>	

Topic	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
<b>General (pages 2 to 4)</b>					
			better enforcement of rush-hour parking restrictions to reduce congestion. (Mallen)		

Topic	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision	
<b>Introduction (pages 5 to 10)</b>						
	Planning Context	What the plan does and does not do.	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide an explanation of what the plan does not do. (SHA)</li> </ul>	<p>The following language should be added: "This plan recommends an extensive network of enhanced transit corridors based on a broad analysis of travel patterns countywide. The rights-of-way recommended for these corridors reflect the footprint required by the typical roadway sections developed for various levels of transit treatment and by specific corridor segment locations in urban or suburban areas of the county. More detailed analysis is required to determine the final treatment and typical section, slope impacts required to build that typical section, the number of travel lanes and turn lanes required to provide an adequate level of traffic service, and the specific location and size of transit stations. The final rights-of-way required for the recommended transit corridors must be determined during facility planning and design for individual corridors, at which time the cost of construction must also be determined."</p> <p>This plan makes no recommendations in regard to the</p>	

Topic	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
Introduction (pages 5 to 10)					
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Montgomery County is attempting a self-contained system to address an issue that requires a broader, regional approach. (Faul-Zeitler)</li> </ul>	<p>operation of BRT such as the frequency, hours, and span of service; bus size, door configuration, and fuel; off-board fare collection; details of the station design; or transfers with and redeployment of local buses, which are within the purview of the Executive.”</p> <p>The Plan makes recommendations for transit corridors within Montgomery County, our area of planning authority. These corridors are intended to accommodate transit services both within the county and those that extend beyond our borders. The recommended transit corridors are not intended to be viewed as bus routes that terminate at the county line.</p>	
	Future Growth	Coordination with future growth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is the County currently focusing development on “compact, mixed-use areas” or is that one of multiple County development foci? Various levels of development foci might better explain the need for various levels of transit service. (SHA)</li> </ul>	<p>We are focusing new planned development in compact, mixed use areas but need to serve existing and previously planned development also. To address this comment, we will replace “future” with “new planned” in the first sentence of the next-to-last paragraph and add, “This system will connect these activity centers with existing and other</p>	

Topic	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
Introduction (pages 5 to 10)					
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support long-range planning that encourages mixed-use development and focuses most growth near urban areas, existing Metro stations, and future Purple Line stops (Chevy Chase Land Company)</li> <li>• <u>BRT needed to support future development. (Reed)</u></li> <li>• <u>BRT needed to support compact walkable and transit-oriented activity centers, which are necessary to deal with worsening traffic and population growth. (Schwartz)</u></li> <li>• <u>Washington region’s success has a lot to do with Metro and having a good transit system. (Goldman)</u></li> <li>• <u>BRT will facilitate Smart Growth. (Brian Ditzler)</u></li> </ul>	planned development.”	
Additional Text	Add BRT success stories	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider including a limited selection of BRT-success examples or case studies in other similarly developed communities. (SHA)</li> </ul>	Add the following: <i>“Emx (Eugene, OR)                      The Lane Transit District (LTD) system currently operates the Emerald Express (EmX) BRT service within the Eugene-Springfield metropolitan area</i>	

Topic	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
Introduction (pages 5 to 10)					
				<p><i>of Lane County, Oregon. After receiving approval in 2001, the first portion of the route – the Green Line – opened in 2007. This “pilot” corridor links downtown Eugene and downtown Springfield via such popular destinations as the University of Oregon and Sacred Heart Medical Center. The EmX, 60 percent of which features dedicated bus lanes, also includes 60-foot articulated vehicles, hybrid electric propulsion, double-sided boarding, wheelchair and bicycle space on board, as well as both median and curbside stations that provide weather protection for riders.</i></p> <p><i>Within a year of the Green Line’s opening, ridership along the corridor had doubled, a statistic largely driving the City’s honorable mention recognition for a 2008 Sustainable Transport Award. The continued success of the EmX pushed LTD’s decision to expand service to connect Eugene and Springfield to the region’s Gateway area via the Gateway Line extension, which opened in 2011.</i></p>	

Topic	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
Introduction (pages 5 to 10)					
				<p><i>HealthLine (Cleveland, OH) The Greater Cleveland Regional Transit Authority (RTA) operates the HealthLine BRT service (formerly referred to as both the Silver Line and Euclid Corridor Transportation Project). Opened in 2008 and subsequently renamed as a result of a partnership with the Cleveland Clinic and University Hospital, the system runs along Cleveland’s Euclid Avenue from the downtown area’s Public Square to East Cleveland’s University Circle. The line covers 58 stations and contains dedicated bus lanes (with advanced signal technology to coordinate with cars), off-board fare collection (at both median and curbside stations), diesel-electric hybrid motors on articulated vehicles, and adjacent bike lanes along the route. Originally billed as a link between hotels, employers, cultural institutions, and other popular destinations, within a year of the project’s opening, the HealthLine’s success was evident; indeed, ridership had risen by nearly 50 percent of that of the Route 6 Euclid Avenue bus,</i></p>	

Topic	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
Introduction (pages 5 to 10)					
				<i>which was formerly the most heavily used route in the RTA system."</i>	

Topic	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
<b>Vision (pages 9 to 14)</b>					
Purpose of BRT System	Does BRT provide an alternative to “increasingly congested roads”?	17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BRT itself does not provide an alternative to “increasingly congested roads”. Less traffic, possibly due to BRT patronage, provides an alternative to “increasingly congested roads”. (SHA)</li> <li>• Congested roads and lack of effective, reliable and innovative public transportation system make the county unattractive to recent graduates. (Jayes-Green)</li> <li>• Unreasonable for a commute on a bus to take over 2 hours, which would otherwise take 25 minutes driving. (Jayes-Green)</li> </ul>	There will be a benefit to all users of the roadway from some drivers moving to BRT, but the benefit for transit users will be greater since dedicated bus lanes will remove them from congestion in the other lanes. Congestion will increase with growth in population and jobs, however, transit service can significantly offset much of the growth.	
Purpose of BRT System	Is there a consensus on the purpose of BRT?	17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Lack of consensus among stakeholders of purpose of system.</u> (City of Rockville)</li> <li>• <u>Support BRT. (Schultz/Takoma Park, Brutz, Barbara Ditzler, Quist, Ambler)</u></li> <li>• <u>Widening roads won't be adequate to address our future transportation needs. (Brutz)</u></li> <li>• <u>Support the CTCFMP to gain the ROW needed to implement BRT to serve the</u></li> </ul>	The purpose of the Plan is to “ <i>greatly increase the extent of high-quality transit service to the County’s most densely developed areas, areas planned for redevelopment, and areas planned for new dense development.</i> ” (p. 17) There is consensus among governmental agencies and supporters that purpose of BRT is to provide transportation choices, reduce vehicle miles traveled and reduce the impact of growth on the County's roads MCDOT’s current	

Topic	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
<b>Vision (pages 9 to 14)</b>					
			<p><b><u>growth in population in Montgomery and surrounding counties. (Brian Ditzler)</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduces the cost of transportation. (Slater)</li> <li>• Common good of our area is much better served by a BRT. (Drayne)</li> <li>• Reinststate free transfers between bus and Metro to reduce peak car use and obviate expending a billion or more on BRT. Existing bus systems, including express and limited stop lines, might do the job, but at peak hours passengers would still need to squeeze in the crowded trains. Expensive Metro fares for commuters, especially in its perimeters, compound commuter disincentives to use mass transit. (Steinberg)</li> <li>• <b><u>Transit riders need to be put on an equal footing with drivers. (Reed)</u></b></li> <li>• <b><u>The 79-mile network recommended in the CTCFMP is more pragmatic than the 160-mile network</u></b></li> </ul>	<p>Service Planning and Integration Study will determine how the BRT network will integrate with local bus service and likely will affect the number and locations of stations along dedicated bus lanes; shared BRT and local use of the bus lanes will likely mean more frequent stops.</p>	

Topic	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
<p>Vision (pages 9 to 14)</p>					
			<p><u>recommended by the task force. (Brian Ditzler)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Young people are owning fewer cars and driving less; they won't live in places without good transit. (Goldman)</u></li> </ul>		
Measuring success	Implementation and operations	19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Among the most important outcomes of implementing BRT treatments is achieving a measurable improvement in bus speeds, travel time, and reliability over existing bus service in mixed traffic. As congestion increases and bus travel times worsen, operating costs to simply maintain existing levels of service rise, and its attractiveness falls. (WMATA)</li> </ul>	Concur	
Data Documentation	Provide additional analysis	18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider adding a table that describes the increase in average travel speed and reduction on congestion growth. (SHA)</li> </ul>	Tables 2-2 through 2-6 from the Online Appendix 2 - reflecting changes in VMT, VHT, traffic speeds, highway trips and transit trips - will be added.	
Park-and-Ride Lots	Provision of park-and-ride lots	18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BRT will not work unless the County creates massive park-and-ride lots. There are only a few places where there is sufficient demand for walking</li> </ul>	The transportation modeling done for this Plan was based on a constrained parking scenario, therefore parking facilities were not evaluated as part of this Plan. This	

Topic	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
<b>Vision (pages 9 to 14)</b>					
			to transit. Has a study been done to estimate walk access to BRT? (Albersheim) • Recognize that park and ride lots will be needed. (Transit Task Force)	Plan recommends that they be considered as part of future area master plan updates. The model took into account walking distance to transit stations as a function of its attractiveness to riders.  Parking facilities or shared parking situations should be explored as part of community master plans or transit facility planning.	

Topic	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
<b>Determining BRT Treatments (pages 15 to 23)</b>					
Transitway Treatment		20-23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BRT should definitely include dedicated lanes as much as possible (Chevy Chase Land Company)</li> <li>• <u>BRT won't be effective without dedicated lanes. Plan shies away from making a firm recommendation in some areas because of logistical difficulties or resistance from neighbors. (Reed)</u></li> <li>• <u>Dedicated lanes ensure the transit reliability needed to entice drivers out of their cars. (Donin)</u></li> <li>• <u>Part of transit's reliability is being able to get where you need to go so connectivity is key. (Goldman)</u></li> </ul>	Concur.	
Dedicated Lanes	Are mixed traffic operations acceptable in some locations?	10, 20-22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High performance treatments are needed for the transit network to fulfill its potential as a high quality, efficient and cost-effective transportation alternative. Mixed traffic operations are not acceptable and will make it impossible to realize the full and intended</li> </ul>	The level of treatment should be commensurate with the forecast ridership to ensure that the network is efficient and cost-effective. The recommended transit corridor network is sufficient to serve the land use in our approved and adopted master plans. A mixed traffic operation is recommended where	

Topic	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
<b>Determining BRT Treatments (pages 15 to 23)</b>					
			<p>benefits of land use recommended in the Great Seneca Science Corridor Master Plan and White Flint Sector Plan, and that could be adopted in future master plans. (Transit Task Force)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dedicated lanes, frequent service, off-vehicle fare collection, multiple door boardings are critical to BRT and are not “gold plating.” (Goffman)</li> <li>• Pay before boarding, lower and multiple entrance/exit (Cavanaugh) High frequency service in peak hours, electronic “next bus” displays at stations, pre-pay kiosks so drivers don’t have to collect fares, and entry via any and all doors (just like MetroRail). (Slater)</li> <li>• Platforms built level to the bus allowing wheel chair riders and strollers to roll onboard. (Slater)</li> <li>• Dedicated ROW, pre-ticketing at stations to expedite boarding, and signal</li> </ul>	<p>forecast BRT ridership, whether alone or in combination with local bus ridership, was too low to warrant dedicated lanes and/or where traffic and/or property impacts would be too great.</p> <p>Land use changes that are made in future master plans must identify any needed transportation infrastructure, including transit corridors.</p> <p>Items such as frequent service, off-vehicle fare collections, and multiple door boardings are important elements of BRT service are operational decisions to be made by the implementing agency and are not within the scope of this Plan.</p>	

Topic	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
<b>Determining BRT Treatments (pages 15 to 23)</b>					
			prioritization make it appealing. (Drayne)		
	Lane Repurposing	Should the Plan recommend lane repurposing to achieve dedicated BRT lanes?	22-23 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposed to the concept of lane repurposing in the City of Rockville. (City of Rockville)</li> <li>• Where transit demand is high and right-of-way is too constrained for new dedicated BRT lanes, the repurposing of existing travel lanes may be required to achieve the full benefits of the recommended BRT network, which has a significant overlap with WMATA’s Priority Corridor Network (PCN). (WMATA)</li> <li>• Lane repurposing based on more people in BRT than in cars is arbitrary and may antagonize stakeholders. (Steinberg)</li> <li>• Support lane repurposing (Goffman, <a href="#">Nicolescu+21 Chevy Chase residents</a>)</li> <li>• <a href="#">Against lane repurposing on</a></li> </ul>	No lane repurposing is proposed in the City of Rockville.  Concur with WMATA’s comment.  Lane repurposing based on greater person-throughput is a way to more equitably allocate the public right-of-way based on demand. While impacts vehicular traffic on individual corridors remain to be determined as part of facility planning, and lane repurposing may have adverse impacts to some drivers, the overall impact on congestion created by the recommended transit corridor network is forecast to be a positive one.  <a href="#">On a day-to-day basis, emergency vehicles would have access to dedicated bus lanes. In the case of an emergency evacuation of the</a>	

Topic	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
<p><b>Determining BRT Treatments (pages 15 to 23)</b></p>					
			<p><u><b>MD355 South where congestion is greatest. , will hinder emergency evacuation. (Afnan)</b></u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports lane repurposing on MD 355 South inside the beltway. (Morrison)</li> <li>• Lane repurposing is not anti-car. It recognizes that the best way to maximize person throughput is by providing some space for BRT and some space for private vehicles. (Goffman, <u><b>Reed, Schwartz, Barbara &amp; Brian Ditzler</b></u>)</li> <li>• We must increase our “people moving capacity” rather than seek to move the most cars at the fastest speeds possible. (Slater)</li> <li>• One bus carries as many as 60 single-occupancy-vehicles. By repurposing part of the public ROW for use by BRT, buses will travel in their own lanes, bypassing the gridlock, and serve as their own advertisement. (Slater)</li> <li>• Provides a cost-effective way to increase road’s carrying</li> </ul>	<p><u><b>District of Columbia and southern Montgomery County, dedicated bus lanes could move more people out of the core faster.</b></u></p>	

Topic	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
<p><b>Determining BRT Treatments (pages 15 to 23)</b></p>					
			<p>capacity. (Anderson)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports lane repurposing on Rockville Pike and Veirs Mill Rd. (Stein)</li> <li>• <u>Against lane-repurposing on US29. (Poor)</u></li> </ul>		
	<p>Lane Repurposing</p>	<p>Is there sufficient information to recommend lane repurposing?</p>	<p>22-23</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Plan goes beyond the goal of identifying rights-of-way by recommending lane repurposing, for which more detailed study is needed. (MCDOT)</li> <li>• <u>Concern that more analysis needs to be done before recommending lane repurposing. (Quinn)</u></li> <li>• <u>See TRANSFORM analysis of San Jose and Alum Rock BRT Corridor Cyclist &amp; Pedestrian Injury Analysis. (Park, MacDougall)</u></li> </ul>	<p>We agree that more detailed study is needed to make a final decision on lane repurposing, however an assessment of the feasibility of lane repurposing was needed to determine those ROW requirements. For the most constrained areas inside the Beltway, including the Bethesda and Silver Spring CBD’s, lane repurposing appears to be the only feasible way to implement BRT since the impacts and costs of building additional lanes in these areas would be far too great.</p> <p><u>The TRANSFORM plan is supportive of lane-repurposing. Chris Lepe, who developed the Powerpoint presentation referenced by these residents of Four Corners and Chevy Chase West, stated in an e-mail to</u></p>	

Topic	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
<p>Determining BRT Treatments (pages 15 to 23)</p>					
				<p><u>our staff that “conversion of general purpose lanes to BRT lanes is the ideal way to go from a multimodal transportation perspective. Widening the street to accommodate BRT lanes without sacrificing auto lanes will provide auto/transit throughput benefits but potentially degrade pedestrian/bike safety, on-street parking, and cause the potential for imminent domain - which of course, results in escalating project costs.” He also stated that his agency is not considering roadway widening at this time for two other corridors under consideration.</u></p>	
	<p>Lane Repurposing</p>	<p>Lane repurposing is subject to SHA review and approval</p>	<p>22-23</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All recommended lane repurposings on State highways are subject to SHA review and approval. Decisions will be based on maximizing the safety and efficiency of the roadway with a combination of highway and transit and will be made on a case by case basis after an</li> </ul>	<p>Concur.</p>	

Topic	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
<b>Determining BRT Treatments (pages 15 to 23)</b>					
			analysis is complete. (SHA)		
Person Throughput	Is person throughput an appropriate metric?	22-23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increasing person-throughput rather than focusing only on moving the most cars is an essential precondition for the County to meet its goals for encouraging economic development, enhancing mobility, improving environmental quality, and improving our general quality of life in the coming decades. (Transit Task Force)</li> <li>Supports the plan’s recommended approach to measuring transportation success through the concept of person-throughput. (City of Gaithersburg)</li> <li>WMATA’s person-throughput study is being pursued in concert with MCDOT and SHA will inform the Planning Board and Council during their deliberations. (MCDOT)</li> <li>WMATA is undertaking the development of a person-throughput policy that can be used to help implement the recommended transit corridor</li> </ul>	Increasing person-throughput requires that we weigh forecast transit ridership against the number of people that can be moved in a general traffic lane so that we can make decisions on lane-repurposing, which is the only feasible way we can accommodate dedicated lanes on roads inside the Beltway serving our most densely developed areas.	

