

**EXHIBIT A - Public & Agency Comments, Staff Responses**  
 (COUNTYWIDE BIKEWAYS FUNCTIONAL MASTER PLAN)

#	Public or Agency Comment	Staff Response	Recommendation
1	<p><b>Structure and Order</b></p> <p>This is a well-written document, however the County Executive would like to see the document maintain its focus on the planning of bikeways. The design and operational elements included in the draft are informational but typically not found in the body of a planning document. While DPWT wants the plan to be a practical working document, actual implementation practices should be left to the agencies that construct and maintain bikeways so that they have the flexibility to adopt innovative practices and technologies over time. In cases where implementation issues must be discussed, the County recommends that <i>AASHTO Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities</i> be used as the main design guideline document. <b>Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</b></p>	<p>While most master plans in Montgomery County do not include design elements, nearly all bicycle planning documents nationwide contain a design section.</p> <p>However, Montgomery County is different from the rest of the country in that planning is done by one agency (M-NCPPC) and implementation is spread among multiple agencies (DPWT, SHA, others). This complicates the issue.</p> <p>The Design section is important for many reasons. It not only provides guidance to implementing agencies, but also educates and informs the public on what to expect to see on the ground when a certain type of facility is recommended for a particular road or segment of road.</p>	<p>The Planning Board and the County Council do not necessarily need to endorse specific designs or design concepts. Therefore, the design section will be retained as an appendix for information purposes only. This will allow implementing agencies more flexibility over the life of the plan to utilize future innovative bikeway designs.</p>
2	<p>Overall many of the details are buried in text and therefore difficult to find. It would be helpful to simplify the text and bullet many of the items. These could be followed by explanatory but abbreviated text.</p> <p>Although the executive branch has many comments, recommendations and deletions, it should not be construed as a negative reaction to the plan itself. The goal is to have the best master plan possible with our agencies working together to make it happen.</p>	<p>Globally restructuring the document would take an enormous amount of time and energy. Staff welcomes any suggestions from DPWT for improving or clarifying specific chapters or sections.</p>	<p>Ways to simplify the text, including using more bulleted items followed by discussions, will be considered. Staff will present proposed revised text at Worksession #2.</p>

**EXHIBIT A - Public & Agency Comments, Staff Responses**  
 (COUNTYWIDE BIKEWAYS FUNCTIONAL MASTER PLAN)

#	Public or Agency Comment	Staff Response	Recommendation
3	<p><b>Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</b>                      Chapters 4 and 5 involve operations rather than physical planning. DPWT requests that these become appendices. <b>Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</b></p>	<p>Chapter 4 is the most important chapter of the plan. It establishes the timeframe for implementing and meeting the goals of the plan. Any language in this chapter that directs DPWT or other agencies to do something will be removed or modified. In addition, "should" will be changed to "should consider" to soften plan recommendations.</p> <p>Chapter 5 could become an appendix. While it highlights important programs and policies to complement to bikeway network and encourage more people to use the bikeway system and bicycle infrastructure, the recommendations do not necessarily need to be endorsed as County policy.</p>	<p>Chapter 4 will be retained in the body of the plan. However, Chapter 5 will become an appendix. As an appendix, the information can still be used by both the County and the public to develop and shape a comprehensive bicycle program for the County without actually committing the County to any specific programs or activities.</p>
4	<p><b>Countywide Bikeways Map</b>                      The map should include street names and should provide a brief statement referring to individual master plans for other planned bikeways. <b>Gail Tait-Nouri on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</b></p>	<p>The black and white version of the map included in the public hearing draft includes bikeway names, which mostly correspond to street names. The final version of the Countywide Bikeway map will be in color and include bikeway names similar to the black and white version in the public hearing draft, but it should be much easier to read and interpret. A note will be added to the map that references all community master plans and sector plans.</p>	<p>The final approved and adopted countywide bikeways map will be in color and include bikeway names. Adding names of streets not identified as bikeways will be explored and considered.</p>

**EXHIBIT A - Public & Agency Comments, Staff Responses**  
(COUNTYWIDE BIKEWAYS FUNCTIONAL MASTER PLAN)

#	Public or Agency Comment	Staff Response	Recommendation
	<b>CHAPTER 1 – specific comments</b> <b>Why Bicycling? (p.1)</b>		
5	Consider adding two more reasons: need and cost. Not everyone can drive, including anyone under age 16, and many people cannot afford a car. Additionally, the plan should mention that would-be drivers often choose bicycling because it is non-polluting and doesn't use fossil fuels. <b>Jack Cochrane, on behalf of Montgomery Bicycle Advocates (MOBIKE).</b>	The last sentence of the first paragraph under this subheading hints at these first two points, but perhaps does not make it clear.  Indeed, many people choose to because they want to help the environment and reduce consumption of fossil fuels.	The language will be modified in this paragraph to clarify. Staff will present revised text at Worksession #2.  The plan also will mention that many people choose to bicycle for altruistic reasons, which in turn reaps benefits for the environment.
6	<b>Plan Scope (pp. 1-2)</b> Non-freeway roads with speeds greater than 50 mph, that also have bikeable shoulders, are also legal bicycle facilities. <b>John Fauerby</b>	Bicycling is allowed on shoulders along State highways with posted speeds greater than 50 mph.	This section will be revised to reflect this information. Staff will present revised text at Worksession #2
7	<b>Plan Concepts (pp. 5-7)</b> Goals and objectives should be numbered and arranged hierarchically, with each goal expanded into a number of objectives. Plan objectives should be distinguished from bikeway network objectives, perhaps by putting the former into a separate section. <b>Jack Cochrane, on behalf of Montgomery Bicycle Advocates (MOBIKE).</b>	The structure of the plan's purposes, goals and objectives are fine as is. Since this is a bikeway network master plan, it is not necessary to differentiate between plan goals and bikeway network goals. They are more or less the same.	
8	Another goal should be continuity within each facility type. For example, a multi-use path network should be coherent by itself and not force path users into shared roadways (and vice versa). <b>Jack Cochrane, on behalf of Montgomery Bicycle Advocates (MOBIKE).</b>	See third bulleted item under Guiding Principles (page 6). Shared use paths inevitably terminate somewhere, often leading bicyclists to other bikeways along roads some of which are off-road and some of which are on-road. Due to space constraints and environmental impacts, it is not possible to have a continuous off-road bikeway network throughout the County. It must be supplemented by bike lanes and shared roadways.	
9	Change second bulleted item under <i>plan objectives</i> to read:	Agree	The objective will be modified to read

