

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

#	Public or Agency Comment	Staff Response	Recommendation
177	<p>Comments from the Technical Advisory Group and minutes from TAG meetings should be included in Appendix B or included as a separate appendix. John Fauerby</p>	<p>The TAG is an informal body of local, regional and national bicycle planning experts and consultants. It was formed by transportation planning staff as a means to shape and guide the development of the plan. Neither the Planning Board nor the County Executive or County Council appointed members to this group. Because of its informal nature, official minutes from any meetings between TAG members and staff were not produced.</p>	
178	<p>The introductory chapter could generally benefit from some tightening up. Move the Vision, Goals and Objectives, Guiding Principles, Plan Scope and Purpose to the front, give them more emphasis and condense them. Jack Cochrane, on behalf of Montgomery Bicycle Advocates</p>	<p>The plan will not be comprehensively revised. However, per comments on the draft, certain sections may be re-structured to better emphasize certain points and to generally make the text more readable.</p>	
179	<p>The bikeway network should be geographically comprehensive, and extend even to non-dense residential communities. The plan should drop the statement "it would not be efficient to attempt to provide bicycle connections for every neighborhood." Jack Cochrane, on behalf of Montgomery Bicycle Advocates</p>	<p>The plan's emphasis on ensuring bicycle connectivity to major destinations, which are located in more densely populated areas, makes it consistent with the county's growth management strategy and land use patterns. By placing an emphasis on these bikeways, the County is making a commitment to meet the needs of the most number of people as soon as possible. Ensuring connections for every neighborhood is not only inefficient, it is impractical. The County will have a limited amount of financial resources over the next 20 years. The plan attempts to maximize the County's future investment in bicycle infrastructure by focusing on the County's designated growth area, where</p>	

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

#	Public or Agency Comment	Staff Response	Recommendation
180	Highlight that during rush hours, a bicycle is often just as fast as a car and trip length is less of an issue. Jack Cochrane, on behalf of Montgomery Bicycle Advocates	nearly 96% of our residents live. See third paragraph under Why Bicycling on page 1.	
181	The plan makes a contrived distinction between shared use paths and hiker-biker trails. Jack Cochrane, on behalf of Montgomery Bicycle Advocates	The plan clearly makes a logical distinction between a facility designed, constructed and/or maintained by a transportation agency (shared use path) and a facility designed, constructed and/or maintained by a park agency (hiker-biker trail). This categorization is necessary in order to contrast those facilities intended primarily for transportation and those facilities designed primarily for recreation. The distinction is important because many park trails were built in the 1970s and 1980s and were designed for recreation and do not meet current national design standards (AASHTO Guide). However, the plan also clearly states that hiker-biker trails serve important transportation functions (particularly connections to transit stations) and shared use path serve important recreational benefits. But again, the distinction is necessary to point out that some facilities are the responsibility of a transportation agency and some are the responsibility of a park agency.	
182	The plan should make recommendations to modify and improve the 1998 Countywide Park Trails Plan. Jack Cochrane, on behalf of Montgomery Bicycle Advocates	The 1998 Countywide Park Trails Plan focuses nearly entirely on identifying park trail corridors, in other words trails located within county, state or federal parkland. The focus is addressing and meeting recreational demand for park	

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

#	Public or Agency Comment	Staff Response	Recommendation
183	<p>Sidepaths (shared use paths along roads) can be safe if cyclists are willing to slow down and look around every time they come to a cross street. Many people prefer to use them, because they feel more comfortable there and they're not pressed for time. But the combination of pedestrians, curb cuts, obstacles like poles and trash cans, and cross streets make these paths certainly slower and less pleasant than stand alone facilities like the Capital Crescent Trail.</p> <p>The main issue is that drivers turning into and out of side streets and driveways do not expect fast moving vehicles to suddenly enter a side street from the curb. Even slow moving bicyclists move more quickly than pedestrians. The fact that half the cyclists on the path must ride against traffic is part of the problem. Consider the car pulling out to make a right turn from a side street onto the main road. The driver does not [necessarily] look to his right, only to his left, because the driver is not concerned about cars coming from the right. Also, consider the car turning left from the main road onto a side street. The driver is focused on oncoming cars, not the cyclists approaching from the rear left corner of his eye.</p> <p>Jack Cochrane, on behalf of Montgomery Bicycle Advocates</p>	<p>By contrast, the CBFMP focuses on addressing and meeting transportation demand for bikeway facilities. The goals and objectives are completely different. The CBFMP clearly states its focus on transportation facilities, recognizing that there is some crossover between the plans. Hiker-biker trails most certainly provide some transportation benefits, but they are not the focus of this plan.</p> <p>Indeed, well-designed sidepaths can be safe, practical and efficient for the average bicyclist; they are not as efficient for experienced bicyclists. Sidepaths meet the needs of the majority of bicycle skill levels, however. Only 5% of bicyclists identify themselves as experienced enough to ride with traffic, therefore the County needs a good network of shared use paths to meet the needs of average bicyclists and to encourage non-bicyclists to start using a bicycle for transportation. The plan cannot account for personal timing and strained schedules. Each bicyclist is responsible for riding safely and in control along the sidepath and every motorist is responsible for watching out for pedestrians and bicyclists when entering a roadway requires crossing a sidewalk or sidepath. While good design and signage can help make these crossings safe, effective driver and bicycle education also is needed to help motorists understand how to deal with</p>	