Topic	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
<b>Determining BRT Treatments (pages 15 to 23)</b>					
			network. (WMATA)		
Flexibility in Implementation	Should the plan provide flexibility in implementation ?	22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Plan must retain the necessary flexibility to allow for the implementation of the highest quality system possible within the recommended right-of-way. (Transit Task Force, <b>Schwartz</b>)</li> <li>• Additional study is needed to determine transitway treatment. Plan should provide flexibility for implementing agency to determine treatment. (Wilhelm)</li> <li>• Support making the recommended transit treatments the basis for determining rights-of-way needed for transit corridors, but leaving the final determination of treatment to the implementing agency. (MCDOT)</li> <li>• Concern with the flexibility being provided to the Executive to determine the details of the transit corridor network. (Faul-Zeitler)</li> </ul>	The Plan provides this flexibility for the implementing agency so that individual projects can respond to the more detailed analysis that can only be done when looking at smaller parts of this very large network, as well as responding to operational decisions on the transit and traffic network that have yet to be made.	

Topic	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
<b>Determining BRT Treatments (pages 15 to 23)</b>					
Technical		20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Question using a threshold of 1,000 passengers per peak hour to warrant dedicated lanes when national standard is 1,200 PPHPD. (Brosnan)</li> </ul>	The lower threshold was used to reflect the high level of analysis, the beyond-30-year timeframe the Board requested, and the potential for a 30% undercounting identified by SHA.	
Flexibility in Implementation	Should the plan designate transitway treatments?	20-23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Plan should designate corridors and recommend rights-of-way without specifying treatments. (Transit Task Force)</li> </ul>	Disagree. While flexibility is needed for the implementing agency to respond to more detailed ridership forecasts and impacts analysis, guidance is needed for the public and for decision-makers as to whether additional ROW is needed.	
Flexibility in Implementation	Should the plan provide additional flexibility to implementing agency?	20-23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Plan should not foreclose the possibility of implementing a higher quality of treatment when implementation decisions are made. (Transit Task Force)</li> </ul>	Agree. The following language will be added: <i>“Recommended rights-of-way should be considered minimum rights-of-way.”</i> This will provide the implementing agency with additional flexibility to accommodate necessary changes in the typical section. Changes in treatment that require significant increases in additional rights-of-way may require a master plan amendment.	

Topic	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision	
<b>Master Plan Phasing (page 24 to 25)</b>						
	Transitway Treatment	Should the recommended transitway treatments be considered a minimum?	24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any specified treatment should be considered a minimum level of treatment. (Transit Task Force)</li> </ul>	<p>Disagree. High levels of treatment that are not warranted by ridership forecasts could burden the County with unnecessary construction and operations costs.</p> <p>The ridership forecast for the 2040 forecast year will not appear immediately upon completion of construction of the ultimate facility. The transit facilities that are built need adequate ridership in the near term to demonstrate their usefulness. Constructing additional pavement that will have little use for many years runs the greater risk of having it reallocated to use by general traffic and then having to justify lane-repurposing later on.</p>	
	Transitway Treatments	Use diamond lanes during rush hours for buses and HOVs.	21-22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The plans should recommend diamond lanes (essentially HOV/bus lanes located in the curb lane during peak periods). (Albersheim)</li> </ul>	<p>The Plan is intended to provide a transit corridor network for the 2040 forecast year. Diamond lanes may be an acceptable interim solution that could be verified by facility planning.</p>	

Topic	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
Master Plan Phasing (page 24 to 25)					
Transitway Treatments	Use of reversible lanes	20-23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recommend using reversible lanes because they reduce the number of lanes that are needed. (Hausner)</li> </ul>	Reversible lanes are recommended on corridors where traffic flows are heavy in the peak direction, with consideration given to property and traffic impacts.	
Pedestrian Safety	Removal of medians	21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Don't remove medians because they allow people to cross large roadways. (Hausner, <b>Davis</b>)</li> <li>The Plan would remove the median on Wisconsin Avenue. (Mallen, <b>Tauben, Mattson, Parisi</b>)</li> </ul>	Median pedestrian refuges are included in the typical section for all recommended median busway and other divided roadways.	

Topic	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
<b>Recommended Corridors (page 26 to 62)</b>					
Corridor Location	– Connecticut Ave	29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports a BRT network without Connecticut Ave, but believes it may be considered in the future. (Mitchem)</li> <li>• Connecticut Avenue and River Road are better candidates than MD355 as transit corridors since they do not have Metro service. (Kaufman)</li> </ul>	Our forecasts showed low ridership but this can be reassessed in the future.	
Corridor Location	– Georgia Ave South, duplication of Metrorail	33	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oppose South Georgia Ave BRT. It duplicates Metrorail. (Brosnan)</li> <li>• Believes proposal offers an attractive alternative for many commuters who find the distance to the nearest Metro Station makes using the system less attractive. (Drayne)</li> </ul>	The Georgia Avenue South corridor serves the same area as the east leg of the Metrorail Red Line but serves different purposes. Compared to Metrorail, BRT has closer station spacing, less of a time investment into getting into and out of the system, and would have quicker transfers to local buses. WMATA sees BRT as being complementary to Metrorail.	
Corridor Location	– MD 355 North, extension to Clarksburg	36	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports MD 355 North corridor but urges that the corridor be extended to Clarksburg (Daly, Hoffman)</li> <li>• Clarksburg must have alternative transit options to CCT to fulfill its vision in the master plan as a transit-oriented community as there are no transportation staging restrictions to limit development. Extend the MD 355 North corridor to Clarksburg because Phase 2 and 3 of the CCT (the extension to Clarksburg) has no immediate prospects for funding. Instead of turning to Shakespeare Blvd from MD 355, must</li> </ul>	While there are no immediate prospects for funding the CCT all the way to Clarksburg, this are no immediate prospects for funding any of the BRT corridors proposed in the functional plan. We believe it is more likely to get a corridor to Clarksburg	

Topic	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
Recommended Corridors (page 26 to 62)					
			<p>continue north along MD 355, MD 27, Snowden Farm Parkway, and Stringtown Rd and terminate either at the Clarksburg Town Center or in the vicinity of I-270 exit 18 at Cabin Branch. (Eapen)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Clarksburg needs better transit, not M-83. (Goffman, Quist, Katz, Ambler)</u></li> <li>• <u>Don't build M-83. (Johnson, Sonnevile)</u></li> </ul>	<p>funded if two BRT corridors use it (the CCT and MD 355 North). In addition, the CCT between Shady Grove and Comsat (at Clarksburg) are in the 2030 Constrained Long Range Plan (CLRP) for the region, whereas the MD 355 North corridor is not.</p>	
Corridor Location	– MD 355 North, alternative alignment in the City of Gaithersburg	36	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Citizens' Plan for Gaithersburg proposes a new downtown at the location of the Fairgrounds. The MD 355 North Corridor should divert from MD 355 North and travel along an extension of an existing road at the eastern edge of the fairgrounds to a road that is an extension of Lake Forest Boulevard, through Gaithersburg Square shopping center and back to Frederick Ave. This route is beneficial because: 1) it avoids a highly constrained section of MD 355, 2) takes some bus traffic off MD 355, 3) serves proposed downtown, 4) allows Frederick Ave to be redesigned as an urban boulevard. (Lindstrom)</li> </ul>	<p>The City of Gaithersburg did consider this alternative roadway alignment for BRT as part of their master plan process but decided against it. This Plan recommends only a mixed traffic operation in Phase 1 which requires no additional ROW and could follow either route as determined through the facility planning process. The City of Gaithersburg has its own planning authority, which would determine the route and treatment for to effect the Phase 2 median busway in cooperation with Montgomery County.</p>	

Topic	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
<b>Recommended Corridors (page 26 to 62)</b>					
Corridor Location	– MD 355 North – MD 355 South, duplication of the Metrorail	36	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How does it serve Rockville residents? (City of Rockville)</li> <li>• More stops needed. (City of Rockville)</li> <li>• Duplicates the Red Line (Chaikin, Lukas/Wood, Glickman, Bernard, Duskin, Wachino, Byman, Jadeja, Batson, Choudhury, J&amp;E Malta, Emden/Edgemoor CA, Dorn, Eftos, Weisman, Cha, Reingruber, Dimond, Yoder, Nielsen, Silverberg, Krochmal, Vanderzon, <u>Tauben, Afnan, Jason, Aresta, Das/Sanchez, Magruder, Jadeja, Macel, Besharov, Billingsley, Sokolove, Mansfield&amp;Schwartzbart, Panner, M&amp;I Burski, Copley, ABrown, Hill</u>)</li> </ul>	<p>The MD355 South and a portion of the MD355 North transit corridors do physically serve the same area as the west leg of the Metrorail Red Line but serve different purposes. Compared to Metrorail, BRT has closer station spacing, less of a time investment into getting into and out of the system, and would have quicker transfers to local buses. WMATA sees BRT as being complementary to Metrorail.</p>	
Corridor Location	– MD 355 South	39	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No high speed busway because: 1) do not need more lanes, 2) dangerous for pedestrians, 3) already a bus line on Wisconsin Ave, 4) duplicates the Red Line so few people will use it (Kiel, Kepniss, Seifert, Mallen, B. Kiel)</li> <li>• Supports BRT from Rockville to Grosvenor. (Bradshaw)</li> <li>• No change to the Green Mile. (Weisman, Reingruber, Geffroy, Fitzgerald, Fidler, Kaufman, Latty, White, Balz, Graef, DeBruce, Vanderzon, Vermillion, Park, Globokar)</li> <li>• Applaud the treatment of Corridor 4: MD 355 South for the focus on increasing people-moving capacity (White Flint Partnership)</li> </ul>	<p>The Plan recommends lane repurposing where it is more efficient than a general traffic lane to avoid the impacts of building additional lanes. Buses would travel at no greater than posted speeds and where operating in curb lanes.</p>	

Topic	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
Recommended Corridors (page 26 to 62)					
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Friendship Heights Metro Station is not able to handle an influx of 1,500 BRT riders per hour. (Wachino, Byman, <a href="#">Mansfield&amp;Schwartzbart</a>)</li> </ul>	<p>This Plan designates transit corridors but not transit routes. Many of the users on the Green Mile Segment are expected not to transfer at Friendship Heights but to continue their journey into DC.</p>	
Corridor Location	– MD 355 South		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Phase 1 should not extend south of Bethesda station because: 1) complicates efforts to get improvement to four bus stops, 2) MD 355 is effectively two lanes in each direction due to delivery trucks and patient drop-offs parked in curb lane and presence of right turn lane south of Willard, 3) increases congestion, difficult to enforce bus-only lane, difficult to make left turns out of neighborhood, 4) cut through traffic. (Akst, J Kepniss, M Kepniss, Sama, Moore, Latty, Fredman, Wiesenfelder, Smith, Acson, Seifert, Glickman, Fernandez, Budington, Blackman, Hambleton, Holmes, Kallay, Spinrad, Bernard, Davis, Bates, Wachino, Byman, Dealy, Batson, Long, M&amp;O&amp;A Muro, Choudhury, J&amp;E Malta, Edgemoor CA, Dorn, Eftos, Allen, Holohan, Fortier, Latty, Mannes, Acocella, Smith, Hoover, Ernst, Voles, Silverberg, Krochmal, Roberts, <a href="#">Franklin, R&amp;S Moore, Jason, Aresta, Bigger, Akst, Ewing, Jadeja, Macel, M&amp;I Burski, Copley, ABrown</a>)</li> <li><b><u>Not enough population density in the Green Mile to warrant BRT, including zero population on the east side at the Chevy Chase Country Club. (Sokolove)</u></b></li> </ul>	<p>The curb lane operation recommended in Phase 1 would facilitate improved local bus operations; whether that is true for the Phase 2-recommended median busway depends on the outcome of MCDOT’s bus service operations study.</p> <p>If the use of the curb lane by general traffic is currently restricted by the presence of delivery vehicles and patient drop-offs, there may be an enforcement issue that needs to be addressed. If those uses are removed from the travel lane, the lane dedication to bus use would further reduce congestion.</p>	

Topic	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
Recommended Corridors (page 26 to 62)					
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u><a href="#">Against BRT on MD355 South. (Allen, Antonelli, Rego, Das/Sanchez, Parisi, Brenner-Leifer, Bigger, Panner, Walle, Charnovich/Somerset, S&amp;E Shewmaker)</a></u></li> <li>• <u><a href="#">Support BRT on MD355 South. (Castro, Fink, Besharov, Billingsley, Brown)</a></u></li> <li>• <u><a href="#">Need better bus service between Grosvenor and Bethesda. Need safer bike accommodation on MD355 from Grosvenor to Medical Center. Need better pedestrian safety at Strathmore. Concerned with traffic congestion at NIH and in downtown Bethesda. (Castro)</a></u></li> <li>• <u><a href="#">Need decent bike lanes and bike racks. (Acson)</a></u></li> <li>• <u><a href="#">Need Complete Streets approach that emphasizes pedestrian and bicyclist accommodation and safety. See TRANSFORM analysis of San Jose and Alum Rock BRT Corridor Cyclist &amp; Pedestrian Injury Analysis. (Park, MacDougall)</a></u></li> <li>• Before considering extension south of Bradley Blvd: 1) Extend WMATA bus route between DC and Maryland because BRT won't be fast if passengers have to transfer to Metorail, 2) deal with drop-off issues in curb lane, 3) improve local bus service, 4) provide crosswalks and traffic control to make access to BRT safe, 5) provide two stops between Bradley Blvd and Western Ave. (Akst, J&amp;N Mercurio, Fortier, Mannes)</li> <li>• There are no benefits for Chevy Chase West. (J Kepniss, M Kepniss, Sama, Moore, Latty, Fredman,</li> </ul>	<p>Detailed operational issues such as ease of access and cut-through traffic are dependent on the final treatment selected for implementation and must be addressed in facility planning.</p> <p>Extension and improvement of WMATA and Ride-On routes and retention of MTA routes are an operational issue that must be coordinated between the Executive and operating agencies. These improvements in local bus service have been previously requested by residents and would be facilitated by the dedicated curb lanes recommended in Phase 1.</p> <p>Drop-off issues in the curb lane are an enforcement issue that must be addressed by the Police/Executive Branch.</p>	

