



July 7, 2003

MEMORANDUM

TO: Montgomery County Planning Board

VIA: Jeffrey Zyontz, Chief
County-wide Planning Division

Richard C. Hawthorne, Chief
Transportation Planning

FROM: Alex Hekimian: 301-495-4525, for the Park and Planning Department *AH*

SUBJECT: Jones Bridge Road – Purple Line Busway Alternatives Analysis
Worksession

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Planning Board endorse and transmit to the County Council the results of the attached report, "Jones Bridge Road – Purple Line Alternatives Analysis," and the following recommendation:

If a future decision is made to place a busway instead of a light rail line in the Purple Line corridor, the results of this preliminary study indicate that it is clearly preferable to place a high-quality busway on the Georgetown Branch right-of-way rather than on Jones Bridge Road. Because there are significant concerns about placing a busway on Jones Bridge Road, the Planning Board recommends that this alternative not proceed to further study in detail by the Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT).

Based upon the public testimony on this issue, staff recommends adding some new text to the report. The new text is shown in Exhibit A.

BRIEF BACKGROUND

The Planning Board held a public hearing on June 26, 2003, regarding the report, "Jones Bridge Road – Purple Line Busway Alternatives Analysis." Exhibit B provides a

summary of the testimony from people who spoke at the hearing as well as those who subsequently sent letters until the public hearing record closed on July 1. Exhibit C is a compilation of the actual written testimony. Copies of the report and Exhibit C are in the Planning Board's packets only.

Having reviewed the testimony, staff has provided a response for each major issue raised, as shown in Exhibit B and in the "DISCUSSION" section of this memorandum. Based on this testimony, staff has concluded that some new text is warranted in the report.

Subsequent to the Board's worksession, the next step would be to transmit the Board's recommendations to the County Council for its consideration. The Council's Transportation and Environment Committee will be discussing the Board's recommendations on July 15.

DISCUSSION

During the review period, several overarching comments were presented that deserve specific detailed discussion. These include suggestions such as trying to fit a busway within the current Jones Bridge Road right-of-way, concerns about the Capital Crescent Trail being disturbed by a future busway, and an explanation of how the analysis accounted for the Riviera Condominium building adjacent to the Georgetown Branch right-of-way.

Suggestions by Delegate Hurson, Henry Kay, and Others

Several people, including Delegate John Hurson and Henry Kay (speaking on behalf of MDOT Secretary Flanagan) suggested that cross sections other than those staff studied would be less costly and could be accomplished within the current constrained right-of-way on Jones Bridge Road. For example, Delegate Hurson suggested that by using the current sidewalk width, planting strip, and roadway pavement, a single peak-direction bus lane could be created, thus causing some of those streetscape elements to be replaced or eliminated. Under his suggestion, buses in the off-peak direction would run in mixed traffic. Henry Kay, meanwhile, suggested that dedicated bus lanes may not be necessary for at least some segments of the corridor. Staff does not agree with such approaches because they run counter to the high-quality Purple Line concept. Unfortunately, they cause the busway to be self-limiting, ridership to be reduced, and cost-effectiveness to be unacceptably low.

One major point of apparent disagreement is how effective the busway must be to attract potential bus riders, especially new riders. Planning staff is working with forecasts that show that over 20,000 daily bus riders would use "bus rapid transit" (BRT) between Silver Spring and Bethesda. This ridership demand would require a large number of buses, short headways, dedicated bus lanes, grade-separations, and special bus terminals. Compromising the BRT approach by having, for example, peak-direction buses run in a single dedicated bus lane and off-peak-direction buses run in mixed

traffic and/or having queue jumpers for buses at some major intersections rather than providing grade-separations for buses, would cause longer travel times, much lower ridership levels, and a route that would not function as a high-quality service. As noted in the staff's report, delays of four minutes would lower ridership about 25 percent and hardly any new riders would be attracted to the bus service. The more time it takes for the trip, including the times to wait and to transfer, the fewer riders would choose the busway. That is why staff has consistently found that only a true BRT approach on Jones Bridge Road, using a dedicated bi-directional two-lane busway, would attract transit ridership comparable to busway or light rail on the Georgetown Branch right-of-way.