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

#	Public or Agency Comment	Staff Response	Recommendation
184	<p>MOBIKE supports separated paths in key corridors. After that, the group favors bicycle lanes which alert drivers to the potential presence of bicyclists and channel drivers away from cyclists whether they see cyclists or not. Bike lanes also are more likely to “survive” future roadway improvements than less official facilities such as shoulders. Signed shared roadways are a good choice for many roads. The plan does a good job highlighting the usefulness of shoulders which often are the easiest solution and require the least extra width. But if considerable width is already available, slower roads without shoulders can be safe. Side paths are the least suitable for transportation bicycling, but they do make sense in many situations. Jack Cochrane, on behalf of Montgomery Bicycle Advocates</p>	<p>shared use path and to help bicyclists understand they are responsible for riding in control. That is why this plan recommends a comprehensive bicycle program that includes bicycle education.</p> <p>Shared use paths located within their own right-of-way (e.g., “stand alone facilities”) are either located within a stream valley or alone an existing or abandoned transit corridor. While these types of facilities indeed provide the most separation between bicyclists and motor vehicles, they are also the most expensive to design, build and maintain.</p> <p>No comment.</p>	
185	<p>The plan suggests various standards, mostly quoted from AASHTO, for construction of bike facilities. Some of these standards, however, are overly strict and may disqualify many good facilities from consideration. The plan states that the minimum allowed width for a bicycle lane is 4 feet which it characterizes as a hard minimum. A better hard minimum would be 2.5 or 3 feet where space is tight such as on MacArthur Boulevard. Four or five feet is still preferred of course. There are</p>	<p>The design guidelines proposed in Chapter 3 are not standards; they are guidelines. The plan states several times under the Purpose subheading that the guidelines serve as an aid to engineers, designers and planners to highlight possible solutions to problems designers are faced with when implementing</p>	

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

#	Public or Agency Comment	Staff Response	Recommendation
	<p>safe bike lanes along Westlake Terrace that are only 2.5 feet wide. The plan might recommend a waiver process that recognizes the limitations of the AASHTO guidelines. Jack Cochrane, on behalf of Montgomery Bicycle Advocates</p>	<p>bicycle facilities. They are not intended to be standards and are not intended to be a complete reference. A bolded statement will be added to the plan that County and state transportation agencies should use the AASHTO Guide.</p> <p>Further even the AASHTO Guide is intended as guidance. These are not standards. Standards must be codified. In any event, the AASHTO Guide is the result of many years of transportation research and analysis. Staff believes the guidelines serve as the unofficial national standards and should be applied to all Montgomery County bikeways. There should be no compromise; otherwise Montgomery County's bikeways will be inconsistent with bikeways from other neighboring and nearby jurisdictions. This will cause unnecessary confusion among both motorists and bicyclists. Recommended AASHTO design guidelines should be applied. Where meeting these design criteria are not possible, bicycling simply should not be encouraged or promoted via pavement markings and/or signage.</p> <p>The County is aware of the substandard bike lanes along Westlake Terrace and intends to correct the situation there.</p> <p>This seems to be a matter of semantics. The three-foot shoulders/"unofficial bike lanes" are a direct reference to SHA "bicycle areas". Bicycle areas, which</p>	
186	<p>The plan states that 3 foot shoulders may be considered "unofficial bike lanes" and says they do not need to be signed or marked for bicycles. This is confusing. If these are intended as bike lanes they should be signed and marked as such even if they</p>		