Topic	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
Recommended Corridors (page 26 to 62)					
			<p>Wiesenfelder, Smith, Simon, Barron)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase the frequency of local bus service. (Riley, <b>Ewing</b>)</li> <li>• Faster/more frequent, cheap, reliable service could be implemented on existing buses (Cavanaugh)</li> <li>• The Plan will intentionally increase congestion to force drivers to switch to BRT. (Silverberg, <b>Dyer</b>)</li> <li>• Support BRT on Wisconsin Avenue. (N&amp;J Gregory)</li> <li>• The benefit to traffic flow on MD355 south of the Bethesda Metro station has not been demonstrated and there would likely be detrimental impacts to Chevy Chase West, Somerset, Drummond, and the Village of Chevy Chase. This corridor segment should be deleted. (J&amp;N Mercurio, Mallen, Spinrad, Bernard, Marmon, M&amp;O&amp;A Muro, Huang)</li> <li>• BRT should be extended all the way to Friendship Heights to improve transit connections and reduce congestion. (Binder)</li> <li>• ITDP did not include the Green Mile segment in their recommended corridors. Why are we including it? (Wallwork)</li> <li>• Recommendations for dedicated bus lanes to achieve optimal transit speeds have ignored the impacts on congestion in the remaining travel lanes. (J&amp;N Mercurio)</li> <li>• The Plan includes no forecast for 2040 vehicular traffic or bicycle traffic. (J&amp;N Mercurio)</li> <li>• The Plan does not adequately address traffic operations and safety in the vicinity of the Concord Hill School. (J&amp;N Mercurio, Mallen)</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>The TRANSFORM analysis notes a cluster of pedestrian and cyclist injuries in proximity to the BRT corridor and recommends a Complete Streets approach that is reflected in this Plan to the extent possible.</u></b></p> <p>Striped crosswalks and traffic control are operational issues that are the responsibility of the Executive.</p> <p><b><u>Population density is low in the Green Mile, which is why no BRT stops are recommended, but BRT is a regional service.</u></b> Additional bus stops must be considered in facility planning in conjunction with the recommendations of the County’s bus service planning study.</p> <p>Lane repurposing has been recommended to achieve</p>	

Topic	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
Recommended Corridors (page 26 to 62)					
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Plan does not document whether the ridership forecasts are for BRT-only or BRT plus local bus service, which is important to determine whether it's worth extending the transit corridor down to the DC line. (J&amp;N Mercurio)</li> <li>• Loss of short-term parking spaces would hurt small businesses in Bethesda. (J&amp;D Barron)</li> <li>• The analogy made at the 5/28/13 presentation to CCW citizens between the Green Mile and MD355 north of NIH/Navy is was inappropriate. <b><u>(Charnovich)</u></b></li> <li>• Presentation to CCW citizens was helpful in getting accurate information on the Plan to the community. (O'Dowd)</li> <li>• <u>Was consideration given to adding a Metro station at Bradley Blvd? (O'Dowd)</u></li> <li>• <b><u>Implementation of BRT can improve pedestrian safety by promoting additional features to serve transit patrons. (Nicolescu+21 Chevy Chase residents)</u></b></li> <li>• <b><u>BRT in the Green Mile would be dangerous for pedestrians and bicyclists, hinder current efforts to improve local bus service, dangerous for CC West drivers, not serve the residents of Drummond, incentivize development near BRT stops, and increase traffic. (Brenner-Leifer)</u></b></li> <li>• <b><u>MD355 South is congested now and BRT would take much needed road capacity for unsubstantiated</u></b></li> </ul>	<p>dedicated bus lanes where they have been found to be warranted and primarily where they would more more people than can be moved in a general travel lane; to a lesser extent, they have also been recommended where adequate levels of service can be maintained in the remaining travel lanes.</p> <p>The Plan includes a forecast for vehicular traffic on a countywide basis, which would be reduced by the introduction of BRT service. Forecasts for individual corridors and management of traffic operations are heavily dependent on the details of the final transit treatments selected must be performed as part of facility planning. This Plan includes no forecast for bicycle traffic.</p> <p>We recommend that the</p>	

Topic	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
Recommended Corridors (page 26 to 62)					
			<p><u><b>BRT ridership. (Dyer)</b></u></p>	<p>Plan be revised to include the following after the first sentence in Appendix B Corridor Descriptions: <i>“The ridership forecasts below reflect BRT forecasts only. Local bus ridership after the implementation of BRT was assumed for the purposes of this Plan to be an additional 20% of the BRT ridership.”</i></p> <p>The transit network is intended to be an integral part of the regional transportation infrastructure; the ability to provide continuous high-quality bus service along MD355, which is Montgomery County’s Main Street, and the District of Columbia is an important aspect of this system.</p> <p>The analogy between the Green Mile and MD355 north of NIH/Navy between the Green Mile and MD355 north of NIH/Navy made at</p>	

Topic	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
Recommended Corridors (page 26 to 62)					
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>All-day BRT would increase congestion, increase pollution, and impede successful NIH and Walter Reed traffic reduction programs. (Seder)</u></li> </ul>	<p>the 5/28/13 presentation was in regard to the average daily traffic (ADT) levels. The ADT for the Green Mile, only 55% of that of MD355 north of NIH/Navy,</p> <p>The addition of a Metro station at Bradley Blvd is outside the scope of work for this Plan and was not considered.</p> <p><u>Operating hours of BRT will be determined by the Executive.</u></p> <p><u>The typical sections shown in Online Appendix 11 show the values for preferred and minimum ROWs for the various typical sections. These values were used in the assessment of existing conditions and existing master plan recommendations to determine the final recommended ROW for each segment. This ROW is</u></p>	

Topic	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
Recommended Corridors (page 26 to 62)					
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>The CTCFMP Scope states that preferred and minimum rights-of-way would be determined for transit corridors and that rights-of-way would be determined for stations. (Jurkovich)</u></li> </ul>	<p><u>intended to reflect what will be needed to maintain the necessary public facilities. Less than the preferred values were chosen in most cases in an attempt to limit impacts since these corridors are generally heavily developed. In many areas, additional ROW will be necessary for slope and other easements to gain temporary access to construct the typical section. The full extent of the impacts of implementing the typical section can only be determined during facility planning.</u></p> <p><u>Additional ROWs will be needed in station areas when the final location is determined in facility planning.</u></p>	
Corridor Location	– New Hampshire Ave	42	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Don't run BRT down MD 650. (SOSCA)</li> <li>• SOSCA residents are concerned about our quality of life and the amenities in our neighborhoods (Catherine Tunis representing South of Sligo Citizen's</li> </ul>	Transportation modeling done for this Plan identified adequate potential BRT ridership to warrant	

Topic	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
<b>Recommended Corridors (page 26 to 62)</b>					
			Association (SOSCA)) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest an initial pilot of BRT program on MD 650. (Slater)</li> <li>• Use an existing lane of MD 650 to be dedicated for buses as a field performance. (Slater)</li> </ul>	dedicated lane (s). Accommodating more travelers via transit can reduce congestion and increase transportation choices, improving quality of life.	
Corridor Location	– North Bethesda Transitway	45	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports realigning North Bethesda Transitway from Grosvenor to White Flint. (Goldberg)</li> </ul>	Concur.	
Corridor Location	– Randolph Rd, extension	48	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Plan should include an extension of the Randolph Road corridor along Cherry Hill Road from US29 to FDA Boulevard. (Transit Task Force, Morrison, Wilhelm)</li> </ul>	The CTCFMP does not include a BRT recommendation for Cherry Hill Road. The WOSG Public Hearing Draft Plan includes maps in the Plan (Map 13) and Appendix (Figure 18) that reflect a BRT corridor along Cherry Hill Road connecting with major activity centers and transportation connections in Prince George’s County. There is however, no specific reference in the WOSG plan (or Appendix) to any recommended treatment. We recommend that the Planning Board include the Cherry Hill Road segment in	

Topic	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
Recommended Corridors (page 26 to 62)					
				<p>the CTCFMP within the existing 80' ROW in mixed traffic with a recommended station location at FDA Boulevard. This relatively short segment is an important connection to the North White Oak Cherry Hill Road Center and Prince George's County.</p>	
Corridor Location	– US 29, Four Corners	54	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BRT will not benefit Four Corners. There is only one proposed stop and it not convenient for most residents. Silver Spring is only a short distance. Community needs local bus improvements. (Goemann)</li> <li>• All of the benefits go to Howard County and upper Montgomery County. BRT is intended to justify additional development, especially in White Oak. Four Corners residents will not use BRT because there are few stops, no park and ride lots. Local bus service in Four Corners will decrease. (Riley)</li> <li>• Number of peak hours MTA Columbia – DC buses now choking in Silver Spring may only rise as the population they serve expands. (Steinberg)</li> <li>• The effect of BRT and other intercity buses converging on the Silver Spring Transit Center, also serving the Purple Line, should be addressed in the Plan. (Steinberg)</li> <li>• Citizens have little faith that a world-class BRT system will be built after greater densities are</li> </ul>	<p>A BRT bus station is proposed at the intersection of US29 and University Boulevard, the junction of two transit corridors that would facilitate faster service in all directions. Additional bus stops should be considered in facility planning in conjunction with the recommendations of the County's bus service planning study and with the findings of a facility planning study that will determine whether dedicated lanes are feasible on US29.</p> <p>Extension and improvement of WMATA and Ride-On</p>	

Topic	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
Recommended Corridors (page 26 to 62)					
			approved in White Oak. (Cavanaugh)	<p>routes are an operational issue that must be coordinated between the Executive and WMATA.</p> <p>BRT users from outside the county are still using the county's roadways; all users of the roadways would benefit from their use of BRT.</p> <p>The operations at the Silver Spring Transit Center and coordination with other vehicles and services must be addressed by the Executive as part of facility planning.</p>	
Corridor Location	– US 29, south of White Oak	54	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider upgrading the transit corridor on New Hampshire Avenue south of US29 rather than US29 south of New Hampshire. (Quinn)</li> <li>• BRT access to White Oak science corridor can be from MD 650 (to Fort Totten Metro) where residents want BRT. (Quinn, Faul-Zeitler, <b>Poor</b>)</li> <li>• Against recommended US29 busway; other less complex corridors should be pursued first. The congestion problem is not caused by just cars, but also trucks, buses of many types, emergency vehicles, and service and delivery vehicles. (Faul-</li> </ul>	Disagree. There would be only about a two minute change in travel time for people headed to DC if the US 29 BRT route was diverted down New Hampshire Ave to Fort Totten, there would be about a 12 minute increase in travel time for trips to Silver Spring and Bethesda.	

Topic	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
Recommended Corridors (page 26 to 62)					
			<p>Zeitler)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It appears that the recommendation to prioritize US29 was made to facilitate a higher level of land use in White Oak. (Faul-Zeitler)</li> <li>• <u>Complete the Silver Spring Transit Center before building BRT on US29. (Poor)</u></li> <li>• <u>Dedicated BRT lanes will make local bus service worse. (Poor)</u></li> </ul>	<p>Of all the trips traveling from areas north of New Hampshire Ave traveling to Bethesda, Silver Spring, and DC, about 45% are to Silver Spring and Bethesda and 55% are to DC.</p> <p>It is likely that all buses of any type, as well as emergency vehicles, will be able to use dedicated bus lanes.</p> <p>The recommendation for prioritization on US29 were based on high existing and forecast ridership, the latter being based on our current planned land use, Additional land use in White Oak was tested and resulted in a higher level of Phase 2 treatment on some corridors but not on US29.</p>	
	Corridor Location	– US 29	<p>54</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is important for BRT to serve the high density communities along Lockwood Drive and Stewart Lane. Confirm the location of the US 29 corridor along these roads. (Finnegan, Cavanaugh)</li> <li>• <u>Do not make the US 29 corridor the first BRT to be</u></li> </ul>	<p>The Plan recommends that a continuous alignment along US29 be considered during facility planning, however the focus is on serving the</p>	

Topic	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
Recommended Corridors (page 26 to 62)					
			<p>implemented. It was studied and proven not to work especially south of White Oak. (Quinn)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><u>Most Four Corners residents do not have an alternative to using US29. (Quinn)</u></b></li> <li>• Earlier US29 studies should be reviewed and MCDOT should make a comprehensive study of transportation uses between White Oak and Silver Spring. (Cavanaugh)</li> <li>• Consider the use of best practices from other places inside and outside the US to ensure that the integrity of local shopping areas is maintained. (Cavanaugh)</li> <li>• Former County Executive Duncan appointed a committee that focused on US 29 BRT that examined benefits and costs to the community. The outcome was a rejection of BRT because of adverse adverse impacts to the community south of MD 650. (Pfetsch)</li> <li>• <b><u>Coordinate with Howard County to intercept commuters before they crowd downcounty roads.</u></b></li> </ul>	<p>White Oak Transit Center and it is likely that through service on US29 would be for peak periods only.</p> <p>Phase II of this Plan recommends a dedicated curb lane treatment within a wider (new) master planned ROW (89' vs. the existing master plan ROW of 80') if an area master plan is adopted with a greater level of land use. The WOSG Public Hearing Draft Plan does not include this wider ROW or higher level of treatment (see page 26 of the WOSG Transportation Appendix. We recommend that the Planning Board reconcile this difference between the two plans by endorsing the 89 foot right of way along Lockwood Drive and Stewart Lane as required in order to accommodate the potential implementation of dedicated curb lane running BRT to</p>	

Topic	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
Recommended Corridors (page 26 to 62)					
				<p>serve the White Oak activity center.</p> <p>The following was not specifically noted in the testimony but is a staff explanation of one of the differences between the CTCFMP and WOSG plans in the proposed right of way on US 29 between Lockwood Drive and Southwood Avenue.</p> <p>The CTCFMP recommends that the master planned right of way on US 29 between Lockwood Drive and Southwood Avenue be widened from 120 feet to 122 feet to accommodate dedicated curb lane BRT operation within the existing six lanes (i.e., repurpose two existing general purpose lanes). This recommendation is because of the forecasted high ridership on this segment – irrespective of the density increase envisioned as part of the</p>	

Topic	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
Recommended Corridors (page 26 to 62)					
				<p>WOSG Plan – along this approximate 2/3 mile segment.</p> <p>The WOSG Public Hearing Draft Plan included a recommendation (see page 26 of the Transportation Appendix) for BRT in mixed-traffic. The staff recommends the Planning Board reconcile this difference between the two plans by endorsing the 122 foot right of way. The feasibility of the lane repurposing in this segment would need to be confirmed through facility planning. This segment of US 29 is immediately north of Four Corners where a similar look at the feasibility of lane repurposing is recommended in the CTCFMP.</p>	
Transitway Treatment	– Georgia Avenue North	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern that a shared use path may not be provided if there is not sufficient room in the median for the cycle track recommended in the Plan. (Fritsch)</li> </ul>	<p>A shared use path (SP-29) is already recommended in the Countywide Bikeways Functional Master Plan. The recommended cycle track is</p>	

Topic	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
<b>Recommended Corridors (page 26 to 62)</b>					
				intended as an alternative to the on-road bike lanes normally required by SHA on State highways.	
Transitway Treatment	– Georgia Avenue South	33	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Neighbors have tried to have a median strip added to Georgia Avenue but believes number of people who will use Georgia because of this median strip is dwarfed by the number of people who will choose to use the BRT than drive. (Drayne)</li> </ul>	This Plan includes the median recommended in the N&W Silver Spring Master Plan.	
Transitway Treatment	– MD 355 South – MD 355 North – Veirs Mill Rd	36 - 42	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports “gold standard” BRT on Rockville Pike and Veirs Mill Rd. (Stein)</li> </ul>	Concur on MD355 but the level of forecast ridership on Veirs Mill Road is not sufficient to warrant a two-lane median busway	
Transitway Treatment	City of Rockville corridors: –MD 355 South – MD 355 North – Veirs Mill Rd	36 - 42 , 57 - 59	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The plan should simply identify the corridors in Rockville. (City of Rockville)</li> </ul>	Phase 1 of the Plan recommends a mixed traffic operation on both the corridors (MD355 and Veirs Mill Road), essentially just putting the lines on a map, as requested by the City. Confirmation of a greater level of treatment, as included in Phase 2, requires master plan action by the City. A note will be added to the Plan clarifying that the stations in the City are	