Delegate Hurson also questioned the routing of express buses on the busway in the Georgetown Branch right-of-way as they would enter and leave the Bethesda CBD. Staff assumed the routing that uses Pearl Street and other local streets into and out of the existing bus terminal at the Bethesda Metrorail station, as recommended in MTA's 1996 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). Our staff made no effort to justify or modify the routing, since this routing came directly from the State's previous study of a busway on the Georgetown Branch alignment. Our assumption is that the State's DEIS found that the existing infrastructure (the bus terminal at the Bethesda Metrorail station and surrounding access roads) would accommodate the additional vehicles generated by this busway alternative. Our bus ridership forecasts accounted for buses running slower on local streets for this short section of the route.

The following additional comments relate to specific suggestions by Delegate Hurson and others:

- The suggestion of implementing a one-lane, one-directional busway assumes not only that there is a large imbalance in the direction of travel demand, but also that there is a satisfactory way for buses in the off-peak direction to return in mixed traffic to the starting point for additional trips. The bus operating costs, and to some extent capital costs, for a busway on Jones Bridge Road are very much determined by how many round-trips a bus can make within the key peak demand times. The more runs there are, using the same drivers and vehicles, the more efficient the system would be. Putting buses in the "off-peak" direction in the mixed traffic lanes will subject them to delays and slower running speeds, requiring more vehicles to provide the same service levels. Also, the ratio of passenger demand by direction is approximately 2:1, meaning that, if buses are running every three minutes in the peak direction, they will be needed at least every six minutes in the off-peak direction. In staff's view, a priority bus lane of some sort would be needed to keep this many buses on schedule.

Staff has also identified several operational problems with a one-lane center busway. If "bollard-separated" from the general purpose lanes, the one-lane one-direction busway concept would not significantly reduce the required cross-section width since three separate travel "pipes" would be created,

each requiring sufficient width to maneuver around during recurring or non-recurring incidents. If each pipe needs to be at least 16-feet wide, the total 48-foot width is only eight feet less than the cross section staff proposed for the two-lane, bi-directional, undivided center busway. Also, the one-lane busway concept has the same operational problems as the two-lane undivided center busway in worsening safety and community accessibility. For example, a car waiting to turn left across the center bus lane, or a breakdown, would slow or even halt the bus movement in a situation where travel times and speeds are critical to cost containment. Staff studied the potential of two-lane, bi-directional busways because of the need to have reliable and fast bus service, with travel relatively unimpeded in both directions between the two ends of the route.

- Implementing a one-lane center busway lessens none of the concerns about a Jones Bridge Road busway changing the nature of the street or reducing the access to adjacent homes. Autos turning left into driveways will still need to cross a bus lane containing high-speed, articulated buses on short headways, and residents will not have any median for refuge as they cross the street. The eastern end of Jones Bridge Road, a residential street with an elementary school, would still become a major transit corridor for all-day bus travel. The “off-peak” direction buses would run even closer to the homes on either side of the road for at least one-half of the day in comparison to the staff-suggested center busway, since the buses in the off-peak direction would be in the outside lane next to the homes.
- Concerning the suggestion that narrower medians be used in the busway cross sections, staff agrees that in many places a six-foot median planting strip would be feasible and acceptable for the center busway with medians. The 15-foot medians were shown to identify the maximum needed where left turns will be allowed and left-turn lanes are carved out of the median. Medians less than six-feet wide could be considered as well, with the narrowest being the removal of medians altogether as shown in the staff report’s 78-foot-wide, undivided busway cross section.
- Using substandard widths for sidewalks, planting areas and medians was not proposed by staff and is strongly opposed. We feel that, in a situation where a major new transportation facility is being included in a neighborhood where none has been before, every effort must be made to provide sufficient basic streetscape elements appropriate for a residential community. This is the approach taken with every project proposed by the County and State, and the Board has consistently supported using such basic standards whenever physically feasible. Improving pedestrian and bicyclist accessibility and safety is a Montgomery County priority. Staff’s suggested cross sections reflect that priority and related design standards and practices.