**EXHIBIT A - Public & Agency Comments, Staff Responses**  
(COUNTYWIDE BIKEWAYS FUNCTIONAL MASTER PLAN)

#	Public or Agency Comment	Staff Response	Recommendation
	<p>“Provide connections to current or planned bicycle facilities in the adjacent counties and the District.” The current language is not very readable; it is not clear what “adjoining jurisdictions” means. <b>John Fauerby</b></p>		<p>as follows: “Provide connections to current or planned bicycle facilities in the adjacent counties, the District of Columbia, and the cities of Rockville and Gaithersburg.”</p>
10	<p><b>Types of Bicyclists (pp. 7-8)</b> Under Advanced and Experienced Cyclists, change “signed shared roadway, bike lanes” to “signed shared roadway, bike lanes, and bikeable shoulders” <b>John Fauerby</b></p>	<p>Bikeable shoulders are a sub-category of Shared Roadways as defined by AASHTO. They are not highlighted as a separate category under this plan.</p>	
11	<p>Under Child cyclists, note that bike lanes and bikeable shoulders are also safe for children. <b>John Fauerby</b></p>	<p>Research shows that child bicyclists (those under age 10) lack traffic sense and therefore should not ride on-road. Child bicyclists under 10 should be encouraged to ride on neighborhood streets, shared use paths and sidewalks. Child bicyclists over age 10 can ride with traffic (in bike lanes or bikeable shoulders) after learning basic rules of the road and traffic laws.<sup>1</sup></p>	<p>The section will be reworded to add these important points. Staff will present proposed revised text at Worksession #2.</p>
	<p><b>Benefits of A Comprehensive Bikeway Network (pp.8-9)</b></p>	<p>Agree</p>	<p>The plan will note that the TERP program is complete.</p>
12	<p>Under environmental benefits (p.8), note that the TERP program is complete. <b>Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</b></p>		
13	<p>Under Existing Bikeway System, hiker-biker trails should be referred to as Park trails as not to confuse the reader. <b>Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</b></p>	<p>Both the County and M-NCPPC have been using the term hiker-biker trail for many years. However AASHTO recommends using the generic term “shared use path” for all paths along roads that are designed for transportation.</p> <p>The term “hiker-biker trail” will</p>	<p>The term “(parks)” will be added immediately following any reference to hiker-biker trails in the plan to more clearly identify hiker-biker trails as park facilities.</p>

<sup>1</sup> National Safe Kids Campaign, [http://www.safekids.org/tier3\\_cd.cfm?folder\\_id=301&content\\_item\\_id=7152](http://www.safekids.org/tier3_cd.cfm?folder_id=301&content_item_id=7152).

**EXHIBIT A - Public & Agency Comments, Staff Responses**  
(COUNTYWIDE BIKEWAYS FUNCTIONAL MASTER PLAN)

#	Public or Agency Comment	Staff Response	Recommendation
		continue to be used to describe shared use paths located within parkland that are primarily used for recreation. However, the term should no longer be used to describe roadside path since roadside paths are considered transportation facilities.	
14	<b>Existing County Bikeway System (pp. 9-13)</b> The plan's use of acronyms, CIP, CBFMP and ICC for example, should be limited or perhaps a list of terms should be provided. <b>Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</b>	Staff agrees a glossary of terms would be useful.	A list of terms and acronyms will be added as an appendix. Staff will present a proposed glossary of terms at Worksession #2.
15	The plan refers to the Metropolitan Branch Trail as if it exists in its entirety. <b>Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</b>	References to the Metropolitan Branch Trail may suggest the trail is complete.	Under District of Columbia (page 12), the word "proposed" will be added prior to the word "Metropolitan" in the fourth sentence.
16	The plan should state newly proposed bike lanes and shared use path for MacArthur Boulevard and that these unscheduled upgrades would occur simultaneously. <b>Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</b>	The proposed changes to MacArthur Boulevard were made after the release of the public hearing draft of this plan.	Any references to this road in the plan will note the newly proposed changes to bikeway designs.
17	The paragraph on page 12 about 18 interjurisdictional connections should be moved to the beginning of Regional Bikeway Connectivity. <b>Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</b>	This paragraph is under the Loudoun County subheading and refers to the Loudoun County plan only, not the CBFMP as a whole. Montgomery County has dozens of interjurisdictional bikeway connections.	To clarify, these connections will be described in the first paragraph under the Regional Bikeway Connectivity on page 11. Staff will present revised text for this section at Worksession #2.
18	Under Fairfax County, the alignment of the path connection on the American Legion Bridge needs further study and coordination with Fairfax County and the National Park Service. <b>Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</b>	The fifth sentence of this paragraph states that connections to Fairfax County require further study. This path would require coordination with the National Park Service since it passes over the C&O Canal National Historic Park.	Text will be added to reflect the required coordination with the National Park Service.
19	<b>Multi-Modal Travel (pp. 13-14)</b> The County's Ride On Bus System should be added to section discussing <i>Bicycle Accommodations - Transit</i> . Ride On also	The section on Metrobuses discusses bike racks on the County's Ride On	To clarify, the section subheading will be changed to "Local and Regional Bus