Topic	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
Recommended Corridors (page 26 to 62)					
				included in Phase 2 only.	
Transitway Treatment	MD 355 North	36	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support mixed traffic in Phase 1, median busway in Phase 2. (City of Gaithersburg)</li> </ul>	Concur	
Transitway Treatment	MD 355 South	39	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opposes use of Green Mile for median busway in Phase 2. It isn't likely because country club is not going to redevelop. (Akst, Acson, Mannes, Krochmal)</li> <li>Oppose removal of median. (Freedman, Ernst)</li> <li>Against median busway. (Spiegel)</li> <li>Widening of MD355 would make the road more dangerous for pedestrians and bicyclists and should not be pursued; if widening is implemented, it should be done on the country club side. (J&amp;D Barron, Lewis)</li> <li>Phase 2 median busway would make left turns difficult and dangerous. (Hambleton, Wachino, Byman)</li> <li><b><u>BRT will make Wisconsin Avenue more dangerous for pedestrians, will divide the community, will increase noise, pollution and environmental problems, and negate the assumptions and recommendations of the Friendship Heights Sector Plan. (Tauben)</u></b></li> <li><b><u>BRT via repurposed lanes would cause more congestion. (Mansfield&amp;Schwartzbart/Village of Friendship heights)</u></b></li> <li>Concerned with potential for tree removal and exacerbating urban heat island effect. (Hambleton,</li> </ul>	<p>Additional right-of-way would be difficult to acquire in this area, which is an important reason why the median busway is in Phase 2 when it can be considered in conjunction with land use and accounting for experience in Phase 1.</p> <p>Landscape panels sufficient to support the planting of street trees are included in the Plan, which would also accommodate the planting of street trees in some areas with medians. Removals of existing trees and locations for new trees must be determined as part of facility planning.</p> <p>The Plan includes a median on the Green Mile segment of MD355.</p>	

Topic	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
Recommended Corridors (page 26 to 62)					
			<p>Nielsen, Vermillion, <b>Mallen, Billingsley</b>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Median area is needed to shelter left-turning vehicles. (Krash, Yoder, Kaufman, White, <b>Kragie</b>)</li> <li>• Provide a bike path adjacent to the Chevy Chase Country Club. (Krash)</li> <li>• Facility planning should consider safety and accessibility to and from the Concord Hill School and avoid ROW takings on MD355 that could affect school facilities. (Gershowitz)</li> <li>• Consider access into and out of neighborhood and the safety of schoolchildren. (Antonelli)</li> <li>• Don't implement BRT as a pilot project between Bethesda and Friendship Heights. (J Kepniss, M Kepniss, Sama, Moore, Latty, Fredman, Wiesenfelder, Smith, Simon, Barron, Osterberg, Acson, Wachino, Byman, Bernstein)</li> <li>• A small number of pilot studies should be implemented and the results quantified before pursuing a full roll-out of the recommended network. The Plan recommended by staff addresses the Board's direction for an aspirational BRT network, but the Board must ensure that the Plan protects residents and their property and includes safeguards to prevent aspirations from becoming standards if the data from the pilot studies do not support the ridership forecasts. (Spinrad, <b>Quinn</b>)</li> <li>• Friendship Heights Metrorail station facilities are inadequate to handle 1,500 transfers during the peak hour. BRT buses will displace local buses. Bethesda Metrorail station is better equipped to</li> </ul>	<p>The Plan includes the master planned shared use path in the Green Mile segment of MD355; this path is currently being designed by SHA.</p> <p>Decisions about timing and ultimate treatment would be determined as part of facility planning.</p>	

Topic	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
<b>Recommended Corridors (page 26 to 62)</b>					
			handle transfers. (Simon, Barron) • Better pedestrian safety is needed via paved median refuges, crosswalks at bus stops, and well-maintained streetlights. (Bernard, J&D Barron)		
Transitway Treatment	MD 355 South	39	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More prudent to begin with mixed traffic south of Cedar Lane. Consider lane repurposing only after ridership reaches a level that offsets traffic impacts. (Goldberg)</li> <li>• Concerned that lane repurposing will increase congestion. (Mitchem, Avent)</li> <li>• Not appropriate to make traffic so bad that people will be driven to transit. (Mitchem)</li> <li>• Add an additional explicit guiding principle to this proposed master plan which requires bus rapid transit planners and implementers to assess potential negative impacts on adjacent residential neighborhoods and implement mitigating measures to protect the quality of life and property values of neighborhoods adjacent to bus rapid transit corridors. (Mitchem, Streicher)</li> <li>• BRT treatments should be tailored to individual communities. (Abeles)</li> <li>• The Plan should limit impacts to existing neighborhoods. (J&amp;N Mercurio)</li> <li>• Median should be retained as a break in the expanse of pavement, a refuge for pedestrians, a welcome to</li> </ul>	<p>Concur, however this is an implementation decision that needs to be made by the Executive.</p> <p>The impacts of lane repurposing must be determined during facility planning.</p> <p>Ridership forecasting was based on the relative attractiveness of driving and transit. Recommendations are based on how the transportation system can best serve the most people.</p> <p>Limiting impacts on adjacent neighborhoods is a central reason why lane repurposing is recommended where transit is forecast to carry more people than a general traffic lane. This is addressed in the 5<sup>th</sup> bullet</p>	

Topic	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
Recommended Corridors (page 26 to 62)					
			<p>Bethesda visitors. (G. Kiel)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If a lane of traffic is taken away, where are the emergency vehicles supposed to go? (G. Kiel)</li> <li>• A contraflow bus lane (accommodating buses in a dedicated lane on the off-peak side of the roadway) would have less adverse impacts. (G. Kiel)</li> <li>• <u>More info is needed on pedestrian safety and accommodation, ADA accommodation, emergency vehicle access, school bus access. (Winik)</u></li> <li>• <u>More info is needed on operational issues such as integrating the firehouse at Bradley Blvd, wait times and congestion for MD355 traffic after BRT implementation. (Winik)</u></li> <li>• <u>What will the impacts be on the existing west side sidewalk and the sidewalk anticipated to be built by SHA and trees in this area? (Winik)</u></li> <li>• <u>Provide 3-5 examples of BRT systems in the US operating in single-family residential neighborhoods with multiple residential streets that enter and exist directly onto the BRT route. (Winik)</u></li> </ul>	<p>on p.19, Guiding Principles: <i>“To further the transportation goal, this Plan recommends....minimizing the construction of additional pavement to limit impacts on the environment and on adjacent communities.”</i></p> <p>Emergency vehicles <u>and school buses</u> would be able to use the dedicated bus lanes.</p> <p>Contraflow lanes were considered but rejected as a general concept because of safety concerns.</p> <p><u>Operational issues must be addressed by the Executive Branch during facility planning.</u></p> <p><u>The exact impacts to existing sidewalks and trees will be determined during facility planning and design.</u></p>	

Topic	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
Recommended Corridors (page 26 to 62)					
				<p><b><u>There are limited examples of US BRT systems at present, but two examples of BRT systems will be provided in the Plan.</u></b></p>	
Transitway Treatment	– MD 355 South	39	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dedicated BRT lanes are appropriate for Rockville Pike, especially in White Flint. (Donin)</li> <li>• Supports BRT in White Flint and adjacent areas. (Apostolou)</li> <li>• Supports BRT in median of Rockville Pike. (Mintz)</li> <li>• Supports two-way median BRT for MD 355 South because it will reduce traffic, improve walkability. (Walters)</li> <li>• Supports curb lanes inside the beltway, not medians, because: 1) would require additional ROW for station and left turns, 2) median busways would shift traffic closer to residences increasing noise and pollution, 3) curb lanes would incentive commuters to use transit because it would benefit Ride On, 4) left turn restrictions at unsignalized intersections, 5) there are few ridership benefits between Build 1 and Build 2A. (Levine)</li> <li>• Median transitway would restrict access to right-in / right-out to Chevy Chase West. (Lukas / Wood)</li> <li>• At a minimum, curb lanes in Phase 1, median busway in Phase 2 after cost-benefit analysis is complete. (Levine)</li> <li>• A cost-benefit analysis should be prepared and made available to the public. (Duskin)</li> <li>• Community met with Councilman Elrich several</li> </ul>	<p>Build 1 vs. Build 2A: These scenarios were modeled but the recommended network was further refined based on other considerations.</p> <p>Additional ROW would be required for the left turn lanes and stations associated with a median busway, however a median busway provides faster service for BRT patrons. These benefits must be weighed against the benefits/impacts of curb bus lanes in facility planning.</p> <p>A median busway would likely require access restrictions to right-in/right-out for many Chevy Chase West residents, however only a curb lane operation is recommended in Phase 1; the median busway</p>	

Topic	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
Recommended Corridors (page 26 to 62)					
			<p>years ago to discuss concerns as this area is a double center-median section, requiring MD 355 widening. They should be changed to non-invasive, curbside treatment to avoid taking necessary green space. (Abeles)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Infrastructure and construction difficulties were listed in the testimony citing that it was determined widening of MD 355 is unfeasible and not cost-effective (Abeles)</li> <li>• A 6' median width to provide a pedestrian refuge is not sufficient to shelter a left-turning car. (O'Dowd)</li> <li>• Include bike lanes on the Green Mile. (O'Dowd, Mosbaek, N&amp;J Gregory, <a href="#">Charnovich</a>)</li> <li>• The relatively low forecast ridership on the Green Mile would not warrant the high cost of construction. (Fortier)</li> <li>• Leaving so many items to be determined as part of facility planning is not acceptable. (Fortier, Silverberg)</li> </ul>	<p>recommended in Phase 2 would require an additional master plan amendment to implement.</p> <p>An overall cost of the network will be prepared by the Executive as part of his staff's review of the Plan.</p> <p>Where left turns are allows, the 6' median pedestrian refuge would typically be in addition to the width of the left turn lane.</p> <p>Bike lanes are included in the Plan's typical section for the corridor – in addition to the master planned shared use path in the Green Mile segment – but the final decision on implementation must be made by the Executive while weighing the impacts. It is likely that the initial implementation of BRT would be via repurposing the existing</p>	

Topic	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
Recommended Corridors (page 26 to 62)					
				<p>curb lanes without widening the pavement to provide bike lanes.</p> <p>The costs and benefits of BRT treatments can be considered in greater detail in facility planning but because lanes are recommended to be repurposed in the Green Mile, the cost of implementation would be relatively low.</p>	
	Transitway Treatment – New Hampshire Ave	– New Hampshire Ave , consistency with City of Takoma Park plan	<p>4 2- 44</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allow flexibility in facility planning, given differences between City’s planned multiway boulevard and proposed typical section in functional plan. (City of Takoma Park)</li> <li>• Please coordinate with the City of Takoma Park’s Multi-Way Boulevard design effort for the “New Ave.” for the two-way median transitway on New Hampshire Avenue. <u>(City of Takoma Park)</u></li> <li>• <b><u>Concern that a median busway could create a visual Berlin Wall and be inhospitable to pedestrians. (Schultz)</u></b></li> <li>• We will amend own MPOT at some future date to mesh with your recommendations for the 6+1 reversible on-lane median in Phase 2 and to be up to date with Takoma Park’s project, as the design and</li> </ul>	<p>Concur, maybe with some minor changes to the City of Takoma Park’s text recommendations.</p> <p>An integrated typical section is desirable from an aesthetic standpoint and should be a goal, but the functional aspects need to first be determined in facility planning.</p> <p><b><u>Bus headways would be in the range of three minutes. Queue lengths for buses are</u></b></p>	

Topic	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
Recommended Corridors (page 26 to 62)					
			<p>implementation progresses). (M-NCPPC-Prince George’s County)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Specific changes to text recommended:                     <p>p.42, end of first paragraph, add sentence: <i>“The City of Takoma Park has been advancing a concept plan adopted locally in 2008 to convert New Hampshire Avenue from University Boulevard, south to Eastern Avenue, into a more pedestrian friendly multi-way boulevard that accommodates multiple modes of transportation, while serving as a destination.”</i></p> <p>p.42, third bullet: Revise to read: <i>“A two-lane median transitway is recommended along New Hampshire Avenue in this segment because of available right-of-way. However, during facility planning, curb lanes or mixed traffic treatments should be considered from Sligo Creek Parkway to the District line, as outlined in the City of Takoma Park’s New Hampshire Avenue Corridor Concept Plan.”</i></p> </li> <li>p.44, last column of Table 8, add double asterisk to Two-Lane Median with the following text: <i>“While this Functional Master Plan can make changes or require dedication within the City of Takoma Park, the City adopted a Concept Plan for a multi-way boulevard on New Hampshire Avenue between Sligo Creek parkway to the DC line in 2008 with a different section than proposed in this plan. Facility planning</i></li> </ul>	<u>not known at this time.</u>	

Topic	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
Recommended Corridors (page 26 to 62)					
			<p><i>for this segment must be coordinated with City staff to ensure consistency of planning efforts.” (City of Takoma Park)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reconfigure MD 650 to have through traffic in the center four lanes with the lane closest to the sides of the road structurally separate from the center four lanes by a planted strip with trees and flowers. (SOSCA) The BRT is inconsistent with our community goals created by City sponsored intensive charette. (SOSCA)</li> <li>• <u>An integrated typical section for all of New Hampshire Ave would enhance the corridor’s aesthetics. (Finnegan)</u></li> <li>• <b><u>What will the frequency of bus service along NH Avenue and how many buses will queue at Powder Mill Road? (Etemadi)</u></b></li> </ul>		
	Transitway Treatment	– New Hampshire Ave	<p>42</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The BRT plan recommends a single-reversible lane transitway because it is a “commuter corridor”. Since the White Oak plan is changing the land use to an "activity center corridor", the treatment specified in the plan should reflect that. (Finnegan)</li> </ul>	<p>The implication is that the Plan should recommend a two-way median busway for New Hampshire Avenue. Whether that is desirable depends in part on whether additional land use is approved in the WOSG plan and what the Board decides on the proposal to emphasize NH Avenue south of US29 as the main corridor to get transit users from the</p>	

Topic	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
Recommended Corridors (page 26 to 62)					
				north to Metrorail.	
Transitway Treatment	– US 29	54	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lane repurposing would make traffic even worse. (Goemann, Riley)</li> <li>• <u>Per the Scope of Work, recommendations were supposed to be made concerning the rights-of-way needed to accommodate stations and bikeway. The impacts of the greater rights-of-way need to be detailed before the Board makes its recommendations on the Plan. This is a particular concern in Four Corners where previous road widenings have already been done on two corridors under consideration – US29 and University Blvd. (Quinn)</u></li> <li>• <u>US29 has a high rate of vehicle crashes and pedestrian collisions. These are problems that BRT would exacerbate. More should be done to address traffic and pedestrian safety. (Quinn, MacDougall)</u></li> <li>• <u>The geometry of the US29/University Blvd intersection that forces US29 drivers wishing to turn left to first turn right is complicated by backups from the nearby Beltway and exacerbates cut-through traffic problems in the Four Corners neighborhood. Implementing BRT would complicate and delay MCDOT’s traffic mitigation problem that is intended to address this problem. (Quinn)</u></li> </ul>	<p>The forecast ridership on US29 is sufficient to warrant dedicated lanes. Because of the proximity of the University Boulevard intersection to the Capital Beltway, there are some localized traffic patterns that could make it difficult to achieve a curb lane operation. While a mixed traffic operation is recommended for Phase 1 to address these difficulties, the Plan also includes a recommendation to consider dedicated lanes as part of facility planning.</p> <p><u>The typical sections used to develop the recommended ROWs include bike accommodation and are shown in Online Appendix 11. Staff’s analysis of the</u></p>	