- Delegate Hurson asked whether a Georgetown Branch busway alternative that uses Pearl Street and other local streets at the western end of the alignment would require a master plan amendment. Master plans and sector plans adopted in the early 1990s generally specified light-rail in the Georgetown Branch right-of-way, so one could argue that any new busway alternative might require a master plan amendment. Staff's view is that a rubber-tire transit service that performs like light-rail (i.e., a true BRT system) would satisfy the intent of those early 1990s master plans, but that queue jumpers would not. We recognize, however, that it's ultimately the County Council's decision as to whether or not an amendment would be needed.
- With regard to questions about the report's cost estimates for the busway projects, staff concurs that the term "mobilization/real estate" in Table 2 is confusing. The discussion on "soft costs" in the third bullet on page 22 refers to the mobilization/real estate line item in Table 2 and indicates that mobilization costs for the Jones Bridge Road busway were not double-counted but rather are pro-rata costs that increase as construction costs increase.
- Delegate Hurson asked why the Jones Bridge Road busway needs an underpass at Connecticut Avenue, whereas the Georgetown Branch busway needs an overpass at that intersection. The overpass for the Georgetown Branch busway is based on the MTA's 1996 DEIS and work performed in 2002 for the supplemental DEIS. An overpass works in part because consideration need not be given in the Georgetown Branch busway alignment to the operations of a signalized intersection below the structure. Unlike the Connecticut Avenue intersection at Jones Bridge Road, the Connecticut Avenue intersection at the Georgetown Branch right-of-way would not have to accommodate at-grade vehicular traffic crossings. Staff estimates that an overpass rather than an underpass at the intersection of the Jones Bridge Road busway and Connecticut Avenue could reduce the capital costs by approximately \$8 million, however, a structural design with piers in the center of the signalized intersection would need to be acceptable to the State Highway Administration. Also, an overpass would cause significant impacts on the adjacent community.

Capital Crescent Trail

Substantial testimony addressed the popularity and value of the Capital Crescent Trail and suggested that introducing a transitway to the Georgetown Branch right-of-way would compromise the experience that trail users have come to expect. Staff concurs that the trail experience would be significantly affected by an at-grade transitway in the same right-of-way.

Staff did not include substantive discussion of the Capital Crescent Trail planning and implementation in its report, as it believed that the prior planning and design efforts

to accommodate both the transitway and trail had been well documented. However, in response to the critique that the Capital Crescent Trail implementation was not adequately described in the report, we note that the County's planning and implementation efforts for the Capital Crescent Trail have consistently included a co-located transitway. A transitway in the Georgetown Branch right-of-way has been incorporated into local and regional adopted plans and included in local, state, and federally funded environmental impact studies for more than two decades:

- 1976 Bethesda CBD Sector Plan (County Council)
- 1986 Georgetown Branch Master Plan Amendment (County Council)
- 1988 Study of the Appropriateness and Applicability of Light Rail Transit in Maryland (MDOT)
- 1989 Georgetown Branch Corridor Study (MCDOT)
- 1990 Georgetown Branch Master Plan (County Council)
- 1990 Bethesda-Chevy Chase Master Plan (County Council)
- 1993 Silver Spring CBD Sector Plan (County Council)
- 1994 Bethesda CBD Sector Plan (County Council)
- 1995 Constrained Long Range Plan (MWCOCG)
- 1996 Georgetown Branch Transitway/Trail MIS / DEIS (MDOT)
- 2000 Silver Spring CBD Sector Plan (County Council)
- 2000 North and West Silver Spring Master Plan (County Council)

Portions of the trail east of Bethesda have been implemented since 1997, ahead of the transitway, due in part to the grass-roots support such as the Capital Crescent Trail Coalition. The County has supported the staged trail implementation to maximize use and, therefore, the return on investment of the transitway/trail right-of-way. At each stage, however, the County has applied the qualifying term "interim" to the trail to indicate that the trail will change when the master plan vision that led to trail implementation is fully realized.

Staff finds that the preponderance of the planning and design evidence supports the position that the same corridor can accommodate both the one million annual trail users estimated by trail supporters and the six million annual transit users forecast by staff.

Riviera Condominiums

The attached staff report has a corrected map #9 in Exhibit 2 that identifies the Riviera Condominiums building. No other related changes were necessary beyond changing the name of the building on the map. The staff report analysis had taken into account households at this location. Additional detailed fieldwork and analysis of the Riviera Condominiums after the public hearing confirmed the report's estimate that there are a total of 80 households, including those at the Riviera, within 50 feet of the Georgetown Branch right-of-way. For high-rise residential buildings, vertical distance is also factored into the count of households affected. The lower levels of the Riviera Condominiums building nearest the proposed transitway are parking levels, with most of

the residential units more than 50 feet away from the Georgetown Branch right-of-way. This building was also studied in the MTA analysis, "Purple Line: Bethesda to Silver Spring Segment Georgetown Branch Light Rail/Trail Conceptual Plans: December 2002," which includes an illustrative cross section of the light rail line relative to the building.