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

#	Public or Agency Comment	Staff Response	Recommendation
	<p>are less than 4 feet wide. If they aren't marked as bike lanes, they should be called bikeable shoulders. Jack Cochrane, on behalf of Montgomery Bicycle Advocates</p>	<p>also should be considered for County roads, are not intended to be official bike lanes. Rather they are informal spaces intended for, but not necessarily designed, for bicycle travel. AASHTO guidelines indicate 4' as the minimum width for bike lanes. Bicycle areas function as wide curb lanes as defined in this plan and will only feature signs.</p>	
187	<p>Four-foot bikeable shoulders are appropriate on high-speed arterials like River Road in Bethesda, but there are numerous roads where a 2 or 3 foot shoulder would provide adequate space. Jack Cochrane, on behalf of Montgomery Bicycle Advocates</p>	<p>The plan should more clearly make a distinction between bikeable shoulders along open section roads (no curb) and "bicycle areas" on closed section roads (with curb). This is briefly highlighted in the Bicycle Facilities Selection Guidelines on pages 24-26, but the plan could more clearly describe these two very different design solutions for two very different roadway conditions.</p>	<p>Staff will present proposed revised text for this section at Worksession #2.</p>
188	<p>Wide curb lanes allow a cyclist to function completely as a vehicle. This leads to more predictable, natural behavior by bicyclists, improves visibility and often enhances safety, provided cars don't have to cross the centerline to pass the cyclist. The preferred lane width of 14 or 16 feet for wide curb lanes may be acceptable as a soft minimum, but even 20 feet should not be considered too wide. The plan suggests to carve out a shoulder on any [lane] wider than 14 feet, but a 12 foot wide [lane] needs bikeable shoulders more than a 16 foot lane. Shoulders are actually a very good option in width-constrained situations where wide curb lanes are impossible, but narrow shoulders could be striped onto the road. Jack Cochrane, on behalf of Montgomery Bicycle Advocates</p>	<p>A 20-foot travel lane encourages two motor vehicles to travel side by side in the same lane. This is unsafe and causes confusion.</p> <p>The lane width standard on most county and state roads is 12 feet. Some roads have 11 foot lanes, and still fewer have 10 foot lanes. In any event, a 12 foot lane cannot be narrowed to 11 or 10 feet to create a one of two foot bicycle area. The minimum bicycle area is three feet. Only 14 foot lanes can be narrowed to 10 or 11 feet to create bicycle areas. Lanes that are 15 feet or wider should be considered for bike lanes.</p>	
189	<p>MOBIKE applauds the "road diet" concept. Many roads in the</p>	<p>Many roads could be candidates for the</p>	

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

#	Public or Agency Comment	Staff Response	Recommendation
	<p>County could easily accommodate bicycles if travel lanes were narrowed to make room for bikeable shoulders or bike lanes. The plan references Tuckerman Lane, but other candidates for this application include East Jefferson Boulevard and Massachusetts Avenue. Jack Cochrane, on behalf of Montgomery Bicycle Advocates</p>	<p>road diet techniques. However, this plan will not cite any further examples and will leave this technique as an option for DPWT and SHA to consider as part of future roadway improvement projects, especially projects along roads with a planned bikeway.</p>	
190	<p>Shoulders are equally useful to bicyclists on open section and closed section roads. Jack Cochrane, on behalf of Montgomery Bicycle Advocates</p>	<p>Shoulders on closed section roads are considered wide curb lanes. The plan should recognize the utility of SHA bicycle areas for County roads not just State highways. A statement will be added to the discussion about SHA Bicycle Facility Guidelines on page 26. In addition, the plan will reference SHA's new policy on providing 16-foot curb lanes on all reconstructed roads.</p>	<p>Staff will present proposed revised text at Worksession #2</p>
191	<p>Consider a bike lane pilot project for a particular area of the County. Roads connecting to and within the Rock Spring Industrial Park and vicinity might be candidates. Jack Cochrane, on behalf of Montgomery Bicycle Advocates</p>	<p>It is unclear what benefits a bike lane pilot project would offer.</p>	
192	<p>Consider a Core Bikeways Network Initiative in which a few dozen routes that connect different areas of the County receive highest priority for immediate completion and improvements. Candidate roads might include Seven Locks Road/Great Seneca Highway; River Road/Bradley Boulevard; the proposed ICC, Matthew Henson and M-83 trails; Tuckerman Lane/Plyers Mill Road; the Route 29 Commuter Bikeway, and of course existing major trails such as Sligo and Rock Creek. Jack Cochrane, on behalf of Montgomery Bicycle Advocates</p>	<p>Cross-county corridors are not a goal of this plan. The plan focuses on major bikeways and providing connections to major countywide destinations and activity centers. Bikeways providing direct connections to these destinations will receive the highest priority.</p>	
193	<p>Consider identifying additional Limited Interference Bikeways (LIB) in the County (trails that have few road intersections and other hindrances to rapid, long distance bicycle transportation like the Capital Crescent Trail, Rock Creek Trail, etc.). Investigate utility rights of way for possible future bike path corridors. Jack Cochrane, on behalf of Montgomery Bicycle Advocates</p>	<p>LIBs as described here refer to park trails and are beyond the scope of this plan. Utility rights of way have been investigated in the past for possible bikeway corridors. However, they were found to be unsuitable due to</p>	