Topic	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
Recommended Corridors (page 26 to 62)					
				<p><u>feasibility of including on-road bike accommodation beyond what is recommended in current master plans in included in Online Appendix 5, however the Board should consider moving this analysis to the Plan Appendix for clarity.</u></p> <p><u>Additional ROW will be needed for stations but the exact locations of these stations cannot be determined at this time. MCDOT's ongoing bus service planning study will determine the general relationship between BRT and bus services and will provide better guidance as to where stations should be located, but final locations may not be determined until facility planning is done for individual corridors. The ROW footprints used in the general consideration of station locations is shown</u></p>	

Topic	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
Recommended Corridors (page 26 to 62)					
				<p><u>on page 33 of Online Appendix 13.</u></p> <p><u>A median busway is not recommended on US29 in Four Corners.</u></p> <p><u>Safe pedestrian accommodation would be provided via 8’ buffers of sidewalks from the roadways and 6’ median refuges.</u></p> <p><u>Traffic safety is the responsibility of the Executive Branch and would not be adversely affected by the recommendations in this Plan.</u></p>	
Network Integration	How will BRT integrate with Purple Line and CCT stations?	2 5- 26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Plan does not address how the BRT network will integrate with the Purple Line and CCT. (MCDOT)</li> <li>• BRT will complement Metro and Purple Line (Chevy Chase Land Company).</li> <li>• Consider explicating the project statuses and proposed routes of the Purple Line and CCT and how they would be integrated with the recommended transit corridor network. (SHA)</li> <li>• Against BRT. (Furcolo, Scattergood, <u>Gandal, Schliefer, Aresta, Rosner, Davis, Magruder, Zaft,</u></li> </ul>	The recommended network has stops at all intersecting Purple Line and BRT stations. Where the BRT corridor and the Purple Line run concurrently along University Boulevard, SHA’s recent decision to repurpose lanes on University will make a mixed traffic operation	

Topic	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
Recommended Corridors (page 26 to 62)					
			<p><b><u>Spellacy, MacDougall</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Against the Plan but support more Metro stations closer together. (Hoover)</li> </ul>	<p>more difficult if BRT uses the general traffic lanes. A final decision has yet to be made on whether BRT would be able to use the Purple Line track area and the results of MCDOT’s service planning study are needed to inform facility planning for BRT in this area.</p> <p>The University Blvd corridor will make stops at both the Piney Branch Road and Takoma/Langley Purple Line stations. The MD 355 North corridor will make stops at both the Shady Grove station and will share the transitway with the CCT. Detailed designs will be developed during facility planning.</p>	
Recommended Right-of-Way	– MD 355 South	39	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Change in ROW recommendation south of Bradley Blvd: What happened to earlier version of plan that said a one-lane reversible busway would need an additional 9 ft of ROW in an earlier version? This option must be detailed publicly. (Akst)</li> </ul>	The draft staff recommendation for a one-lane median busway, which would have required additional pavement, was replaced by the current recommendation for a curb	

Topic	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
Recommended Corridors (page 26 to 62)					
				lane operation in Phase 1 to reduce property impacts.	
Recommended Right-of-Way	– New Hampshire Ave	42	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planning staff has described the ROW on New Hampshire Ave between White Oak and the Beltway as 120 feet, but the recommendation in the plan is for 130 ft. Please provide clarity. (Finnegan)</li> </ul>	<p>The CTCFMP recommends a reversible one lane median and the associated minimum 130 foot right of way in this segment, which would also accommodate bike lanes. <b>Staff working on the WOSG Public Hearing Draft Plan will recommend that the existing 120-foot right of way in that plan be revised to be consistent with BRT operating in mixed traffic the 130-foot ROW recommended by the CTCFMP.</b> The basis for the recommended reversible one lane median treatment is a combination of the high ridership forecast for the connected segment south of Northampton Drive (just south of the plan area), the directional traffic pattern within the plan area, and the right of way constraints along some segments that</p>	

Topic	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
Recommended Corridors (page 26 to 62)					
				<p>preclude more advanced treatments. <u>The recommended bike treatment in the WOSG Plan will include a consideration for implementing a bi-directional cycle track in place of the shared use path and bike lanes as part of any project planning.</u></p> <p><u>Between Oaklawn Drive and Powder Mill Road - a two-block segment - only about 105 feet of ROW now exists; some modification to the typical section may need to be made in this area during facility planning.</u></p> <p><del>We recommend that the Planning Board reconcile this difference between the two plans by endorsing a one-lane median busway in WOSG and Phase 1 of CTCFMP but with a ROW of 124 ft (min), which would accommodate the master planned shared use path but</del></p>	

Topic	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
<b>Recommended Corridors (page 26 to 62)</b>					
				<del>not the on-road bike lanes.</del>	
Stations	– General, ROW for stations	1 2, 29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plan needs to retain flexibility to acquire land for stations, since these are not included in the plan. (Wilhelm)</li> </ul>	The recommended station locations are identified by intersection for each corridor and the right-of-way footprints are shown for the stations in Online Appendix 13. This is sufficient to provide the flexibility needed to acquire ROW.	
Stations	– General , station locations and spacing	12 , 29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional study is needed to determine station locations. (Wilhelm)</li> <li>Tension between number of stops and system’s rigidity. (City of Rockville)</li> </ul>	Concur.	
Stations	– New Hampshire Ave , Prince George’s County	42	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The placement of the Oakview Drive and Northhampton Drive stops will serve the extensive amount of multi-family housing that is there and appear to be in the best locations for ridership maximization. (M-NCPPC – Prince George’s County)</li> </ul>	Concur	
Stations	– New Hampshire Ave	42	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The intersection of New Hampshire Ave and Powder Mill Rd is highly congested. Plan should provide flexibility to shift station to New Hampshire Ave and Elton Rd and could link to a neighborhood circulator bus. (Finnegan)</li> </ul>	The final location of the station will be determined as part of facility planning.	

Topic	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
<b>Recommended Corridors (page 26 to 62)</b>					
Stations	– North Bethesda Transitway	45	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide an additional stop at Nicholson Ln / Old Georgetown Rd to serve Wall Park. Wall Park is too far from proposed stop at Edson Ln. (Goldberg)</li> <li>• <b><u>A transit connection to Tysons Corner is needed. (Schwartz, Hawkins)</u></b></li> </ul>	<p>Additional stops can be considered during facility planning and / or as part of the White Flint II Sector Plan.</p> <p><b><u>The revised alignment of this corridor will facilitate a future connection between White Flint and Tysons.</u></b></p>	
Stations	– MD 355 North	24 , 36	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add station MD 355 / Watkins Mill Rd Intersection (City of Gaithersburg)</li> </ul>	<p>This station will be added to the list on p.36. The following will be added to the second paragraph of Phase 2 on p. 24, “<i>All stations within jurisdictions that have independent planning authority should be considered as being part of Phase 2.</i>”</p>	
Stations	– MD 355 North – MD 355 South	36	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is premature to identify number of stations and locations since plan does not address land use, impacts to auto circulation, connections to transit, ROW availability. (City of Rockville)</li> </ul>	<p>The stations recommended reflect those judged viable for BRT service and used in the ridership forecasting exercise; an expanded response on this topic is provided below. The Functional Plan is intended to serve current planned land use and proposes no change in land use or zoning.</p>	

Topic	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
Recommended Corridors (page 26 to 62)					
				<p>Impacts to automobile circulation have been determined to be beneficial on a countywide basis, but local impacts must be determined as part of the facility planning for individual corridors. Connections to other mass transit systems are reflected in the modeling and ridership forecasting. Right-of-way impacts for the typical sections for each recommended transit corridor have been identified; additional right-of-way impacts associated with traffic operations and station locations must be identified as part of facility planning.</p>	
Stations	– MD 355 South	3 9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insufficient stations to serve Rockville’s needs. (City of Rockville)</li> </ul>	<p>The recommended station locations were chosen in response to forecast ridership. The recommendations of MCDOT’s bus service planning study can inform facility planning efforts, but</p>	

Topic	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
<b>Recommended Corridors (page 26 to 62)</b>					
				the City of Rockville will determine its own planned station locations in its master plan.	
Intersections	ROW for intersections	29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Critical to start reserving ROW at intersections now. Every intersection project must be built with BRT in mind. (Morrison)</li> </ul>	Recommended rights-of-way are shown for each corridor, however additional rights-of-way needed to accommodate turn lanes is dependent on more detailed study during facility planning.	

Topic	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
<b>Setting Implementation Priorities (pages 62-64)</b>					
Implementation Criteria	What criteria should be used to decide the corridor prioritization?	60	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plan should be phased based on where ridership is sufficient and dedicated lanes can be provided quickly. (Morrison)</li> <li>Establish 2 or 3 routes as optimally as possible (City of Rockville)</li> </ul>	The Plan identifies three priority corridors; however the Executive is responsible for the final determination on priorities within the limitation set by the County Council.	
Speed of Implementation	Should BRT be implemented incrementally?	60	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BRT will be implemented incrementally over time. (MCDOT, <b>Barbara Ditzler</b>)</li> </ul>	For the network recommended in Phase 1, the Executive Branch will make the final decisions on implementation; however we believe	

Topic	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
<b>Setting Implementation Priorities (pages 62-64)</b>					
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern with incremental implementation. Urge that the County be bold in initial implementation so that’s clear that BRT is a new and superior service. (Town of Chevy Chase)</li> <li>• The implementation of MetroExtra limited-stop service on the PCN can help build the market for future BRT service. (WMATA)</li> <li>• Phasing implementation of treatments on individual transit corridors, beginning with mixed traffic operations, will compromise the ability to attract “riders of choice”. (Transit Task Force)</li> <li>• Adverse impact on system performance of the Rapid Transit System vehicles operating in mixed general traffic. Encourage “riders of choice” to shift from single occupancy vehicles to transit by creating and investing in a high quality transit. (White Flint Partnership)</li> </ul>	<p>that an incremental approach is likely given the cost of operation of BRT facilities and the high cost of construction where additional pavement is needed. The treatment enhancements recommended in Phase 2 should generally not be pursued unless confirmed in a future area master plan update.</p>	
Speed of	When to	24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Full-time dedicated bus lanes</li> </ul>	Disagree. Greater levels of transit	

Topic	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
<b>Setting Implementation Priorities (pages 62-64)</b>					
Implementation	implement Phase 2 recommendations		recommended in Phase 2 should be implemented in Phase 1 in locations where it can be accommodated. (White Flint Partnership)	corridor treatment recommended in Phase 2 should only be implemented where the community impacts and/or higher level of land use can be assessed in an area master plan.	
Local/Other Bus Service	Should local bus service be improved before BRT is implemented?	10-11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focus on improving local bus service before implementing BRT. (Williamson)</li> <li>Concerned about MTA route for the ICC (east to west travel) Investigate why ICC bus routes are being cancelled (Cavanaugh)</li> </ul>	Both BRT implementation and improvements to local bus service are the responsibility of the Executive.	
Local/Other Bus Service	Maintenance of local bus service after BRT implementation		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensure local bus service levels are maintained for areas not served by BRT. (City of Rockville)</li> </ul>	This is the responsibility of the Executive.	
White Flint	Speed of implementation in White Flint	39	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BRT is important to success of White Flint. (Walters)</li> </ul>	Concur	

Topic	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
<b>Bicycle Pedestrian Priority Areas (pages 65 to 69)</b>					
Supports Bicycle Pedestrian Priority Areas	Supports Bicycle Pedestrian Priority Areas	61-69	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>While WABA supports the inclusion of Bicycle Pedestrian Priority Areas, the on-road bicycle accommodations in the plan are insufficient. 36% of corridor miles are for shared roadways, but these are insufficient for cyclists. Cycle tracks are the best form of on road accommodations, but account for only 0.9 miles in plan. Plan should increase miles of cycle tracks, bike lanes, and on-road sharrows. (Gray)</li> <li><b><u>Support the designation of BPPAs. (Schwartz)</u></b></li> </ul>	The Plan recommends a cycle track in the median of Georgia Avenue where additional space was available. However, cycle tracks on the side of the roadway have not found complete acceptance within MDOT/SHA yet with the result that excessive ROWs are needed to accommodate both cycle tracks and on-road bike lanes. We have allocated additional right-of-way where possible to accommodate bike facilities recommended by existing master plans and/or on-road bike lanes. This additional space can be used for cycle tracks if and when SHA, the agency responsible for most of transit corridors, determines that they are an acceptable substitute for bike lanes.	
Bicycle-Pedestrian Priority Areas	Designation of areas	61-68	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The designation of BPPA's (Bicycle and Pedestrian Priority Areas), are enabled by State law (Sec. 2-604). This Plan designates BPPA's, based on land use and proximity to rail transit. MDOT is looking for support mechanisms for the BPPAs, so their inclusion and</li> </ul>	Concur	

Topic	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
Bicycle Pedestrian Priority Areas (pages 65 to 69)					
			<p>functional designation is important. MDOT presented draft goals at the MWCOG subcommittee meeting this week that are addressing issues we brought up at our focus group meeting a few weeks ago. Prince George's County may also look to update our plans and designate BPPA's in the plans as a matter of practice to support the additional right of way needs to accommodate the BRT, but also the entire multi-modal network. We might consider updating our own Master Plan of Transportation with the BPPAs. (M-NCPPC - Prince George's County)</p>		
Access	Are pedestrian and bicycle accommodations in plan sufficient?	30-59, Online Appx 11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sidewalks and shared use paths along SHA roadway facilities should meet or exceed the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). (SHA)</li> <li>• The State of Maryland requires compliance with Complete Streets policies on</li> </ul>	The typical sections developed for this Plan are intended to facilitate meeting ADA Best Practices, Complete Streets policies, and improved access to transit. They are located in Online Appendix 11 and were used to develop the ROW recommendations included in this Plan.	