AH:ct

Enclosures

EXHIBIT A

Staff recommends inserting the following new section after the “Environmental Impacts” section of the original staff report:

STAFF RESPONSES TO PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS

The Planning Board held a public hearing on June 26, 2003 regarding this report. Exhibit 5 provides a summary of the major points from testimony of people who spoke at the hearing as well as of those who subsequently sent letters until the public hearing record closed on July 1.

During and after the public hearing on the staff report, several overarching comments were presented that deserve specific detailed discussion. These include suggestions, such as trying to fit a busway within the current Jones Bridge Road right-of-way, and concerns about the Capital Crescent Trail being disturbed by a future busway.

Suggestions by Delegate Hurson, Henry Kay, and Others

Several people, including Delegate John Hurson and Henry Kay (speaking on behalf of MDOT Secretary Flanagan) suggested that cross sections other than those staff studied would be less costly and could be accomplished within the current constrained right-of-way on Jones Bridge Road. For example, Delegate Hurson suggested that by using the current sidewalk width, planting strip, and roadway pavement, a single peak-direction bus lane could be created, thus causing some of those streetscape elements to be replaced or eliminated. Under his suggestion, buses in the off-peak direction would run in mixed traffic. Henry Kay, meanwhile, suggested that dedicated bus lanes may not be necessary for at least some segments of the corridor. Staff does not agree with such approaches because they run counter to the high-quality Purple Line concept. Unfortunately, they cause the busway to be self-limiting, ridership to be reduced, and cost-effectiveness to be unacceptably low.

One major point of apparent disagreement is how effective the busway must be to attract potential bus riders, especially new riders. Planning staff is working with forecasts that show that over 20,000 daily bus riders would use “bus rapid transit” (BRT) between Silver Spring and Bethesda. This ridership demand would require a large number of buses, short headways, dedicated bus lanes, grade-separations, and special bus terminals. Compromising the BRT approach by having, for example, peak-direction buses run in a single dedicated bus lane and off-peak-direction buses run in mixed traffic and/or having queue jumpers for buses at some major intersections rather than providing grade-separations for buses, would cause longer travel times, much lower ridership levels, and a route that would not function as a high-quality service. As noted in the staff’s report, delays of four minutes would lower ridership about 25 percent and hardly any new riders would be attracted to the bus service. The more time it takes for

the trip, including the times to wait and to transfer, the fewer riders would choose the busway. That is why staff has consistently found that only a true BRT approach on Jones Bridge Road, using a dedicated bi-directional two-lane busway, would attract transit ridership comparable to busway or light rail on the Georgetown Branch right-of-way.

Delegate Hurson also questioned the routing of express buses on the busway in the Georgetown Branch right-of-way as they would enter and leave the Bethesda CBD. Staff assumed the routing that uses Pearl Street and other local streets into and out of the existing bus terminal at the Bethesda Metrorail station, as recommended in MTA's 1996 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). Our staff made no effort to justify or modify the routing, since this routing came directly from the State's previous study of a busway on the Georgetown Branch alignment. Our assumption is that the State's DEIS found that the existing infrastructure (the bus terminal at the Bethesda Metrorail station and surrounding access roads) would accommodate the additional vehicles generated by this busway alternative. Our bus ridership forecasts accounted for buses running slower on local streets for this short section of the route.

The following additional comments relate to specific suggestions by Delegate Hurson and others:

- The suggestion of implementing a one-lane, one-directional busway assumes not only that there is a large imbalance in the direction of travel demand, but also that there is a satisfactory way for buses in the off-peak direction to return in mixed traffic to the starting point for additional trips. The bus operating costs, and to some extent capital costs, for a busway on Jones Bridge Road are very much determined by how many round-trips a bus can make within the key peak demand times. The more runs there are, using the same drivers and vehicles, the more efficient the system would be. Putting buses in the "off-peak" direction in the mixed traffic lanes will subject them to delays and slower running speeds, requiring more vehicles to provide the same service levels. Also, the ratio of passenger demand by direction is approximately 2:1, meaning that, if buses are running every three minutes in the peak direction, they will be needed at least every six minutes in the off-peak direction. In staff's view, a priority bus lane of some sort would be needed to keep this many buses on schedule.