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

#	Public or Agency Comment	Staff Response	Recommendation
194	<p>While the Sierra Club wholeheartedly endorses the concept of transportation biking, the group reserves the right to object to particular projects and proposed routes because of environmental concerns. The group concluded it does not have sufficient data to determine environmental impacts of specific routes and alignments until feasibility studies are done on specific routes.</p> <p>Jim Fary, on behalf of the Sierra Club, Montgomery County Group</p>	<p>topographic difficulties and complex policy issues pertaining to legal use of such rights of way.</p> <p>Environmental impacts of specific bikeways are determined at the project planning level. However, some bikeways can be clearly identified as having potential environmental constraints. With help from Environmental Planning staff, these issues are highlighted in the Discussion column of Table 2-2 for certain bikeways.</p>	
195	<p>Highway departments should provide shoulders for bicyclists and should avoid creating hazards to bicyclists by failing to coordinate other construction projects in roadway shoulders. Agencies need to recognize that bicyclists rely on shoulders along many highways and that many programs (Sidewalk Retrofit Program) have adverse impacts on important bicycle routes and often create unnecessary hazards to bicycling (unmarked/not-well-lit curbs where only shoulders previously existed). William Malone</p>	<p>Both SHA and the County DPWT recognize the value of shoulders. Avoiding the creation of hazards during roadway construction is a DPWT operations issue and outside the scope of this plan.</p>	
196	<p>The plan should give highest priority to locating bike lanes where automobile traffic is highest. If bike lanes are placed along roads where traffic is most congested, they are more likely to encourage more people to use a bicycle for transportation, thereby substituting car trips with bicycle trips. Bicycle-for-automobile substitution will occur if the County puts adequate bicycle infrastructure in place. The full potential for automobile traffic reduction can only be realized if efficient, interconnected bike routes exist. William Malone</p>	<p>All types of bikeways will encourage more bicycle usage. Highest priority is afforded to bikeways that provide connections to major destinations and activity centers as defined in this plan.</p>	
197	<p>We appreciate the emphasis on variety and balance to provide an integrated system of on-road and off-road facilities. Shared use paths, bicycle lanes and shared use roadways can be each a part of the travel equation for cyclists in Montgomery County. With this in mind, we encourage that careful consideration be given to existing on-road facilities and that they not be abandoned in favor of side path trails which may not provide the same level of</p>	<p>On-road bicycle accommodation must be considered as part of all future County and State roadway improvement projects. Shared use paths do not replace on-road facilities in this plan.</p>	