Topic	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
<b>Bicycle Pedestrian Priority Areas (pages 65 to 69)</b>					
			SHA roadways. (SHA) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any plan elements for existing or future BRT facilities should include references to transit-friendly design elements and improved access to transit. (SHA)</li> </ul>		
Ped / Bike Connections	Focus on Ped / Bike Connections	60-68	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pleased that the plan devotes significant attention to ped / bike improvements (Goffman)</li> </ul>	Concur	
Safety	Is crossing a road with BRT safe?	60-68	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BRT will impact pedestrian safety in Four Corners. (Riley)</li> <li>It will be unsafe to cross the street due to traffic signal overrides. (McDougall)</li> <li>BRT will impact pedestrian safety for Chevy Chase West. (J Kepniss, M Kepniss, Sama, Moore, Latty, Fredman, Wiesenfelder, Smith, Simon, Barron, Osterberg)</li> <li>The BRT system will be unsafe for B-CC students and others that have to cross MD 355 to walk to school, especially since it will remove the median. (Yampolsky-</li> </ul>	<p>The median will not be removed. Median refuges will be provided at intersections within the limits of the recommended corridors.</p> <p>Even where BRT will get traffic signal priority, the buses will be required to adhere to all signal indications, traffic laws and speed limits; there will not be an adverse safety impact.</p>	

Topic	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
<b>Bicycle Pedestrian Priority Areas (pages 65 to 69)</b>					
			<p>Schwat, Park, Toujas)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It appears that the Plan was developed without regard to pedestrian and bicyclist safety. (Acosta)</li> <li>• High-speed buses result in deaths – 462 pedestrians were killed by buses from 2000 to 2011 (Park)</li> <li>• Federal crash statistics are misleading since they are not specific to collisions with pedestrians. (Park)</li> <li>• Wisconsin Avenue has a high number of schools and schoolchildren, who have a poorer ability to judge to speed and distance of approaching vehicles, would be placed at risk by encouraging a higher number of large, faster-moving buses on the road. (Park)</li> <li>• Buses also increase pedestrian crashes with other vehicles, because of decreased visibility (Park)</li> <li>• Traffic signal overrides will make it unsafe to cross US</li> </ul>	<p>The Plan provides for safe pedestrian and bicyclist accommodation. Large trucks and buses are grouped in federal crash statistics. For the year 2011 the fatality and injury rates per 100 million vehicle miles traveled were:                      Large trucks and buses: 0.136 fatalities and 3.80 injuries                      All vehicles: 1.10 fatalities and 75.3 injuries                      Therefore, the fatality and injury rates for large trucks and buses are far less than that for all vehicles. Source: USDOT, Commercial Motor Vehicle Facts – March 2013, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration: <a href="http://www.fmcsa.dot.gov/documents/facts-research/CMV-Facts.pdf">http://www.fmcsa.dot.gov/documents/facts-research/CMV-Facts.pdf</a></p> <p>Since buses carry a large number of passengers and are forecast to reduce overall vehicle-miles-traveled, there would be fewer potential conflicts with pedestrians.</p>	

Topic	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
<b>Bicycle Pedestrian Priority Areas (pages 65 to 69)</b>					
			29. (McDougall)		

Topic	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
<b>MARC Brunswick Line Expansion (pages 69-70)</b>					
Inclusion of MARC	Inclusion of MARC 3 <sup>rd</sup> Track	69-70	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support MARC Brunswick Line expansion. (City of Gaithersburg, Daly, Quinn, <b>Goffman</b>)</li> <li>• Staff’s suggestion to add a third track to the MARC, reaching ultimately into northern Virginia, has one risk and one huge benefit. (Steinberg)</li> <li>• The benefit: This is a regional problem that a rail could solve. Staff’s mention of ultimately considering P.G. County in a BRT network underscores the truth that our congestion’s a regional problem. (Steinberg)</li> <li>• Such a train solution would join all Metrorail spokes, and it would be truly rapid transit. (Steinberg)</li> </ul>	Concur	

Topic	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
<p><b>MARC Brunswick Line Expansion (pages 69-70)</b></p>					
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unique geography and political-created entities along such a line propose that it could be funded more easily than any other mass transit proposal for the region. (Steinberg)The risk: joining the track to the two CSX tracks in Bethesda. Surely Staff could not mean to add the track all the way to Union Station. An analogy with the nightmare of I-270 joining I-495 at peak is clear. (Steinberg)</li> </ul>		
	<p>Separate Plan</p>	<p>The MARC recommendation should be in a separate plan.</p>	<p>69-70</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support MARC expansion but separate it from the BRT plan so that MARC’s growth and expansion can move ahead quickly. (Ross, Slater)</li> </ul>	<p>Disagree. This countywide Plan is the appropriate vehicle to adopt this recommendation. Should the Board or Council decide not to move forward with the Plan with its current focus on accommodating BRT, breaking out this recommendation separately could be reconsidered.</p>	

Area	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision	
<b>Technical Issues (pages 71-74)</b>						
	Technical Rigor	Is there sufficient analysis to support recommendations ?	20-23, Online Appendices 1-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Routes proposed have no basis in studies but instead are based on a gut feeling. (Bienenfeld, McLachlen)</li> <li>• Assumptions are overly simplistic and analysis is lacking. (Riley)</li> </ul>	The basis for the recommendations was transportation modeling and other technical analysis, as explained in the Plan and Online Appendices 1-4.	
	Ridership Forecasting	What is the appropriate use of ridership forecasting?	20-23, Online Appendices 1-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use ridership forecasting for operational decisions (headways, span of service, hours of dedicated lanes), not to compromise the high performance attributes of a BRT network, including dedicated lanes. (Genn)</li> </ul>	The ridership forecasts were used to determine appropriate levels of treatment, consistent with the transportation analysis done for other master plans.	
	Ridership Forecasting	Was ridership forecasting significantly rigorous?	20-23, Online Appendices 1-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planning staff was sufficiently prudent in their assumptions. (City of Gaithersburg)</li> </ul>	Concur	
	Ridership Forecasting	What are the ridership impacts to Metro and Ride On?	20-23, Online Appendix	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How many riders will BRT pull from Metro and Ride-On? What study has been done to determine this? (Williamson)</li> </ul>	We estimate the following reductions in weekday boardings in 2040:  Metrorail: 14,000 and 22,000 Metrobus: 22,000 to 28,000 RideOn: 29,000 to 42,000	

Area	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision	
<b>Technical Issues (pages 71-74)</b>						
					The estimated reduction in boardings on these transit services is about half of the forecast BRT boardings.	
Ridership Forecasting	What are the impacts of mixed traffic operations on MD 355 and US 29?	20-23, Online Appendices 1-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How will mixed traffic operations in these corridors affect ridership? (Williamson)</li> </ul>	Mixed traffic operations do not have the advantage of the higher bus speeds afforded by dedicated lanes and ridership is lower, but the percentage varies by corridor.		
Ridership Forecasts	Accuracy of ridership forecasts on MD 355 South, south of Bradley Blvd.	20-23, Online Appendices 1-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ridership will be considerably less than forecast of 1,440 passengers per hour per peak direction between Bradley Blvd and Friendship Heights. (Akst)</li> </ul>	Our ridership forecasts are based on standard transportation modeling.		
Documentation	What are the impacts on all transportation modes?	20-23, Appendix A, Online Appendices 1-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is little documentation of the proposed corridor improvements on traffic, pedestrians, bicyclists, and commercial roadway users. (MCDOT)</li> <li><b><u>Not enough attention paid to providing bicycle accommodation.</u></b></li> </ul>	<p>The impacts on vehicular traffic on a countywide basis are summarized in Plan Appendix A and further documented in Online Appendices 1-3. Pedestrians have been accommodated in the typical roadway sections, as well as at intersections via the recommended median pedestrian refuges.</p> <p>All master plan bicyclist accommodation has been</p>		

Area	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision	
<b>Technical Issues (pages 71-74)</b>						
				<u>(Afnan)</u>	accommodated in the typical sections and additional on-road accommodation has been provided where feasible; alternative accommodation is identified where specific bike accommodation cannot be provided in the typical section.	
	Documentation	Is more detailed analysis needed before lane repurposing occurs?	20-23, Appendix A, Online Appendices 1-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The scale of analysis is too broad to understand the impacts of repurposing lanes on the roadway and in the surrounding facilities that will have to serve the detour traffic. A detailed traffic analysis is needed before lane repurposing should occur. (MCDOT)</li> </ul>	Concur.	
	Environment			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduces environmental degradation, carbon emissions (Morrison, Nyamweya)</li> </ul>	Concur	
	Environmental analysis	Should the Plan include additional environmental analysis?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is no environmental impact analysis of the proposed network on air quality, noise, and storm water management. (MCDOT)</li> </ul>	A Carbon Footprint Analysis will be included as required by County law. Landscape panels were included in the typical sections in part to facilitate storm water management. Detailed analyses of	

Area	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
<b>Technical Issues (pages 71-74)</b>					
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Plan does not assess its impact on the environment. (Mallen)</li> <li>Include nature in the design. (Mosbaek)</li> </ul>	air quality, noise, and SWM must be undertaken as part of the facility planning process on individual corridors, however there is a general principle that the BRT system will reduce the growth in vehicle miles travelled, helping to achieve air quality goals.	
US 29	Traffic Congestion	Appendix A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What study shows LOS on US 29 improving after White Oak development is completed with BRT? (Williamson)</li> </ul>	Our analysis showed an overall improvement in traffic conditions with the introduction of the recommended transit corridor network. The specific impacts on US29 must be determined as part of facility planning.	
Transitway Treatment	Are median busways beneficial without grade separation?	21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Without grade separations at intersecting roads for bus patrons to reach median stations, median busways are not an improvement on limited stop metrobuses. Median busways require expensive passenger bridges and escalators (and perhaps elevators) to satisfy federal law. (Steinberg)</li> </ul>	Median busways are recommended to improve bus speeds that would be hindered by congestion and conflicts, providing a higher level of service for bus patrons. Median pedestrian refuges would be provided at all stations to enhance pedestrian safety. No bridges/escalators/elevators are required to meet ADA requirements. Grade separations to get bus patrons to median stations are not needed or practical.	

Area	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
<b>Benefits (pages 75-78)</b>					
Access			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BRT enhances access for everyone: children and seniors who cannot use a car – no license, aging in place; supports choice and freedom. (Nicolescu, Morrison, Nyamweya)</li> </ul>	Concur	
Quality of Life		54	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BRT will entice young professionals and entrepreneurs to the County. (Morrison)</li> <li>• BRT will worsen quality of life in Four Corners. (Goemann)</li> </ul>	<p>Concur, appears to coincide with analysis of travel patterns and preferences.</p> <p>Our analysis showed an overall improvement in traffic conditions with the introduction of the recommended transit corridor network. The specific impacts in Four Corners must be determined as part of facility planning.</p>	
Congestion	Adequacy of documentation to support assertion that BRT improves congestion	Appendix A, Online Appendices 1-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BRT will reduce congestion, including for emergency vehicles (Nyamweya, Mitchem, Smirniotopoulos, Hoffman, Vernon, <u>Nicolescu+21 Chevy Chase residents, Barbara Ditzler</u>)</li> <li>• <u>Doing nothing is not an</u></li> </ul>	The forecast reduction in vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and vehicle hours traveled (VHT) was part of the transportation modeling results. Our countywide travel analysis shows that there would be an overall drop in vehicle miles and hours travelled. The dedicated bus lanes would be open for use by emergency vehicles and should greatly decrease their	

Area	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
Benefits (pages 75-78)					
			<p><u>option because congestion will become excessive. (Nicolescu+21 Chevy Chase residents)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Plan assumes that the recommended network would improve the overall operation of the roadway network for drivers by increasing travel speeds and reducing the growth in congestion, but does not demonstrate or prove the correctness of the assumption (MCDOT, Emden/Edgemoor CA)</li> <li>Shouldn't we have more answers before we go farther and spend upwards of \$10 billion on something that no study has shown will improve traffic? (Williamson)</li> </ul>	<p>peak hour delays.</p> <p>The modeling results are included in Online Appendix 2 and summarized in the maps on pages 73-78, but for clarity, we will include in the Plan Appendix Tables 2-2 through 2-6 from the appendix, reflecting changes in VMT, VHT, traffic speeds, highway trips and transit trips. We concur that the Policy Area analysis done for this Plan is not sufficient to make final decisions on transportation investments and that additional, more detailed modeling needs to be done for each individual corridor to determine the impacts on traffic operations before proceeding with major construction.</p>	
	Transportation Options		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need better transportation choices. (Anderson)</li> <li>Support improved public transportation</li> </ul>	<p>The recommended transit corridors would facilitate the development of a high quality transit choice and enhance the value of other components of the transit network.</p>	

Area	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
Benefits (pages 75-78)					
			infrastructure and particularly BRT. (Rivera, <a href="#">Goffman</a> ) • Urges implementation of WMATA priority corridors as a “first step” to give the public better transit sooner. (Slater)		
Person Throughput	BRT increases person throughput	22-23	• Submitted one table showing drive through commuter trips from outside the region in 2010 (230,000) and 2030 (700,000). A second table shows the relationship between demand and capacity for auto lanes and BRT lanes. Auto lanes are unable to accommodate more than 1380 to 1560 persons per hour, whereas bus lanes can accommodate 9000 riders per hour. (Genn)	The table is incorrect in showing that the capacity of the bus lane increases with demand. The capacity of the bus lane is constant the same as the capacity of the general traffic lane is constant. The question is how much of that capacity is being used.  We have not come to an agreement in our discussions with MCDOT as to the capacity of a bus lane but agree that it is in the range of 7,000-9,000 passengers per hour. Our highest forecast corridor has approximately 2,500 passengers in the peak hour in the peak direction. It is because we’re only using about 30% of that bus lane’s capacity that the level of service for those bus patrons is so good.	

Area	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
Benefits (pages 75-78)					
	Safety	Option to avoid drunk driving	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides an option to keep drunk drivers off the road. (Fields)</li> <li>• <u>Los Angeles Orange Line BRT has experienced less than half the number of collisions per mile than the city's other bus routes, based on the Federal Transit Administration's evaluation of the project. (Nicolescu+21 Chevy Chase residents)</u></li> </ul>	Concur	

Area	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision	
<b>Impacts (pages 79-84)</b>						
	Traffic Impacts	Insufficient documentation to support assertion that BRT improves congestion	Appendix A, Online Appendix 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Plan assumes that the recommended network would improve the overall operation of the roadway network for drivers by increasing travel speeds and reducing the growth in congestion, but does not demonstrate or prove the correctness of the assumption (MCDOT)</li> </ul>	The forecast reduction in vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and vehicle hours traveled (VHT) was part of the transportation modeling results, which are included in Online Appendix 2 but summarized in the maps on pages 73-78. For clarity, we will include in the Plan Appendix Tables 2-2 through 2-6 from the appendix, reflecting changes in VMT, VHT, traffic speeds, highway trips and transit trips. We concur that the Policy Area analysis done for this Plan is not sufficient to make final decisions on transportation investments and that additional, more detailed modeling needs to be done for each individual corridor to determine the impacts on traffic operations.	
	Traffic Impacts	Will BRT exacerbate existing congestion?	Appendix A, Online Appendix 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BRT would aggravate existing choke points Silver Spring, Bethesda, Four Corners. (Steinberg)</li> <li>County is advocating transit to promote development, especially in White Flint and north of White Oak. The riders gained from BRT will be</li> </ul>	Our analysis showed an overall improvement in traffic conditions with the introduction of the recommended transit corridor network. The specific impacts on the locations noted, including travel times in individual corridors, must be determined as part of facility planning.	

Area	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
<b>Impacts (pages 79-84)</b>					
			<p>overwhelmed by the additional traffic created by the development. (Williamson)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The US 29 corridor will be used to bring even more traffic onto Colesville Road from the proposed White Oak development rather than to serve our community. BRT cannot ameliorate this congestion. (Goemann)</li> <li>• The Plan will reduce traffic capacity by one-third on Wisconsin Ave and Connecticut Ave that are already congested. (High)</li> <li>• Plan will increase travel times for parents, nannies, contractors, commuters. (High)</li> <li>• Desire to move people between areas far to the north and DC has no relation to the life goals of families who live in Bethesda/Chevy Chase.</li> </ul>	<p>Connecticut Avenue is not recommended as a transit corridor in the Plan.</p>	

Area	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
Impacts (pages 79-84)					
			(High) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plan will increase traffic queues exiting Norwood Park after sporting events. (High)</li> <li>• Due to added congestion and traffic signals on Wisconsin Ave, traffic will divert through Chevy Chase West neighborhood. (High, J Kepniss, M Kepniss, Moore, Fredman, Wiesenfelder, Smith, Simon, Barron)</li> <li>• If BRT brings more traffic to Four Corners it will result in cut through traffic through the Woodmoor neighborhood. (Goemann)</li> <li>• How much travel time is saved by commuters along US 29? What study has been done to determine this? (Williamson)</li> </ul>		
	Transit Signal Priority (TSP)	Will TSP degrade traffic	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How does TSP affect the flow at crossing streets</li> </ul> MCDOT is currently undertaking a study on Traffic Signal Priority	

Area	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
<b>Impacts (pages 79-84)</b>					
	operations?		and areas with lots of pedestrians? (Williamson) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BRT must receive signal priority (Van Houten)</li> <li>• Support signal prioritization (Daly)</li> </ul>	implementation that will inform future facility planning efforts.	
<b>Transit Mode Speeds</b>	<b>Purple Line speed</b>	<b>11</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Table 2 inaccurately states the Purple Line speed as being moderate whereas the proposed design speed for the segment between Chevy Chase Lake and Bethesda is 50 mph. (Afnan)</b></li> </ul>	<b>The Purple Line speed varies according to segment. The “moderate” speed noted would be more typical.</b>	
Property Values	Will BRT degrade property values on Wisconsin Ave?	36	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Property values will be affected on Wisconsin Ave if: 1) lane repurposing reduces traffic capacity by one-third, 2) left turn restrictions, 3) additional traffic signals are provided. (High)</li> </ul>	No analysis of property value impacts was done for this master plan; such an evaluation would have to consider a comparison between corridors with higher levels of congestion than we see today with corridors that have fewer vehicles but a superior transit service.	
Traffic Safety	Do buses degrade traffic safety?	36	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It will be difficult and dangerous for vehicles making westbound left turns out of Chevy Chase</li> </ul>	Buses are required to travel at no higher than the posted speed. There is no obvious reason why a dedicated bus lane would degrade traffic safety.	