Staff has also identified several operational problems with a one-lane center busway. If "bollard-separated" from the general purpose lanes, the one-lane one-direction busway concept would not significantly reduce the required cross-section width since three separate travel "pipes" would be created, each requiring sufficient width to maneuver around during recurring or non-recurring incidents. If each pipe needs to be at least 16-feet wide, the total 48-foot width is only eight feet less than the cross section staff proposed for the two-lane, bi-directional, undivided center busway. Also, the one-lane busway concept has the same operational problems as the two-lane undivided center

busway in worsening safety and community accessibility. For example, a car waiting to turn left across the center bus lane, or a breakdown, would slow or even halt the bus movement in a situation where travel times and speeds are critical to cost containment. Staff studied the potential of two-lane, bi-directional busways because of the need to have reliable and fast bus service, with travel relatively unimpeded in both directions between the two ends of the route.

- Implementing a one-lane center busway lessens none of the concerns about a Jones Bridge Road busway changing the nature of the street or reducing the access to adjacent homes. Autos turning left into driveways will still need to cross a bus lane containing high-speed, articulated buses on short headways, and residents will not have any median for refuge as they cross the street. The eastern end of Jones Bridge Road, a residential street with an elementary school, would still become a major transit corridor for all-day bus travel. The "off-peak" direction buses would run even closer to the homes on either side of the road for at least one-half of the day in comparison to the staff-suggested center busway, since the buses in the off-peak direction would be in the outside lane next to the homes.
- Concerning the suggestion that narrower medians be used in the busway cross sections, staff agrees that in many places a six-foot median planting strip would be feasible and acceptable for the center busway with medians. The 15-foot medians were shown to identify the maximum needed where left turns will be allowed and left-turn lanes are carved out of the median. Medians less than six-feet wide could be considered as well, with the narrowest being the removal of medians altogether as shown in the staff report's 78-foot-wide, undivided busway cross section.
- Using substandard widths for sidewalks, planting areas and medians was not proposed by staff and is strongly opposed. We feel that, in a situation where a major new transportation facility is being included in a neighborhood where none has been before, every effort must be made to provide sufficient basic streetscape elements appropriate for a residential community. This is the approach taken with every project proposed by the County and State, and the Board has consistently supported using such basic standards whenever physically feasible. Improving pedestrian and bicyclist accessibility and safety is a Montgomery County priority. Staff's suggested cross sections reflect that priority and related design standards and practices.
- Delegate Hurson asked whether a Georgetown Branch busway alternative that uses Pearl Street and other local streets at the western end of the alignment would require a master plan amendment. Master plans and sector plans adopted in the early 1990s generally specified light-rail in the Georgetown Branch right-of-way, so one could argue that any new busway alternative might require a master plan amendment. Staff's view is that a

rubber-tire transit service that performs like light-rail (i.e., a true BRT system) would satisfy the intent of those early 1990s master plans, but that queue jumpers would not. We recognize, however, that it's ultimately the County Council's decision as to whether or not an amendment would be needed.

- With regard to questions about the report's cost estimates for the busway projects, staff concurs that the term "mobilization/real estate" in Table 2 is confusing. The discussion on "soft costs" in the third bullet on page 22 refers to the mobilization/real estate line item in Table 2 and indicates that mobilization costs for the Jones Bridge Road busway were not double-counted but rather are pro-rata costs that increase as construction costs increase.
- Delegate Hurson asked why the Jones Bridge Road busway needs an underpass at Connecticut Avenue, whereas the Georgetown Branch busway needs an overpass at that intersection. The overpass for the Georgetown Branch busway is based on the MTA's 1996 DEIS and work performed in 2002 for the supplemental DEIS. An overpass works in part because consideration need not be given in the Georgetown Branch busway alignment to the operations of a signalized intersection below the structure. Unlike the Connecticut Avenue intersection at Jones Bridge Road, the Connecticut Avenue intersection at the Georgetown Branch right-of-way would not have to accommodate at-grade vehicular traffic crossings. Staff estimates that an overpass rather than an underpass at the intersection of the Jones Bridge Road busway and Connecticut Avenue could reduce the capital costs by approximately \$8 million, however, a structural design with piers in the center of the signalized intersection would need to be acceptable to the State Highway Administration. Also, an overpass would cause significant impacts on the adjacent community.

Capital Crescent Trail

Substantial testimony addressed the popularity and value of the Capital Crescent Trail and suggested that introducing a transitway to the Georgetown Branch right-of-way would compromise the experience that trail users have come to expect. Staff concurs that the trail experience would be significantly affected by an at-grade transitway in the same right-of-way.