**EXHIBIT A - Public & Agency Comments, Staff Responses**  
(COUNTYWIDE BIKEWAYS FUNCTIONAL MASTER PLAN)

#	Public or Agency Comment	Staff Response	Recommendation
20	allows bikes on buses. The subheading should reflect Ride On as well. <b>Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive; John Fauerby; Lynne Rosenbusch</b>	buses, but it is buried in the text. The section heading does not reflect the Ride On program.	Transit.”
21	Under Metrorail, mention ride on rail. <b>Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</b>	This is an important program during non-peak commute hours and should have been included.	Ride on Rail will be added to this section. Staff will present revised text for this section at Worksession #2.
21	Delete the sentence referring to the County owning property around certain Metro stations and the installation of bike racks unless specific areas can be cited. <b>Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</b>	The County currently owns land near or surrounding numerous Metrorail stations, most notably Bethesda and Silver Spring, and likely will own land in the future around Shady Grove. These parcels of land could accommodate additional bike racks or lockers in the future, should demand increase. However, since bicyclists only will use racks and lockers located immediate adjacent to or within a transit station, text could be added to this section to encourage WMATA to consider installing additional bicycle parking facilities on their property and to generally use existing space more efficiently.	Text will be added to this section to encourage WMATA to consider installing additional bicycle parking facilities on their property and to generally use existing space more efficiently. Staff will present proposed revised text for this section to Worksession #2.
22	“Other Transit Corridors” should be retitled “Future Transit Corridors.” <b>Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</b>	Agree	The subheading will be changed to “Future Transit Corridors.”
23	Under Park and Ride, a few of the County’s park and ride lots feature bike racks, not lockers. Last sentence should read “‘is’ expected to be adequate.” <b>Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</b>	DPWT Commuter Services has not inventoried bike parking at commuter lots but confirms that many park and ride lots feature bike racks. The Park and Ride lot at Georgia Avenue (MD 97) and Norbeck Road (MD 28) features bike lockers and other lots may feature them as well.	In the last sentence, “are” will be changed to “is” to make it grammatically correct.  Language will be added to the description to highlight difficulties associated with administering bike locker programs, and difficulties associated with theft and vandalism since many lots are remote and do not

**EXHIBIT A - Public & Agency Comments, Staff Responses**  
(COUNTYWIDE BIKEWAYS FUNCTIONAL MASTER PLAN)

#	Public or Agency Comment	Staff Response	Recommendation
24	Under Bike Stations, add valet parking for bicycles (this is a key feature). Also, the Bike Station is still a recommended component, not an integral component. <b>Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</b>	Agree	have surveillance. Staff will present revised text for this section at Worksession #2. Valet bicycle parking will be added to the description. The word "recommended" will be added to the second sentence after the word "significant." Staff will present proposed revised text for this section at Worksession #2.
25	Under Bicycle Parking, showers should be encouraged in conjunction with bike storage. All public bike racks should be covered when possible. This will encourage usage and ridership since most people do not want to leave their bicycles unprotected from weather. A pilot of this at the Grosvenor Metrorail Station found that more bikes parked in the covered racks resulted in an increase in bikes parked at the racks overall. In this case, the lockers were already full. Simple roof structures or racks such as "Bike Lids" also could be utilized. <b>Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</b>	Showers and changing rooms are indeed an important incentive for employees to bike to work and should be encouraged for all new office buildings in the County.  Covered bike parking also should be encouraged whenever possible.	The description will be modified to include information about protecting bike racks from weather and about showers and changing facilities. Staff will present revised text for this section at Worksession #2.
26	The BUP/BTS program is a joint program with the County and State. The Silver Spring and North Bethesda TMDs do not install bike racks upon request. They work with the County and State and that program is complete. <b>Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</b>	Bike racks are installed by DPWT in the County's transportation management districts at the request of employers located within the TMDs.  However, Commuter Services, which oversees all the TMDs in the County, still partners with the County's bicycle program and TMD employers to fund and install bike racks and lockers. This service remains an important traffic mitigation measure for the County and particularly for transportation management districts.	The second paragraph under Bicycle Parking will be rewritten to reflect the comments, which are mostly correct. Staff will present proposed revised text for this section at Worksession #2.
27	Delete the Planning Process section and Table 1-2. This information could become an Appendix, if necessary at all. <b>Gail</b>	Staff agrees this information is not necessary to include in the document.	The section and table will be deleted

**EXHIBIT A - Public & Agency Comments, Staff Responses**  
(COUNTYWIDE BIKEWAYS FUNCTIONAL MASTER PLAN)

#	Public or Agency Comment	Staff Response	Recommendation
	Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.		
	<b>CHAPTER 2 – specific comments</b>		
	<b>Background and Definitions (p.17)</b>		
28	Shared Use Path should be identified with a “(Class I)” afterward. It is doubtful that the County can change the nomenclature fully since multiple master plans refer to the older term. <b>Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</b>	Staff concurs: Changing this nomenclature will take time.	“(Class I)” will be added after the term “shared use path” intermittently throughout the document to remind readers of this recent change in nomenclature. Related, “(Class II)” will be added after the term “Bike Lanes” intermittently throughout the document, and “(Class III)” will be added after the term Signed Shared Roadway.
29	Bikeable shoulders needs to be listed as part of the signed shared roadway category or as a 4 <sup>th</sup> category. <b>John Fauerby</b>	Shoulder bikeways are a subcategory of signed shared roadways.	
30	Delete the Plan Scope on page 18; it is repetitive information. Delete Table 2-1 or place in an appendix. <b>Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</b>	Staff agrees that these sections could be combined and condensed. Some information is repeated and the sections overlap.	The Plan Scope section in Chapter 2 will be condensed and moved to the Plan Scope section in Chapter 1. Staff will present revised text for the Chapter 1 section at Worksession #2.
31	<b>Bikeway Facility Selection Guidelines (pp.24-26)</b> Note that bike lanes are one-way facilities, with one lane on each side of a road. <b>John Fauerby</b>	This information is highlighted in the section on bike lanes in Chapter 3.	As part of the document restructuring, some of the text describing bikeway types in bikeway design section will be moved to the description of bikeway types in Chapter 2. Staff will present proposed revised text for this section at Worksession #2.
32	Bikeable shoulders need to be clearly defined as a separate category. Doing so would raise the importance of bicycling along these roads and ensure a consistent pavement condition for bicycle riding. <b>John Fauerby</b>	Shoulder bikeways are considered signed shared roadways by the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO). Bicyclists share the road with motorists. In any event, this is largely a maintenance and/or implementation	Language will be added to the implementation chapter about consistent pavement condition for all shoulders. Staff will present proposed revised text for this section at Worksession #2.