Area	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
<b>Impacts (pages 79-84)</b>					
			West (Yampolsky-Schwat, J Kepniss, M Kepniss, Sama, Moore, Latty, Fredman, Wiesenfelder, Smith, Simon, Barron, Osterberg)	The accommodation of all movements to and from Chevy Chase West must be included in any facility planning study to implement transit along MD355.	
	Property Impacts	How will BRT impact private property?	24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Define “major impacts on existing development”. (SHA)</li> </ul>	Add the following wording, “, such as requiring the removal of buildings, slope impacts within ten feet of buildings, or eliminating off-street parking for residential properties”.
	Property Impacts	Should BRT acquire additional ROW along US 29?	54	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expanding the roadway in Four Corners is undesirable because there is not more open space – it would be harmful to community to lose stores and restaurants. (Goemann)</li> <li>Will US 29 be widened for BRT? What property will be taken? Have property owners been notified? (Williamson)</li> <li>Concerned that BRT will take additional ROW on US 29 south of New Hampshire because there is insufficient ROW</li> </ul>	Recommendations for additional right-of-way for the US29 corridor are identified on page 102 of the Public Hearing Draft and are summarized as follows:  <u>Along Colesville Rd/Columbia Pike</u> East-West Hwy to Georgia Ave: +1' Southwood Ave to Lockwood Dr:+2' Stewart Lane to MD198: The current master plan recommends a range of 100'-200'. The existing ROW is typically 200' but varies to 134' minimum. The Functional Plan recommends a range of 161'-200', so that maximum additional ROW would be +27' to meet the lower end of the range at 161'.

Area	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
<b>Impacts (pages 79-84)</b>					
			and because the plan does not specify ROW needed for stations. (Riley)	<u>Along Lockwood Drive/Stewart Lane US29 to US29</u> : No change for Phase 1; +9' for Phase 2	
Property Impacts	Should BRT acquire additional ROW along MD 355 South?	39	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BRT should not acquire additional ROW along MD 355 South. (Chaikin)</li> </ul>	A small amount of additional ROW is recommended to implement the typical section needed to accommodate BRT.	
Property Impacts	Insufficient assessment of property impacts	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This plan does not fully assess potential impacts; therefore, it is premature to suggest that this plan can or will limit impacts to route-adjacent properties. (SHA)</li> </ul>	The typical sections that were used to determine rights-of-way limited physical impacts to adjacent properties by means of including lane repurposing – and therefore a smaller pavement footprint – where possible.	
Property Impacts	Add text acknowledging that private land owners are concerned about loss of land.	22-23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Shares the concern with property owners that they will lose private land for BRT. Plan should add language noting this concern. (Humphrey)</li> </ul>	The Plan has minimized property impacts by recommending lane repurposing where a dedicated bus lane would be more efficient than a general purpose lane.	
Median Impacts	BRT will remove the “Green Mile”	39	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Green Mile median b/w Bradley Blvd and Western Avenue will be removed (Yampolsky-Schwat, Lukas/Wood, G. Kiel)</li> </ul>	This is incorrect. The median would be retained both in Phase 1, which recommends a curb lane operation, and in Phase 2, which recommends a median operation with buses on either side of the existing median.	

Area	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision	
<b>Transit Operations (pages 85-86)</b>						
	Transitions between transitway types	How will buses transition from mixed traffic to median busways?	54	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How will BRT vehicles transition between mixed traffic and medians? Where has this been done successfully? (Williamson)</li> <li>• A queue-jump should be considered at MD355/Bradley Blvd at the fire station where the Plan recommends a transition between a median busway to the north and curb lanes to the south. (O’Dowd)</li> </ul>	<p>A queue jump traffic signal with a separate phase can be used to facilitate BRT vehicles moving from a median bus lane to a general traffic lane, and likewise queue jump from an inside left turn lane to the median in the opposite direction.</p> <p>The need for queue-jump lanes and traffic signal priority must be considered during facility planning.</p>	
	Bus storage facilities	Need for and location of bus maintenance and storage facilities	18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If storage and maintenance facilities are not located proximate to proposed BRT corridors then, do those corridors remain viable proposals? (SHA)</li> <li>• The Plan should recognize the need for bus maintenance facilities and state that there is a potential need for a facility to serve the</li> </ul>	<p>The extent of needed bus storage facilities will become clearer upon completion of MCDOT’s service planning study. Without identifying the particular site, the County Executive’s Transit Task Force has made a recommendation on an east county facility.</p> <p>The Plan recognizes that there is a need for maintenance facilities <i>“The need for additional bus storage and maintenance facilities will need to be</i></p>	

Area	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
<b>Transit Operations (pages 85-86)</b>					
			east county area. (MCDOT)	<i>explored in a future master plan once the County's bus service plan is complete." (p.18). The following language can be added ", however it is likely that a facility will be needed in the east county area."</i>	
	Bus Station Design	Stations should accommodate BRT and local buses	12 • Stations will need to serve BRT vehicles and local bus vehicles. (Wilhelm)	This will be determined by the results of MCDOT's service planning study and reflected in the facility planning done for each corridor.	

Area	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision	
<b>Coordination (pages 87-88)</b>						
	Coordination with MCDOT Service Planning and Integration Study	Coordinate BRT Plan with with MCDOT Service Planning and Integration Study		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The ongoing Service Planning and Integration Study and Traffic Signal Priority Study will inform the Planning Board and Council during their deliberations. (MCDOT)</li> </ul>	Concur	
	Coordination with City of Takoma Park	The City has proposed a different typical section for New Hampshire Blvd	42	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planning staff should continue to coordinate on proposed section within City boundaries. (City of Takoma Park, <a href="#">Schultz</a>)</li> </ul>	Concur	
	Coordination with City of Rockville Planning Commission	Ability to physically accommodate proposed typical sections	54-59	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Direct Planning staff to coordinate with Rockville Planning Commission (City of Rockville)</li> </ul>	Concur, however the lead planning agency responsible for pursuing the planning of corridors and stations within the City of Rockville will be the City's Planning Department.	
	Coordination with Town of Chevy Chase	Coordinate with Town during facility planning for MD 355 South.	39	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Coordination with Town residents is needed during facility planning on issues such as bus stop locations, traffic operations, and pedestrian and bicycle crossings. (Town of Chevy Chase)</li> </ul>	Concur, however the responsibility for facility planning rests with the Executive.	
	Coordination with municipalities	Coordination with municipalities	54-59	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recognize that a simple process needs to be promptly put in place to</li> </ul>	Staff has coordinated closely with planning staff of the Cities of Rockville and Gaithersburg on this	

Area	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
<b>Coordination (pages 87-88)</b>					
			allow coordination between the County’s planning agencies and those municipalities to ensure a seamless outcome in BRT network implementation. (Transit Task Force)	Plan. The implementing agency will be responsible for leading coordination after the Plan is approved and adopted.	
	Consistency with White Oak Science Gateway MP	Whether and should the BRT Plan and White Oak plan use the same assumptions?	48, 54,57 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plan should assume anticipated White Oak land use. (Finnegan)</li> <li>• WOSG Plan’s higher density traffic modeling was based on a full-treatment “gold” level BRT system, i.e., a two-way dedicated transitway system without loss of travel lanes, NOT the single-lane transitway treatment recommended in the BRT Plan. (Finnegan)</li> </ul>	<p>Concur. The Planning Board Draft of this Plan will be coordinated with the WOSG MP. An additional post-processing exercise was completed as part of the CTCFMP that included the land use under consideration in the WOSG plan.</p> <p>It is correct that the WOSG Plan modeled network assumed a level of service for BRT that is consistent with a two way dedicated treatment. Steps were taken, however, in the development of the methodology used in the WOSG analysis to address this issue to the extent possible – given the timing of the plan and the technical aspects of the analysis. An explanation of the methodology is provided in pages 24-26 of the WOSG Transportation Appendix.</p>	Consistency with White Oak Science Gateway MP

Area	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
<p><b>Process (pages 89-92)</b></p>					
	<p>Public Input</p>	<p>Did the plan provide sufficient public input?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to the lack of public input in three areas: 1) choice of buses as the mode, 2) corridors selection by Transit Task Force, 3) decision to realign North Bethesda Transitway (Bienenfeld, McLachlen)</li> <li>• Affected business and property owners should receive notification of proposed changes. (G. Kiel)</li> <li>• Insufficient community participation. Add language to the plan recommending a public process in which residents and other stakeholders participate to study possible impact on land use and density and other services and facilities that might result from the introduction of BRT into planning areas where a route is not currently in the master/sector plan.</li> </ul>	<p>Our approved Scope of Work included a consideration of BRT only. The corridors recommended by the task force were considered but this Plan includes 79 miles of the 162 miles they recommended. The realignment of the North Bethesda Transitway provides better service to an activity center.</p> <p>A CAC is difficult to assemble for a countywide plan with a technical focus. The Purple Line Master Plan Amendment had a CAC because it covered a much smaller area than a countywide plan, was more focused on station areas, and had had some detailed planning work already done. The other BRT corridors that are already in the master plan did not have specific CAC's but were considered by the area master plans' CACs.</p> <p>It is not feasible to provide individual notices to all business and property owners on corridors under consideration, nor is it normal practice for master plans. However, during facility planning and design,</p>	

Area	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
<p>Process (pages 89-92)</p>					
			<p>(Humphrey)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned that there is not CAC. CAC would review alternatives and cost-benefit analysis. Previously approved BRT routes and Purple Line had CAC. (Riley, <a href="#">Quinn</a>)</li> </ul>	<p>impacts can be better determined and affected persons will be notified by the implementing agency.</p> <p>We believe that the substantial public outreach efforts undertaken for this Plan were sufficient. In addition to ten Planning board meetings open to the public plus the Public Hearing, our community outreach has included the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Oct-Nov 2011: Two community meetings/open houses</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Apr 2012: White Oak Science Gateway CAC</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Oct 2012: Four Corners civic groups and an open house at the Planning Department headquarters building</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Nov 2012: Three community meetings</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Jan-May 2013: Mid-County CAB, Coalition for Smarter Growth, BRAC Implementation Committee, the MC Civic Federation, Rockville Planning</li> </ul>	

Area	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
<p><b>Process (pages 89-92)</b></p>					
				<p>Commission, Western Montgomery CAB, Rockville Mayor and Council, Action Committee for Transit, North Woodside Citizens Association, and Chevy Chase West citizens groups</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Plan webpage links to all staff memos, presentations, and resources, as well as an invitation to comment</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Two segments on the Montgomery Plans cable show</li> </ul> <p>The recommended BRT network is intended to serve current planned land use; no changes to land use are recommended.</p>	
	<p>Plan Schedule</p>	<p>Insufficient time for coordination, input</p>	<p>36, 39, 54, 57</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insufficient time for public input, full analysis, coordination with municipalities (City of Rockville)</li> <li>• Plan should go through the normal process so that there is ample time to conduct a study of impacts to Woodmoor neighborhood in Four Corners and to review</li> </ul>	<p>City residents and business owners were provided opportunities for public comment during two series of public meetings in Fall 2011 and Fall 2012, the latter including a meeting at the Parks Shady Grove Training Facility, selected for its proximity to Rockville and Gaithersburg residents. Additional public presentations were made to groups on request. Presentations were also made to the Rockville Planning Commission on</p>	

Area	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
<p><b>Process (pages 89-92)</b></p>					
			<p>other options. (Goemann)</p>	<p>April 10, 2013 and to the Mayor and Council on April 22. Rockville Planning Department staff were interviewed at the start of the master plan process, participated in stakeholder meetings, hosted additional meetings with our staff, and coordinated with us throughout the process.</p>	
	<p>Master plan updates</p>	<p>Should the plan be regularly updated?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recognize that the Plan should be updated on a shorter time horizon than similar plans to allow for adjustment necessitated by detailed design, engineering, and construction of elements of the BRT network; improvements on existing corridors; and inclusion of additional corridors in the future. (Transit Task Force)</li> </ul>	<p>Agree that master plan updates may be necessary as planning and engineering efforts are undertaken; possibly as changes are made to existing corridors; and definitely if additional corridors are proposed.</p>	

Area	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
Equity (pages 93-94)					
Corridor Locations	Does plan focus impacts and costs away from wealthier areas of the county?	54	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was a decision to eliminate the wealthiest part of the county from the BRT routes and taxes associated with the BRT routes, and push all the BRT routes within a very limited part of the county, into areas where the lowest income and under-represented groups live. (Bienenfeld, McLachlen)</li> <li>• The <u>affected</u> residents along US 29 <u>in Four Corners</u> are disproportionately minorities and immigrants. (McDougall)</li> <li>• <u>US29 BRT corridor would help low-income residents get to job centers downcounty; there are currently not good alternatives.</u> (Bradbury)</li> </ul>	<p>The recommended BRT network is intended to serve those areas with adequate forecast ridership. The recommended corridors pass through areas of all incomes.</p> <p>Maps of the recommended corridors overlaid on countywide maps of employment, income and minority populations are attached. <u>Four Corners is shown as having a lesser percentage of low-income and minority residents than communities farther north on US29, who would be served by BRT.</u></p>	

Area	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
<b>Equity (pages 93-94)</b>					
	Economic Equity	48, 51	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BRT promotes economic equity – strong east-west connections. (Morrison)</li> <li>• East-West routes on the BRT master plan are key to providing better connectivity. (Slater)</li> </ul>	An economic analysis was not included as part of the Plan, so we can't address this question, but east-west connections would be improved by this Plan.	

Area	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision	
<b>Implementation (pages 95-98)</b>						
	Mitigation	Develop an “Adjacent Neighborhood Assessment and Impact Mitigation Plan”	18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop an “adjacent neighborhood assessment and impact mitigation plan” during planning and implementation that will: 1) purchase quiet, low-polluting, low-vibration vehicles, 2) conduct sound and vibration studies and implement mitigation, 3) minimize ROW acquisition from private homes, 4) select BRT station and vehicle designs that are non-industrial looking and blend in with neighborhoods, 5) demonstrate that lane repurposing and other BRT treatments don’t increase congestion. (Mitchem)</li> </ul>	<p>Lane repurposing is recommended where our modeling shows that dedicated bus lanes would be more efficient in modeling people than general traffic lanes; this must be confirmed by more detailed modeling done in future facility plan efforts that will detail the congestion and noise impacts.</p> <p>The choice of bus equipment is the responsibility of the Executive.</p> <p>Re aesthetics of BRT station design: The following language should be added: <i>“Most of the BRT corridors pass through residential areas and in addition to serving the transportation function of moving people, the system should be implemented in such a way that it enhances the surrounding area to the extent possible. Overhead signage should be kept to the minimum necessary and minimize obtrusiveness. Stations must be identifiable but should be designed to be complementary to the surrounding neighborhood.”</i></p>	
	Exclusivity of Dedicated Lanes	Suggests a methodology	60	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The task force plan provides a nine stage</li> </ul>	Implementation staging is the responsibility of the Executive.	