Staff did not include substantive discussion of the Capital Crescent Trail planning and implementation in its report, as it believed that the prior planning and design efforts to accommodate both the transitway and trail had been well documented. However, in response to the critique that the Capital Crescent Trail implementation was not adequately described in the report, we note that the County's planning and implementation efforts for the Capital Crescent Trail have consistently included a co-located transitway. A transitway in the Georgetown Branch right-of-way has been

incorporated into local and regional adopted plans and included in local, state, and federally funded environmental impact studies for more than two decades:

- 1976 Bethesda CBD Sector Plan (County Council)
- 1986 Georgetown Branch Master Plan Amendment (County Council)
- 1988 Study of the Appropriateness and Applicability of Light Rail Transit in Maryland (MDOT)
- 1989 Georgetown Branch Corridor Study (MCDOT)
- 1990 Georgetown Branch Master Plan (County Council)
- 1990 Bethesda-Chevy Chase Master Plan (County Council)
- 1993 Silver Spring CBD Sector Plan (County Council)
- 1994 Bethesda CBD Sector Plan (County Council)
- 1995 Constrained Long Range Plan (MWCOG)
- 1996 Georgetown Branch Transitway/Trail MIS / DEIS (MDOT)
- 2000 Silver Spring CBD Sector Plan (County Council)
- 2000 North and West Silver Spring Master Plan (County Council)

Portions of the trail east of Bethesda have been implemented since 1997, ahead of the transitway, due in part to the grass-roots support such as the Capital Crescent Trail Coalition. The County has supported the staged trail implementation to maximize use and, therefore, the return on investment of the transitway/trail right-of-way. At each stage, however, the County has applied the qualifying term "interim" to the trail to indicate that the trail will change when the master plan vision that led to trail implementation is fully realized.

Staff finds that the preponderance of the planning and design evidence supports the position that the same corridor can accommodate both the one million annual trail users estimated by trail supporters and the six million annual transit users forecast by staff.

EXHIBIT B

**JONES BRIDGE ROAD – PURPLE LINE BUSWAY ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS PUBLIC HEARING TESTIMONY
JUNE 26, 2003**

| Comments | Staff Response |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>Oppose busway on Jones Bridge Rd. Ronald Resh, on behalf of Bethesda-Chevy Chase Chamber of Commerce*; Harry Sanders, on behalf of Action Committee for Transit*; Webb Smedley, on behalf of Coalition to Build the Inner Purple Line*; Perry Berman, on behalf of Howard Hughes Medical Institute*; Connie Fernandini*; Iris Fernandini*; Ronald Tripp*; Krishna Kundu & Leo Paladini; Emmett Roden; Milos, Svetlana, & Pavle Doroslovacki; A. Grant-Suttie; T. Tagamets; Jonathan Meyer; Richard & Donna Curtiss; Miriam & Leonard Rosenberg; Irvin Blass; John Minton; Joseph Strnad; Robert Ragland; Mrs. Richard Pierson; Joyce & Robert Hershey; L. E. Mobin; Donald Graybill; Mr. & Mrs. Alfred Maier; Ronald Wange; Stephen and Holly Rhodes; Ian Plenderleith; Jane & Irwin Papish; Johan Milbrink; Beatrice Marie; Bonnie & Gene Wicklund; Alan Fox; Christa Stanoyevitch; Pauline Steinhorn; Margaret Go; Reda & Nadia Asaad; Gregory Gagarin; Felicity McGrath; Dave Jarvis; Cris Bombaugh, on behalf of Greater Silver Spring Chamber of Commerce</p> | <p>51 people expressed their opposition to a busway on Jones Bridge Rd. See attached letters.</p> |
| <p>Prefer busway on the Georgetown Branch right-of-way. Mayor Kathy Porter, on behalf of the City of Takoma Park*; Connie Fernandini*; Iris Fernandini; Howard Kaplan; Dave Jarvis</p> | <p>5 people expressed a preference for a busway on the Georgetown Branch right-of-way. See attached letters.</p> |
| <p>Oppose busway on Georgetown Branch right-of-way. Harry Sanders, on behalf of Action Committee for Transit*; Webb Smedley, on behalf of Coalition to Build the Inner Purple Line*; Ronald Tripp*; Mitchell Duvall, on behalf of Riviera Condominium Association*; Cris Bombaugh, on behalf of Greater Silver Spring Chamber of Commerce</p> | <p>5 people expressed their opposition to a busway on the Georgetown Branch right-of-way. See attached letters.</p> |
| <p>Continue to support light rail, with Capital Crescent Trail, on Georgetown Branch right-of-way. Robert Weesner, on behalf of Village of North Chevy Chase*; Ronald Resh, on behalf of Bethesda-Chevy Chase Chamber of Commerce*; Harry Sanders, on behalf of Action Committee for Transit*; Webb Smedley, on behalf of Coalition to Build the Inner Purple Line*; Krishna Kundu & Leo Paladini; Randell Prothro; Milos, Svetlana, & Pavle Doroslovacki; A. Grant-Suttie; T. Tagamets; Jonathan Meyer; Richard & Donna Curtiss; Miriam & Leonard Rosenberg; Irvin Blass; John Minton; Joseph Strnad; Robert Ragland; Mrs. Richard Pierson; Joyce & Robert Hershey; L. E. Mobin; Donald Graybill; Mr. & Mrs. Alfred Maier; Ronald Wange; Stephen and Holly Rhodes; Ian Plenderleith; Jane & Irwin Papish; Johan Milbrink; Beatrice Marie; Bonnie & Gene Wicklund; Alan Fox; Christa Stanoyevitch; Pauline Steinhorn; Margaret Go; Reda & Nadia Asaad; Gregory Gagarin; Felicity McGrath; Cris Bombaugh, on behalf of Greater Silver Spring Chamber of Commerce</p> | <p>46 people expressed their continued support for light rail and trail on the Georgetown Branch right-of-way. See attached letters.</p> |