**EXHIBIT A - Public & Agency Comments, Staff Responses**  
(COUNTYWIDE BIKEWAYS FUNCTIONAL MASTER PLAN)

#	Public or Agency Comment	Staff Response	Recommendation
33	<p>This subsection illustrates the confusion with bikeable shoulders. First, there is a statement that there is no designated space for bicyclists. Second, it states that shoulders, if present, are informal. This lowers the importance of bikeable shoulders, may lower the quality of the shoulders pavement and may cause the shoulder not to be a permanent or consistent feature of the road. That is why I am asking for Bikeable Shoulders to become its own category. As its own category, it will have standards, be permanent and be consistently applied. <b>John Fauerby</b></p> <p>Consider creating a table to show the comparisons between facility types. <b>Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</b></p>	<p>issue, not a master plan issue. The section on bikeway maintenance (currently in Chapter 5, but likely will be moved to an appendix) mentions the need for regular maintenance for roads on which a signed shared roadway exists, including shoulders.</p> <p>Again, bikeable shoulders as defined by Mr. Fauerby, are signed shared roadways – shoulder bikeways. Shoulders are not needed on every road, but will be considered, along with bike lanes, as part of all future County or State roadway improvement projects.</p>	
34		<p>Agree</p>	<p>A table will be created to clarify the Bicycle Facility Selection Guidelines section on pages 24-25. Staff will present revised text for this section at Worksession #2.</p>
35	<p>The details of this section are confusing and contradictory. Sources of guidelines should be referenced, otherwise criteria is subject to question</p> <p>In open section roads, a curb is mentioned. It should reference edge of pavement” instead.</p> <p><b>Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</b></p>	<p>The guidelines were adapted from a document entitled “Bicycle Facility Selection: A Comparison of Approaches” by Michael King for the University of North Carolina’s Highway Safety Research Center. The selection guidelines were reviewed and endorsed by the M-NCPPC Transportation planners as well as the plan’s technical advisory group. Staff agrees details may be buried in the text and lead to confusion.</p>	<p>A table will be created to clarify this section, per staff response above. Staff will present revised text for this section at Worksession #2.</p>
36	<p><b>Comments on Countywide Bikeways (Table 2-2; pp. 27-42)</b></p> <p>An abbreviated legend at the bottom of each page would be useful. Consider moving the table to Chapter 4, Implementation,</p>	<p>Staff concurs with the legend concept, but does not agree with the suggestion</p>	<p>A legend for acronyms only will be added to the bottom of each page of the</p>

**EXHIBIT A - Public & Agency Comments, Staff Responses**  
 (COUNTYWIDE BIKEWAYS FUNCTIONAL MASTER PLAN)

#	Public or Agency Comment	Staff Response	Recommendation
	where the discussion is located. <b>Gail Tait-Nouri</b> , on behalf of <b>Montgomery County Executive</b> .	location for the table. The discussion of countywide bikeways is in Chapter 2.	table. The discussion of countywide bikeway types will be moved closer to Table 2-2 to clarify the document.
37	The City of Takoma Park supports the shared roadway designation for <b>SR-49, Piney Branch Road (MD 320)</b> , but asks that SHA re-stripe the road to provide informal bicycle areas where possible on both sides of the road. <b>Robert Inerfeld</b> , on behalf of the City of Takoma Park	Staff supports this recommendation. Informal bicycle areas would be a good application for Piney Branch Road (MD 320)	The following language will be added to the Countywide Bikeways Table (Table 2-2) in the comment column for SR-49: "SHA should re-stripe the road to provide informal bicycle areas where possible on both sides of the road."
38	The City of Takoma Park does not believe it is practical to develop a shared use path for <b>SP-11, New Hampshire Avenue, (MD 650)</b> . Most of the corridor is residential and development that would provide streetscape improvements is unlikely to take place in these areas. The right of way does not provide enough room to install a shared use path unless the number of vehicular lanes is reduced from four to six, which the SHA has been unwilling to do. The City recommends that either bike lanes or informal bicycle areas be striped on both sides of New Hampshire Avenue or that the outer lanes be designated only for buses, bicycles and turning vehicles. Also adequate sidewalks should be installed on both sides of New Hampshire Avenue. <b>Robert Inerfeld</b> , on behalf of the City of Takoma Park	The shared use path recommendation in the CBFMP was incomplete. The East Silver Spring Master Plan (ESSMP) had recommended dual bikeway status (shared use path and signed shared roadway). Transportation Planning and Community Planning staff concur this remains a valid recommendation for this corridor. Since the ESSMP is only three years old and conditions have not changed in this corridor, staff does not see any reason to override the recommendation of the ESSMP. Transportation Planning staff agrees informal bicycle areas would be an appropriate application for the segment of MD 650 passing through the Takoma-Langley crossroads area.	The description of this bikeway in Table 2-2 will propose to maintain the recommendation in the ESSMP as a dual bikeway.
39	The City of Takoma Park contents that it is impractical to develop a shared use path along <b>DB-5 University Boulevard (MD 193)</b> in Takoma Park due to insufficient right of way, multiple curb cuts and inconsistency with SHA plans for redesigning the corridor. The City recommends that either bike lanes or informal bicycle areas be striped on both sides of University Boulevard and that sidewalks on both sides be upgraded where they are currently substandard. Should a shared use path be developed, it should be designed with the pedestrian foremost in-mind. <b>Robert Inerfeld</b> ,	The dual bikeway, including the shared use path, is recommended in the ESSMP. Again, this plan is only three years old; staff is reluctant to change the bikeway classification for this part of the County. While space may be insufficient to provide both bikeways in the short-term, both the path and the shared roadway will be feasible when the road is rebuilt.	