Area	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision	
Implementation (pages 95-98)						
		for determining how to determine when dedicated lanes should be used exclusively for BRT.		methodology for providing increasing exclusivity of dedicated lanes for BRT vehicles. (Genn)		
	Corridor Prioritization	What corridors should be prioritized?	60	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conduct pilot project including the four BRT corridors currently in the master plans (CCT, Georgia Ave Busway, Veirs Mill Rd, North Bethesda Transitway). Highest priority should be given to CCT. (Humphrey, Riley, <b>Quinn</b>)</li> <li>• <b><u>Prove the effectiveness by building two or three BRT pilot projects on the highest traffic corridors first. To work out any unanticipated problems.</u></b> (<b>Brian Ditzler</b>)</li> <li>• Don't build several BRT routes at once. (Cavanaugh)</li> <li>• Build the infrastructure to see how it works then</li> </ul>	The Plan recommends MD355, US29, and the southern portion of MD650 as the highest priorities. Final decisions on implementation are the responsibility of the Executive but it is highly likely that the BRT system would begin with a pilot project.	

Area	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
Implementation (pages 95-98)					
			<p>approve more development and build more routes. (Cavanaugh)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BRT should begin where there is clearly a need to fill in the gaps of the Metro system (Olney to Wheaton or Glenmont and/or Rockville to Wheaton route)</li> <li>• Defer consideration of a Georgia Ave South BRT route (Woody Brosnan)</li> <li>• The New Hampshire Ave corridor should be prioritized as far north as the White Oak Transit Center because planned development at the National Labor College will benefit from it, and because it could stimulate development within the Hillandale Center. (Peinovich)</li> <li>• Don't implement BRT as a pilot project between Bethesda and Friendship Heights. (J Kepniss, M</li> </ul>		

Area	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
<b>Implementation (pages 95-98)</b>					
			Keptniss, Sama, Moore, Latty, Fredman, Wiesenfelder, Smith)		
Local Bus Service	Improve local bus service first.	60	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Downcounty residents have no need for BRT. They do need better local bus service. (McLachlen, McDougall)</li> </ul>	Our ridership forecasts show demand for BRT. The recommended dedicated curbside lanes could be used to improve local bus service also.	

Area	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
<b>Other (pages 98-104)</b>					
System financing			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How will system be financed? (City of Rockville)</li> <li>Special assessment is illegal under Maryland state law because downcounty residents that will be assessed would receive special harm, not special benefit. (McDougall)</li> </ul>	Financing construction and operation of the BRT system is the responsibility of the Executive.	
Conflict of interest			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All rumors of conflict of interest concerning professional profit from promoting BRT should be looked into. There is one major one floating around put forward online by a Washington Post reporter. (Abeles)</li> </ul>	Any conflicts of interest should be referred to the Montgomery County Office of the Inspector General.	
Plan approach			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed BRT corridors contained in</li> </ul>	Concur	

Area	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
Other (pages 98-104)					
			the draft plan are a realistic, cost-effective response to the very real and growing problem of traffic congestion. (Town of Chevy Chase)		
	BRT Network		29 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports the plan because it provides a network of interconnected routes. (Goffman, Morrison, Dean)</li> <li>There may be a need for an outer beltway on transit on ICC. (Dean)</li> </ul>	Concur	
	Social Engineering	Is County engaged in social engineering ?	20-23 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opposed to social engineering. (Chaikin)</li> </ul>	Our recommendations are based on ridership forecasts reflecting the attractiveness of transit.	
	Crime	Do bus stops increase crime?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bus stop crimes are well documented. (Chaikin)</li> </ul>	Facility planning will include considerations of user safety.	
	Right-of-way	Station locations, turn lanes, and ancillary facilities	18, 29 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recognize that the number and specific locations of stations, turn lanes, and ancillary facilities is approximate and can be modified during implementation based upon additional studies, including a study dealing with the integration of BRT and local bus service. (Transit Task Force)</li> </ul>	Agree on the specific location of stations and intersection modifications. The following will be added to the Plan to address the question of additional stations: <i>“The County’s ongoing Service Planning and Integration Study will determine the general relationship between</i>	

Area	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision	
Other (pages 98-104)						
					<p><i>BRT and local bus service; incorporating that study's recommendations may require that additional stations be added during facility planning." The location and length of turn lanes will be highly dependent on the type of treatment selected at the time of implementation – curb lanes or a median busway – and must be determined in conjunction with more detailed traffic and ridership forecasts. The need for bus storage facilities is discussed on p. 18 but no such facilities are recommended in this Plan.</i></p>	
	<p>Coordination with local buses</p>	<p>9, 17-21</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recognize that reconfiguration of the County's Ride-On bus system to serve as a feeder to BRT service may result in changes to this local network, impacting ridership projections. (Transit Task Force)</li> <li>• The statement that a large part of the initial BRT ridership will come from existing transit riders suggests that the forecast ridership is based predominantly</li> </ul>	<p>Potential changes to the local bus network were discussed with WMATA and Ride-On staff and reflected in the transportation modeling done for this Plan. Further changes may be recommended by the County's ongoing Service Planning and Integration</p>		

Area	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision	
Other (pages 98-104)						
				<p>on existing transit use. (Transit Task Force)</p>	<p>Study; these changes will have to be considered in worksessions for this Plan and/or in subsequent facility planning efforts, depending on the time of completion of the study.</p> <p>The 2040 forecast ridership is based on housing and employment forecasts with the above assumed changes in local bus <u>service</u>; the forecast ridership is NOT based on an extrapolation of existing bus <u>ridership</u>.</p>	
	Network integrity	Additional corridor segmen	29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recognize the need for connections that may not be supported on a standalone basis but justified because they add value to the network. (Transit Task Force)</li> </ul>	<p>The Phase 1 network includes segments, notably much of Randolph Road and New Hampshire Avenue north of US29, that have less-than-desirable forecast ridership and has several other segments where a higher level of treatment is recommended than the forecast ridership would suggest. These recommendations were made</p>	

Area	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision	
Other (pages 98-104)						
					for the purposes of network integrity but need to be confirmed in more detailed facility planning. While lower thresholds were used for these corridor segments, objective criteria - most importantly forecast ridership - are needed in order to make decisions.	
BRT Funding	It is unfair to make people living near the BRT shoulder a higher tax burden to pay for it	60	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Eliminate the special tax district as a funding option and make all MoCo residents pay equally for a system that may reduce congestion for everyone. (Cavanaugh)</li> <li>• Concern that their neighborhood is near Metro and would not use BRT, but the tax would be implemented for them. The BRT users are from Howard and Burtonsville. (Cavanaugh)</li> <li>• <u>No funding for BRT has been identified.</u> (Silverberg)</li> <li>• <u>Nearby residents should not have to pay for a very expensive system. (Mullen, Davis, Mallen, Brenner-Leifer)</u></li> </ul>	<p>Financing the BRT network is the responsibility of the Executive and Council.</p> <p>The highest forecast ridership corridor is MD355, which runs concurrently with Metrorail because people’s origins and destinations are not necessarily at Metro stations.</p> <p>Funding mechanisms for the BRT have yet to be determined, but are the responsibility of the County Executive.</p>		
BRT Funding vs. Other Capital	Choice of investment	60	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern that other projects would be deferred if the BRT project proceeds.</li> </ul>	While the Plan recommends an approach to prioritization		

Area	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision	
<b>Other (pages 98-104)</b>						
	Projects	projects has financial implications	(Pfetsch) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Capital project selection and execution requires that risks of non-productive investment be minimized. (Pfetsch)</li> </ul>	of BRT projects, it does not recommend how these projects should be pursued in the context of the County’s capital transportation program. The Planning Board will make recommendations to the County Executive and Council in this regard, but the final determination rest with the Council.		
	Funding for Transit Service	Provide additional funding for transit service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide more funding for WMATA to return to previous funding levels and to fund 8 car trains. (Riley, Lukas / Wood, Glickman, Hambleton)</li> <li>The Metrorail system should be expanded. (J&amp;D Barron)</li> </ul>	Additional funding for WMATA is a stated County priority and funding for 8-car trains is included in WMATA’s Momentum Strategic Plan.		
	Local Bus Service	Bus Service	60	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Add BRT attributes to existing bus service. (Riley)</li> <li>Improve local bus stops by providing more shelters. (Riley)</li> </ul>	These are operational decisions that are the responsibility of the Executive.	
	Zoning/Economic development	Should zoning be changed at BRT stops?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide assurance that zoning changes will not be imposed near the various BRT stop. (Hausner)</li> <li>Don’t make BRT the “economic development engine” that the Purple Line has become. (Cavanaugh)</li> <li>Don’t add commercial or mixed use</li> </ul>	No land use changes are permitted in the Functional Plan, which is intended to serve our current land use. Potential land use changes can only be considered as part of an area master plan or		

Area	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
Other (pages 98-104)					
			development to neighborhoods just because there is a BRT stop (Cavanaugh) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No new development until BRT is proven to take cars off the road and reduce traffic congestion (Cavanaugh)</li> <li>• BRT will be the key to the growth of future land-use plans, such as White Oak Science Gateway and White Flint. (Slater)</li> </ul>	the General Plan.	
	Subdivision Staging Policy	Housing and transportation costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A new metric called the housing-transportation cost index shows that households incur close to 50% of their income in many cases for these two necessities. The master plan and its proposed investment are a tremendous opportunity to impact on this problem. (Watkins)</li> <li>• APFO is a failure inside the Beltway. (Ross)</li> </ul>	This should be considered as part of the Subdivision Staging Policy update.	

Area	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
<b>UNSORTED COMMENTS (pages 105-111)</b>					
Implementation	Implement TTF's Phase I	60	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Firmly believe that the best ridership model for the Rapid Transit System Phase One is reflected in the White Flint Sector Plan's rapid transit vision. (White Flint Partnership)</li> </ul>	The Plan recommends the transit corridor network that serves current land use and that can be justified by ridership forecasts and recommends that implementation be determined in large part by ridership forecasts.	
Transitway Treatment	General		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need dedicated lanes, especially in bottlenecks and along congested corridors (Van Houten)</li> <li>Transit needs to be convenient and efficient as possible to people who ride it (Van Houten)</li> <li>Dedicated bus ways don't add congestion to local roads (Daly)</li> </ul>	Concur.	
Transit Operations			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Separate branding from regular buses</li> <li>Platforms for safety, ease of use, and our neighbors who are physically challenged (Daly)</li> </ul>	These BRT elements are the operational responsibility of the Executive.	

Area	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
<b>UNSORTED COMMENTS (pages 105-111)</b>					
General		69, 84	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Upcounty (Clarksburg vicinity) residents are not served by a nearby Metro station or any comprehensive transit system (Daly?)</li> <li>• <u>Clarksburg residents need BRT service on MD355 as an alternative to building MidCounty Highway, which would have adverse environmental, traffic, and community impacts. (Schoap/TAME, Wilder, Hall, Shank/Dayspring Church, Garthright)</u></li> <li>• The CCT/BRT system and third track on MARC line could ease traffic congestion (Beth Daly)</li> <li>• Support expansion of mass transit (Smirniotopoulos, Vernon, Hoffman,</li> </ul>	<p>Clarksburg residents would be served by the CCT. Express bus services on I-270 would also be a good option, however the latter is an operational decision to be made by the Executive.</p> <p>Concur that a greater use of transit could relieve congestion.</p> <p>While we are planning for new development to be in mixed use areas that will reduce the average trip length, this Plan is intended to help meet future the transportation demand of our forecast housing and employment.</p>	

Area	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
<b>UNSORTED COMMENTS (pages 105-111)</b>					
			<p>Fried)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expanded transit options benefit the disabled and help them to be independent. (Fried)</li> <li>We shouldn't plan for people to be commuting 20 miles each way to work in the future. (O'Dowd)</li> <li>Per the Institute for Transportation &amp; Policy Development, Montgomery County has limited experience in managing a project of this scope, scale, and complexity. Why is a bigger network being proposed than any other municipality has ever attempted and why are we recommending more than the four corridors recommended by ITDP? (Wallwork)</li> </ul>		

Area	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
<b>UNSORTED COMMENTS (pages 105-111)</b>					
Impacts	Community Impacts are not represented	22-23, 33-35	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is not clear that an evaluation of community impacts was considered as a factor in determining feasibility (Pfetsch)</li> <li>• A definition of the community impact costs has not yet been attempted (Pfetsch)</li> <li>• Incomplete evaluation of feasibility (Pfetsch)</li> </ul>	Two examples of how community impacts were considered: lane repurposing was proposing where more people could be carried than in the general traffic lanes to avoid the addition of pavement with the required additional ROW; and the desired median busway treatments for segments of MD355 and Georgia Avenue were placed in Phase 2 because the impacts of doing so without considering land use impacts were considered too great.	
Technical Issues	<p>Complex investment requires metrics</p> <p>What are the objectives of the project?</p> <p>How will we know whether the project is a success?</p>	17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A mission need was not included in the process of defining measures of success. (Pfetsch)</li> <li>• Performance metrics should be established to evaluate success or failure of the project (Pfetsch)</li> <li>• Metrics should include transportation and community impact measures (Pfetsch)</li> </ul>	The need for the transit corridor network is set forth in the Vision section. The Plan will be implemented as a series of projects that will have to set the metrics for their success.	
General	It is still too cheap to drive		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Investigate ways other cities make driving less</li> </ul>	The goal of this Plan is to facilitate development of a BRT system that	

Area	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
<b>UNSORTED COMMENTS (pages 105-111)</b>					
	and park		attractive (Cavanaugh) • Goal is to get people out of their cars (Cavanaugh)	would provide people with an alternative to congested roads and to make better use of our transportation infrastructure.	
General			• North Woodside has to live with decisions made by officials to put the road users ahead of the livability of down-county neighborhoods (Woody Brosnan)	Community impacts have been considered in the development of this Plan to the extent possible for a countywide plan.	
Other (Georgia Avenue Study per SHA)			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SHA is studying changes to Georgia Ave between 16<sup>th</sup> and Forest Glen.</li> <li>• Priorities for left turn lanes to allow left turns off of Georgia during rush hour</li> <li>• Adherence to the North Silver Spring master plan calls for a median on Georgia Ave</li> <li>• BRT would eliminate any chance for a median and potentially eliminate businesses on one or both sides of this segment of</li> </ul>	We are coordinating with SHA’s project planning study for Georgia Avenue in Montgomery Hills.  Operational decisions must be made by MCDOT and SHA.  This Plan is consistent with the N-W Silver Spring Master Plan’s recommendation to provide a median in Montgomery Hills.  The plan does not include any ROW changes for Phase 1. Phase 2 would require additional ROW to implement a median busway but an area master plan effort must be undertaken following completion	

Area	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
<b>UNSORTED COMMENTS (pages 105-111)</b>					
			Georgia Ave (Woody Brosnan)	of the current project Montgomery Hills planning study.	
General			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support investing in BRT because it makes transit more accessible, encourages smart growth, and reduces air pollution (Smoot)</li> </ul>	Concur	
Coordination between the BRT and WOSG Plans			WOSG Plan’s higher density traffic modeling was based on a full-treatment “gold” level BRT system, i.e., a two-way dedicated transitway system without loss of travel lanes, NOT the single-lane transitway treatment recommended in the BRT Plan. (Finnegan)	It is correct that the WOSG Plan modeled network assumed a level of service for BRT that is consistent with a two way dedicated treatment. Steps were taken, however, in the development of the methodology used in the WOSG analysis to address this issue to the extent possible – given the timing of the plan and the technical aspects of the analysis. An explanation of the methodology is provided in pages 24-26 of the WOSG Transportation Appendix.	
General			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support efforts of others who are attempting to introduce affordable housing concepts and practices around the</li> </ul>	No land use changes are included in this Plan.	

Area	Issue to Be Resolved	Draft Plan (page)	Testimony (Commenter)	Staff Response	Board Decision
<b>UNSORTED COMMENTS (pages 105-111)</b>					
			planned transit stations of the Purple Line. (Watkins)		