| Comments | Staff Response |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>Support Capital Crescent Trail, without transit, on Georgetown Branch right-of-way. Mayor Mier Wolf, on behalf of Town of Chevy Chase*; Pam Browning, on behalf of Petition Drive to Save the Trail*; Andy O'Hare, on behalf of East Bethesda Citizens Association*; John Warnock and Bev Denbo, on behalf of Greater Bethesda-Chevy Chase Coalition*; Alan Ward*; Emmett Roden; Ron Tripp; Eric Peek, on behalf of Coquelin Run Citizens Association</p> | <p>9 people expressed their support for a trail, without transit, on the Georgetown Branch right-of-way. See attached letters.</p> |
| <p>Implement better bus service on existing east-west roads first. Mayor Mier Wolf, on behalf of Town of Chevy Chase*; Andy O'Hare, on behalf of East Bethesda Citizens Association*</p> | <p>New and creative ways of improving existing bus service are certainly worth pursuing by this region's bus operating agencies. However, new bus routes and increased frequency of bus service on existing east-west roads would not attract many new riders as long as buses continue to get bogged down in congested traffic. Dedicated lanes for buses help assure speed and reliability of bus service, offering an appealing link between Silver Spring and Bethesda and attracting new riders.</p> |
| <p>Continue looking at alternative alignments, vehicle types, and treatments for east-west transitway. Henry Kay, on behalf of Maryland Secretary of Transportation*; Mayor Mier Wolf, on behalf of Town of Chevy Chase*; Pam Browning, on behalf of Petition Drive to Save the Trail*; Andy O'Hare, on behalf of East Bethesda Citizens Association*; John Warnock, on behalf of Greater Bethesda-Chevy Chase Coalition*; Edward Finn, on behalf of The Committee to Save the Trail*; Alan Ward*; Pat Baptiste*; Bill Vincent, on behalf of Breakthrough Technologies Institute; Delegate John Hurson; Rachael Gingrich; Lou Cantolupo; Eric Peek, on behalf of Coquelin Run Citizens Association</p> | <p>Further study of a busway alternative between Silver Spring and Bethesda is worthwhile, however, in staff's opinion, Jones Bridge Rd. does not lend itself to the type of busway that would be needed.</p> |
| <p>May not need dedicated lanes for express buses – consider running them in mixed traffic. Henry Kay, on behalf of Maryland Secretary of Transportation*; Roger Mitchell, on behalf of Elm, Oakridge, Lynn Civic Association*</p> | <p>Running buses in mixed traffic reduces bus speeds and degrades reliability of service. Such bus service cannot be considered "bus rapid transit."</p> |
| <p>Do not put express buses in mixed traffic. Mayor Kathy Porter, on behalf of the City of Takoma Park*</p> | <p>Staff agrees.</p> |
| <p>Prefer underground Metrorail connection between Bethesda and Silver Spring. Elizabeth Buchanek & Joseph Parlante</p> | <p>The examination of this very costly option was not within the work scope of this study.</p> |
| <p>Busway on Jones Bridge Rd. would encroach on and cause accessibility, safety, and/or noise problems for nearby residences and/or institutions. Robert Weesner, on behalf of Village of North Chevy Chase*; Harry Sanders, on behalf of Action Committee for Transit*; Webb Smedley, on behalf of Coalition to Build the Inner Purple Line*; Perry Berman, on behalf of Howard Hughes Medical Institute*; Connie Fernandini*; Iris Fernandini*; Eleanor Rice; Gregory Gagarin; Felicity McGrath; Reda & Nadia Asaad</p> | <p>Staff agrees that these problems would make a busway on Jones Bridge Rd. an undesirable option.</p> |
| <p>Busway on Jones Bridge Rd. would not improve transit between Silver Spring and Bethesda. Harry Sanders, on behalf of Action Committee for Transit*; Gregory Gagarin</p> | <p>For bus trips between Silver Spring and Bethesda, staff concurs that a Jones Bridge busway would not be a good alternative to the more direct bus service on East-West Highway.</p> |
| <p>Busway on Jones Bridge Rd. would not be cost-effective. Harry Sanders, on behalf of Action Committee for Transit*; Felicity McGrath</p> | <p>Staff agrees.</p> |