**EXHIBIT A - Public & Agency Comments, Staff Responses**  
 (COUNTYWIDE BIKEWAYS FUNCTIONAL MASTER PLAN)

#	Public or Agency Comment	Staff Response	Recommendation
	on behalf of the City of Takoma Park	Staff agrees that the path should be designed with the pedestrian foremost in-mind since this area of the County has high concentrations of pedestrians. However, the path's design should be safe for casual bicyclists and meet AASHTO standards to the extent practical.	
40	The City of Takoma Park supports the recommendation for a shared roadway along <b>Sligo Creek Parkway (SR-14)</b> , but would like to see safety concerns be addressed. <b>Robert Inerfeld, on behalf of the City of Takoma Park</b>	The M-NCPPC has initiated a study of traffic safety along commission parkways, including Sligo Creek Parkway. New "Share the Road" signs should be installed in early 2004.	
41	The City of Takoma Park supports the recommendation for the <b>Metropolitan Branch Trail (SP-12)</b> , but would like the plan to recognize that the City and Montgomery College segments of the trail are complete. <b>Robert Inerfeld, on behalf of the City of Takoma Park</b>	At the time of publication, staff was unaware that these trail segments were complete.	The comment section for SP-12 will acknowledge that the City and Montgomery College segments of the trail are complete.
42	The City of Takoma Park recommends a <b>new countywide bikeway: "Sligo Creek-Takoma Metro Connector"</b> via Maple Avenue and Cedar Avenue. <b>Robert Inerfeld, on behalf of the City of Takoma Park</b>	Staff concurs this would be a valuable addition to the countywide bikeway network. It provides an important connection between a major regional trail and parkway and a transit hub. It is similar to a framework route already identified in the 2000 Takoma Park Master Plan.	This bikeway will be added to the Countywide Bikeway network. It will be added to Table 2-2 and to the countywide bikeway map.
43	<b>DB-1, MacArthur Boulevard</b> , the eastern/southern limit should be the D.C. line, not Seven Locks Road. <b>Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</b>	Agree	The southern/eastern limit will be changed to the D.C. line.
44	<b>SP-2, Democracy Boulevard</b> , DPWT requests that "8' sidewalk" be changed to read, "8' concrete shared use path." Some paths in the County have been constructed in concrete. DPWT believes concrete has longer maintenance longevity for certain situations. <b>Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</b>	Agree	The text will be changed to read, "8' concrete shared use path."
45	<b>DB-4, Bradley Boulevard</b> , DPWT recommends the road be	The right of way along Bradley	Language will be added to the comment

**EXHIBIT A - Public & Agency Comments, Staff Responses**  
(COUNTYWIDE BIKEWAYS FUNCTIONAL MASTER PLAN)

#	Public or Agency Comment	Staff Response	Recommendation
	assigned as a signed shared roadway. Uniform four-foot shoulders may not be possible to achieve. <b>Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</b>	Boulevard is inconsistent. While bike lanes are preferred, signed shared roadway may be the best the State can do until the road is redesigned or rebuilt.	section of the table to reflect the difficult ROW, the preference for bike lanes, and the designation as a signed shared roadway in the short term.
46	<b>BL-2, Wilson Lane</b> , DPWT recommends the road be assigned as a signed shared roadway. Uniform four-foot shoulders may not be possible to achieve. <b>Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</b>	This is a carryover recommendation from the 1978 plan. BL-2 refers to the portion of Wilson Lane between MacArthur Boulevard and River Road primarily, but extends to Elmore Lane. While adequate ROW exists for bike lanes as recommended between MacArthur Boulevard and River Road, inconsistent ROW exists between River Road and Elmore Lane.	The portion of Wilson Lane between River Road and Old Georgetown Road features significant space limitations and is recommended for signed shared roadway (see SR-2). The limits for SR-2 will be changed to River Road and Old Georgetown.
47	<b>SP-4, Cedar Lane</b> , DPWT recommends the road be assigned as a signed shared roadway as well. <b>Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</b>	The shared use path from Old Georgetown Road to Wisconsin Avenue is a carryover recommendation from 1978 plan and is still valid. The portion of Cedar Lane from Wisconsin Avenue to Beach Drive is more complicated due to space constraints under I-495. Although a substandard shared use path currently exists from Wisconsin Avenue to almost I-495 via Cedar Lane and Elmhurst Freeway, this portion of West Cedar should be officially designated as a signed shared roadway in order to ensure bikeway continuity.	The limits for SP-4 will be changed to Old Georgetown Road and MD 355.  The portion of Cedar Lane east of MD 355 will be officially designated as a distinct bikeway separate from SP-4 and classified as signed shared roadway in order to ensure bikeway continuity. This new bikeway will be added to the Countywide Bikeway network. It will be added to Table 2-2 and to the countywide bikeway map.
48	<b>SR-3</b> should be entitled "Georgetown Branch Interim Trail (Future Capital Crescent Trail)" <b>Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive; Wayne Phyllaier and Ernie Brooks, on behalf of the Coalition for the Capital Crescent Trail.</b>	The referenced bikeway number in the comment appears to be incorrect. It should be SP-6. Staff agrees this new name would clarify	The name of the SP-6 will be changed to "Georgetown Branch Interim Trail (Future Capital Crescent Trail)"
49	DPWT recommends a new bikeway designation along Jones Mill Road between Beach Drive/Stonebrook Road and East-West Highway. Bicyclists currently use this road to reach destinations	Although incorrectly considered by many to be part of Beach Drive, Jones Mill Road is a County road, not a park	Jones Mill Road will be identified as a separate countywide bikeway and assigned a separate SR number. Its

**EXHIBIT A - Public & Agency Comments, Staff Responses**  
(COUNTYWIDE BIKEWAYS FUNCTIONAL MASTER PLAN)

#	Public or Agency Comment	Staff Response	Recommendation
50	in D.C. and Silver Spring from upcounty. <b>Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</b>	road and therefore cannot be considered part of SR-16, Beach Drive. Agree	limits will be Stoneybrook Road to East-West Highway. The text will be changed to read "temporary."
51	<b>SP-6, Georgetown Branch Trail</b> , surface is "temporary" (not "temporarily") crushed stone. <b>Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</b>	Staff agrees that these routes are complex. A map would help both DPWT and the public better understand the precise routes these bikeways are proposed to follow.	A page-size map of each will be included at the end of Chapter 2 after Table 2-2. Staff will present these new maps at Worksession #2.
52	<b>SR-14, Sligo Parkway</b> , should read "Sligo Creek Parkway" <b>Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</b>	Agree	The bikeway name will be changed to Sligo Creek Parkway.
53	<b>DB-6</b> , add street name for MD 384. <b>Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</b>	MD 384 is Colesville Road.	The road name will be added to the bikeway name.
54	DPWT recommends a new bikeway possibly on Pliers Mill Road from Rock Creek Trail at Pliers Mill Road terminus crossing Connecticut Avenue to Howard Avenue at or on a new bridge over the railroad to Kensington Parkway south to Rock Creek Trail. The safe crossing of Connecticut Avenue is critical. The Town of Kensington has requested this as well. This should be coordinated with SR-24 east of Connecticut Avenue. <b>Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</b>	Staff received this request after the release of the public hearing draft. Providing a connection between Rock Creek Trail and the Town of Kensington meets the goals of the plan and is worth consideration.	This proposed bikeway will be evaluated and at Worksession #2 staff will present a recommendation.
55	<b>SR-21, Viers Mill Road alternative</b> , the discussion should mention coordination with the upcoming BRT (Bus Rapid Transit) study for Viers Mill Road. <b>Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</b>	While most of this route is along neighborhood streets or short stretches of sidewalks, the BRT study, and how it will affect the bikeway, should be described in the discussion.	A sentence about the BRT study will be added to the discussion.
56	<b>SP-14, Rock Creek Trail-Forest Glen connector</b> , the location of this trail requires more definition. Is this the one along the beltway? <b>Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</b>	Yes, it is the path adjacent to the beltway proposed in the 1996 Forest Glen Sector Plan.	
57	Bike lanes also should be considered for <b>DB-2, River Road (MD 190)</b> . <b>Alan Migdall, on behalf of the Gaithersburg Bicycle and</b>	While bike lanes could fit along most portion of River Road, most bicyclists prefer to ride with traffic or along the shoulder. This road is one of the most	

**EXHIBIT A - Public & Agency Comments, Staff Responses**  
(COUNTYWIDE BIKEWAYS FUNCTIONAL MASTER PLAN)

#	Public or Agency Comment	Staff Response	Recommendation
	<p align="center"><b>Pedestrian Committee</b></p>	<p>popular weekend group ride routes in the County. Designating it as a shared roadway provides more flexibility in riding and does not confine the bicyclist to designate space in would be the case with bike lanes.</p>	
58	<p>Bike lanes should be considered for <b>SP-62, Muddy Branch Road.</b></p> <p><b>Alan Migdall, on behalf of the Gaithersburg Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee</b></p>	<p>Ample right of way exists for adding bike lanes along Muddy Branch Road as part of any future road widening and major roadway improvements. The bikeway planner for the City of Gaithersburg would support changing the recommendation for Muddy Branch Road to Dual Bikeway, shared use path and bike lanes.</p>	<p>Bike lanes will be recommended for Muddy Branch Road. SP-62 will be changed to a dual bikeway and assigned a new number.</p>
59	<p>Bike lanes on Riffleford Road could be installed with little cost, thus providing a great connector to Germantown Recreational Park. <b>Alan Migdall, City of Gaithersburg Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee</b></p>	<p>Bike lanes are already recommended for Riffleford Road (BL-34).</p>	
60	<p>The Page 18 reference to the Muddy Branch Stream Valley Trail (and shared use path on Travilah Road) should allow for flexibility. The type of facility is a preference. It should not preclude a different type of facility if the preferred turns out not to be feasible. <b>Alan Migdall, City of Gaithersburg Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee</b></p>	<p>The shared use path along Travilah serves as the primarily off-road connection between Gaithersburg and the C&amp;O Canal Towpath, as the lower portion of Muddy Branch Stream Valley is no longer recommended for a hard surface hiker-biker trail due to environmental concerns. The shared use path on Travilah functions as a park trail connector. Continuous off-road bikeway and trail connectivity is very important in this corridor.</p>	
61	<p>It is a major oversight not to mention the Interim Capital Crescent Trail (CCT) in the plan. The Planning Board approved the facility plan for the CCT/Metropolitan Branch Trail in 2000. The facility plan lays out a conceptual design for an interim CCT. The interim CCT meets the priority criteria and should be listed as a high</p>	<p>Staff agrees differentiating between the short-term solution and the long-term solution would be more correct. The interim CCT should be high priority, while the final CCT as part of the</p>	<p>SP-6 will be renamed "Georgetown Branch Interim Trail (Future Capital Crescent Trail)" per comments from the County Executive.</p>