| Comments | Staff Response |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>When accounting for additional bus ridership due to extension to New Carrollton, buses can't handle the demand, and the community adjacent to Jones Bridge Rd. won't tolerate heavy bus traffic. Harry Sanders, on behalf of Action Committee for Transit*; Webb Smedley, on behalf of Coalition to Build the Inner Purple Line*</p> | <p>Since the impact of extending the busway to New Carrollton was not examined closely in this study, additional review would be required.</p> |
| <p>Busway on Jones Bridge Rd. would cause unacceptable impacts on traffic. Webb Smedley, on behalf of Coalition to Build the Inner Purple Line*; Emmett Roden; Ronald Wange; Richard & Donna Curtiss; Joseph Strnad; John Minton; Miriam & Leonard Rosenberg; Stephen and Holly Rhodes; L. E. Mobin; Bonnie & Gene Wicklund; Pauline Steinhorn; Reda & Nadia Asaad</p> | <p>Staff agrees.</p> |
| <p>Consider grade separation at Jones Mill Rd. (bus only) and at Connecticut Ave. (all vehicles), and at-grade queue jumper at MD 355. Henry Kay, on behalf of Maryland Secretary of Transportation*</p> | <p>All-vehicle grade separation of Connecticut Avenue below Jones Bridge Road would likely improve the overall level of traffic service. However, such a grade separation would be more costly and result in higher delays for JBRB transit vehicles than the busway-only grade separation evaluated by staff.</p> <p>Signal cycle lengths along MD 355 are generally about three minutes in length. Therefore, even with queue jumpers, JBRB buses with an exclusive signal phase would be expected to incur, on average, about one and a half minutes of delay per trip and a loss of schedule reliability.</p> |
| <p>Consider putting transitway under ground in portions of Georgetown Branch right-of-way. Pat Baptiste*</p> | <p>Staff concurs that such creative mitigation techniques within the Georgetown Branch right-of-way warrant consideration and further study.</p> |
| <p>Make changes in staff report to reflect existence of Riviera Condominiums. Mitchell Duvall, on behalf of Riviera Condominium Association*</p> | <p>No changes are necessary beyond changing the name of the building on the map, which has been done. The staff report analysis took into account the building at this location.</p> |
| <p>Reduce width of suggested busway cross sections. Delegate John Hurson</p> | <p>See specific section of staff report responding to Delegate Hurson comments</p> |
| <p>The western terminus of a busway on the Georgetown Branch right-of-way is problematic. Delegate John Hurson</p> | <p>See specific section of staff report responding to Delegate Hurson comments</p> |
| <p>Busway cost estimates need better explanations. Delegate John Hurson</p> | <p>See specific section of staff report responding to Delegate Hurson comments</p> |
| <p>Suggest that daily-to-peak transit ridership ratio be closer to 3.0 for Jones Bridge Rd. busway alternative. Harry Sanders, on behalf of Action Committee for Transit*</p> | <p>Staff finds substantial overlap in the origin-destination patterns for both GBB and JBRB alignments during the peak period. Based on this similarity, staff felt the assumed peak-to-daily ratios should be identical.</p> |

* Spoke at June 26 Public Hearing