**EXHIBIT A - Public & Agency Comments, Staff Responses**  
 (COUNTYWIDE BIKEWAYS FUNCTIONAL MASTER PLAN)

#	Public or Agency Comment	Staff Response	Recommendation
	<p>priority. The interim CCT can be implemented separate from the BiCounty Transitway which may take years to plan and resolve issues. <b>Wayne Phyllaier, on behalf of the Coalition for the Capital Crescent Trail</b></p>	<p>BiCounty Transitway should be moderate priority.</p>	<p>In addition, a new countywide bikeway will be added to reflect the interim on-road bikeway route for the trail. The bikeway limits and description will be taken from the 2000 facility plan. This bikeway will be identified for high priority.</p>
62	<p>Consider a bikeway along difficult corridors like Connecticut Avenue in Chevy Chase. <b>Jack Cochrane, on behalf of Montgomery Bicycle Advocates (MOBIKE)</b></p>	<p>Travel lanes along Connecticut Avenue are already as narrow as the law allows and insufficient ROW exists to widen the road or build a parallel shared use path. It is therefore unlikely that Connecticut Avenue in Chevy Chase could ever be designed in a manner to designate it as a bikeway.</p>	
63	<p>The Planning Board should insist that SHA implement the <b>ICC bike path (SP-40)</b> as part of the State's ICC project. The path would serve as the east-west backbone to the off-road bike path network, linking with the shared use path along MidCounty Highway (SP-70) as well as the Matthew Henson Trail, Northwest Branch Trail and Rock Creek Trail. <b>Jack Cochrane, on behalf of Montgomery Bicycle Advocates (MOBIKE)</b></p>	<p>Planners from both counties are coordinating closely with SHA staff to design the highway corridor with the parallel bike path.</p>	
64	<p>The Germantown/Clarksburg area provides few facilities for on-road bicyclists. This area of the County has an extensive proposed network of sidepaths (shared use paths along roads), but more effort needs to be made to add bike lanes or signed shared roadways. For example, Watkins Mill Road is proposed for a bike path but is fairly bikeable as is. Same with the Potomac area. <b>Jack Cochrane, on behalf of Montgomery Bicycle Advocates (MOBIKE); John Fauerby; Lynne Rosenbusch</b></p>	<p>Shared use paths meet the needs of most bicyclists and thus also most residents. Meeting the needs of the most number of bicyclists as quickly as possible is a major goal of this plan. Many recommendations in this plan mirror these areas.</p> <p>Germantown and Clarksburg are among the more newly built areas of the County and therefore roads in these areas features wider rights of way than perhaps others areas. Therefore shared use paths</p>	

**EXHIBIT A - Public & Agency Comments, Staff Responses**  
(COUNTYWIDE BIKEWAYS FUNCTIONAL MASTER PLAN)

#	Public or Agency Comment	Staff Response	Recommendation
65	<p>The Olney area has only two roads that feature shared use paths and no accommodations for on-road bicycling. The excellent access to Olney via bike lanes on Bowie Mill Road and Hines Road is appreciated, however. <b>Jack Cochrane, on behalf of Montgomery Bicycle Advocates (MOBIKE)</b></p>	<p>are recommended, or have been constructed, along these roads as a result of opportunity.</p> <p>Watkins Mill Road is located within the limits of the City of Gaithersburg, which also intends to designate the road as shared use path.</p> <p>The public hearing draft of the Olney Master Plan features an extensive network of on-road, neighborhood level bikeways. These more local bikeways were not highlighted in this plan because they do not serve as major connections to countywide destinations.</p> <p>Many local roads in Montgomery Village could function as bikeways, however, this plan only highlights bikeways of countywide significance. The Gaithersburg Area Master Plan is scheduled to be updated in 2004-2005. Local bikeways will be evaluated and designated as part of this master plan update.</p>	
66	<p>The plan shows few bike routes for Montgomery Village, though there are numerous roads that could serve as important bike routes. Numerous cyclists live there. <b>Jack Cochrane, on behalf of Montgomery Bicycle Advocates (MOBIKE)</b></p>		
67	<p>The plan has no east-west routes between I-270 and the Patuxent River north of Olney, but Sundown Road, Brink Road and West Old Baltimore Road provide a continuous, direct east-west corridor that attracts a number of cyclists despite being narrow in spots. This route should be added to better serve the northern part of the County. <b>Jack Cochrane, on behalf of Montgomery Bicycle Advocates (MOBIKE)</b></p>	<p>East-west connectivity in this part of the County is lacking. It would be difficult for bicyclists in Laytonsville to travel to Gaithersburg and Germantown (and vice versa). Providing connections between municipalities and major destinations is a major goal of this plan.</p>	<p>Sundown Road-Brink Road-West Old Baltimore Road will be added as a Countywide Bikeway. This new bikeway will be added to the Countywide Bikeway network. It will be added to Table 2-2 and to the countywide bikeway map.</p>
68	<p>Continuity of shared use paths is an issue for certain routes: 1) Route 29 path ends at University Boulevard; 2) Georgia Avenue path ends at Randolph Road; 3) the Randolph Road path becomes bicycle lanes between Parklawn Drive and Veirs Mill Road; 4) Norbeck Road between Rock Creek and Georgia Avenue; 5) the</p>	<p>1) There is no shared use path along US29 at University Boulevard. <b>SR-31, Columbia Pike (US29)-South</b>, deviates from US29 at Eastwood Avenue.</p>	



**EXHIBIT A - Public & Agency Comments, Staff Responses**  
 (COUNTYWIDE BIKEWAYS FUNCTIONAL MASTER PLAN)

#	Public or Agency Comment	Staff Response	Recommendation
	<p>Wisconsin Avenue path through downtown Bethesda, Chevy Chase and Friendship Heights. <b>Jack Cochrane, on behalf of Montgomery Bicycle Advocates (MOBIKE)</b></p>	<p>2) The shared use path along Georgia Avenue terminates at Randolph Road due to insufficient right of way south of Randolph Road. SR-20, Georgia Avenue alternate connects Randolph Road to downtown Wheaton.</p> <p>3) The bicycle lanes along Randolph provide much needed on-road connectivity across the Rock Creek stream valley. It serves as an alternative to the shared use path along Montrose Parkway to get people from eastern county to the I-270 and MD 355 corridors.</p> <p>4) This section of Norbeck Road is recommended for signed shared roadway. A bike path, built by Rockville, extends from East Gude Drive to Avery Road. The County does not intend to extend this path to the east.</p> <p>5) The path along Wisconsin Avenue is recommended in the Friendship Heights CBD plan to provide connectivity to the Friendship Heights Metrorail station and the central business district.</p>	
69	<p>Downtown Silver Spring seems to be getting few bikeways of any sort. The path along East-West highway is substandard. Increased access to the Metro station is needed. <b>Jack Cochrane, on behalf of Montgomery Bicycle Advocates (MOBIKE)</b></p>	<p>The Silver Spring CBD plan features numerous on-road local bikeways not highlighted in this plan. Bicycle access to the Metrorail station is adequate from all directions when proposed bikeways are constructed.</p> <p>Language will be added to the discussion</p>	

**EXHIBIT A - Public & Agency Comments, Staff Responses**  
 (COUNTYWIDE BIKEWAYS FUNCTIONAL MASTER PLAN)

#	Public or Agency Comment	Staff Response	Recommendation
70	The bike route along or near Georgia Avenue does not continue south of Forest Glen Road. A suitable route already exists along Second Avenue, so connecting Forest Glen Road to Second Avenue (crossing I-495) provides the only major hurdle. <b>Jack Cochrane, on behalf of Montgomery Bicycle Advocates (MOBIKE)</b>	of the East-West Highway path (SP-9) about the substandard condition of the path. Staff will present a revised version of Table 2-2 at Worksession #2. The Georgia Avenue corridor south of I-495 is severely space constrained and features complex traffic operation issues (reversible lanes during rush hour). Bicycling through this corridor is not recommended in this plan. Bicyclists can bypass this area by taking Forest Glen Road (SP-13) to Sligo Creek Trail to SR-15, Sligo Creek Trail-Silver Spring Metrorail connector.	
71	Tuckerman Lane and Plyers Mill Road serve as a major east-west bikeable corridor. The plan should extend this route to Sligo Creek via residential streets and Dale Avenue. <b>Jack Cochrane, on behalf of Montgomery Bicycle Advocates (MOBIKE)</b>	While it is true these roads collectively could function as a major east-west bikeway corridor, linking them as a major cross-county bikeway corridor has limited value. The referenced bikeways serve different purposes. The Tuckerman Lane bikeway provides an important connection to Grosvenor Metrorail station, while Plyers Mill Road links Wheaton with Kensington.	
72	Tilden Lane should connect to Montrose Road via Old Stage Road or other route. <b>Jack Cochrane, on behalf of Montgomery Bicycle Advocates (MOBIKE)</b>	Such a connection, which would primarily serve local needs, does not meet the goals of the plan. Executive Boulevard offers a suitable connection between the bikeways.	
73	Twinbrook Parkway is so space-constrained that the County may never be able to implement bike lanes there. The gap between Rock Creek Trail and Twinbrook Metrorail station could be completed via a path along the edge of Parklawn Cemetery. <b>Jack Cochrane, on behalf of Montgomery Bicycle Advocates (MOBIKE)</b>	Twinbrook Parkway is severely space constrained and has limited current ROW. Bike lanes are unlikely to be implemented unless the road is redesigned to eliminate the continuous center turn lane, however the road provides an important connection to	Retain Twinbrook Parkway in the plan as bike lanes or signed shared roadway until a replacement connection along neighborhood streets between the Twinbrook Metrorail Station and Veirs Mill Road is adopted as part of the City of Rockville's plan.

**EXHIBIT A - Public & Agency Comments, Staff Responses**  
(COUNTYWIDE BIKEWAYS FUNCTIONAL MASTER PLAN)

#	Public or Agency Comment	Staff Response	Recommendation
		<p>Twinbrook Metrorail station and should remain a countywide bikeway as bike lanes or signed shared roadway.</p> <p>A path or bike route through Parklawn Cemetery is desirable. Due to security concerns of federal tenants in the Twinbrook area, bicycle and pedestrian access in general through this area will require further study as part of the Twinbrook Sector Plan update, including the connection between Rock Creek Trail and the metro station.</p>	<p>Staff will coordinate with community planning staff as part of the Twinbrook Sector Plan update to investigate ways to provide potential off-road connection between the Rock Creek Trail and the Twinbrook Metrorail Station, including providing a connection through or skirting along the Parklawn Cemetery property.</p>
74	<p><b>Strathmore Lane (SR-18)</b> should connect to a destination or a countywide bikeway at its western terminus. Consider adding the shared use path through the American Speech and Language Association and Strathmore Hall properties to the countywide bikeway network. This path, although substandard, serves as an important local connector to the Grosvenor Metrorail station and also could connect to <b>Tuckerman Lane (SP-42)</b>. The plan should recommend that this path be upgraded to County standards in the future.</p> <p><b>Jack Cochrane, on behalf of Montgomery Bicycle Advocates (MOBIKE); Suzanne Hudson, on behalf of the Garrett Park Estates-White Flint Park Citizens' Association.</b></p>	<p>This path functions as an important connection to the Grosvenor Metrorail station from the north.</p>	<p>The shared use path that passes through both the ASLA and Strathmore Hall properties will be added as a countywide bikeway. This bikeway will be added to the Countywide Bikeway network. It will be added to Table 2-2 and to the countywide bikeway map. The discussion will highlight the need to upgrade the path to AASHTO standards.</p>
75	<p>Democracy Boulevard west of Gainsborough Road should also be planned as a dual bikeway since the existing shoulders are currently bikeable. <b>Jack Cochrane, on behalf of Montgomery Bicycle Advocates (MOBIKE)</b></p>	<p>Democracy Boulevard west of Gainsborough Road is suitable for a dual bikeway. However, insufficient space exists to the east. It is illogical to designate only the western portion as a dual bikeway since bikeway continuity is a goal of this plan. Bicyclists would be encouraged to use the shared use path east of Gainsborough Road. For eastbound riders, that would fine. But it</p>	

**EXHIBIT A - Public & Agency Comments, Staff Responses**  
 (COUNTYWIDE BIKEWAYS FUNCTIONAL MASTER PLAN)

#	Public or Agency Comment	Staff Response	Recommendation
76	A bikeway on or under the American Legion Bridge is both feasible and desirable. <b>Jack Cochrane, on behalf of Montgomery Bicycle Advocates (MOBIKE)</b>	creates operational problems for westbound bicyclists. See SP-76, page 30.	
77	The plan should endorse and connect to Loudoun County's proposal to implement a bike ferry across the Potomac River at Lowes Island, which would provide connections between Dulles area and the Rockville/Gaithersburg area. <b>Jack Cochrane, on behalf of Montgomery Bicycle Advocates (MOBIKE)</b>	This plan deems the concept worth further study (see page 13).	