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

#	Public or Agency Comment	Staff Response	Recommendation
198	<p>transportation utility as any on-road facility. David Whitaker, on behalf of the Maryland Department of Planning</p> <p>I would like to request more "share the road" signs in both directions along Old Georgetown Road. Ellen Decarlo</p>	<p>Old Georgetown Road is not identified as a countywide bikeway.</p>	
199	<p>The plan calls for a shared use path on E. Jefferson from Montrose to Rollins. I believe this should be bike lanes; the road is directly connected to Executive Boulevard. Keeping bike lanes going a little further will add value to the network as a whole. I believe there is sufficient room for bike lanes. There are a lot of cars turning into and out of Federal Plaza off E. Jefferson; bikers on the path would have conflicts with these turning vehicles. Bike lanes would provide greater visibility for bicyclists and improve safety. If the road is too narrow to support two bike lanes, consider providing a bike lane on only one side of the street. This could reduce the number of bikes heading in the opposite direction on the path. Carl Henn, on behalf of the NIH Bicycle Commuter Club</p>	<p>Continuing bike lanes on E. Jefferson makes sense, especially since this is the primary alternative route to MD 355. Bike lanes on only one side of a street are unsafe and not recommended.</p>	<p>Bike lanes on E. Jefferson will be evaluated. Staff will report findings at Worksession #2.</p>
200	<p>GENERAL COMMENTS – Support and Praise</p> <p>I am writing to support the Countywide Bikeways Functional Master Plan slated for adoption.</p> <p>I want to commend staff on their effort to include neighboring jurisdictions in the planning process. The success of cycling in DC is directly related to a bicycle friendly Montgomery County. We already have several important connections between the two jurisdictions and the Master Plan will help ensure the implementation of more.</p> <p>The Master Plan represents very thorough analysis of the County's bicycling network. It recommends additional bike paths, lanes and routes that will improve access to key destinations and to transit hubs. These bicycle facilities will provide important transportation, recreation, health, and environmental benefits. Bicyclists can be considered the indicator species for a county. The more there are, the better the quality of life in the county.</p>	<p>No comment.</p>	

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

#	Public or Agency Comment	Staff Response	Recommendation
201	<p>As both a county resident and a bicycle planner, I urge you to adopt the Master Plan and support its implementation.</p> <p>James R. Sebastian, Bicycle Program Manager, District Department of Transportation</p> <p>The City of Rockville commends M-NCP&PC on the comprehensive Countywide Bikeways Functional Master Plan slated for adoption. This is a very thorough analysis of the existing infrastructure and recommends a user-friendly system that connects trails and roadways to create a transportation network that is usable for cyclists and pedestrians. The development of signed, connected routes and instituting required maintenance will provide an alternative transportation network suitable for cyclists of all levels.</p>	<p>No comment.</p>	
	<p>The M-NCP&PC plan links nicely with the routes identified in the City of Rockville Bikeway Master Plan and provides connections to all of the major routes travelling through and around Rockville. Care was taken to ensure that the City of Rockville and many other jurisdictions were included in all phases of the planning process. Chuck Kines met with us on many occasions and I personally reviewed three separate drafts of the document presented to you for adoption.</p> <p>The addition of several off-road, multi-use paths traveling along major roads will encourage the novice cyclist and pedestrians to make short trips without the use of a vehicle. Bike lanes are an important amenity for the more experienced cyclist providing a guideline for both the vehicle operator and the cyclist, and also warns motorist to look out for cyclists on the roadways. This promotes physical fitness, a cleaner environment and ultimately reduced traffic congestion. A healthy environment to live, work and raise our children is what we as public servants must strive for.</p>		

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

#	Public or Agency Comment	Staff Response	Recommendation
202	<p>Although adopting a plan such as this does not ensure that it gets built, I feel strongly that the Planning Commission will uphold the priorities established in the plan, and will look for opportunities in new development to implement wherever possible. I congratulate you on having the foresight to produce a Bikeway Master Plan and offer my support in adoption and implementation of this plan.</p> <p>Betsy Thompson, bicycle coordinator, City of Rockville The City of Gaithersburg, members of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee and myself would like to extend its endorsement of the Countywide Bikeways Functional Master Plan. The plan incorporates key ideas from nationally recognized bicycle plans, and it acknowledges the inventory of numerous state, County and local roads on which bicyclists currently ride. The plan also acknowledges future needs and proposed plans. Incorporating a detailed list of countywide bikeways will be especially helpful to those who will ultimately design and fund projects, and the County's numbering system works well for this purpose.</p> <p>Often, bikeways plans are no more than a list of broad goals and objectives, but this plan can actually be implemented. The design guidelines in Chapter 3 are succinct and they wade through what are often times a myriad of divergent design ideas to provide a clear vision for the County's bikeways.</p> <p>The plan acknowledges and describes known populations of bicyclists and their types. The popularity of bicycling has increased immeasurably over the years, and encouraging biking under the umbrella of the proposed plan will improve the health, safety and welfare of all communities in Montgomery County.</p>	No comment.	
203	<p>Dan Janousek, Planner, City of Gaithersburg Planning and Code Administration We are pleased that his plan is being prepared. The 1978 Master Plan of Bikeways has been a very serviceable document and is a</p>	No comment.	

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

#	Public or Agency Comment	Staff Response	Recommendation
204	<p>tribute to those who prepared and implemented it. However, the passage of 25 years requires a renewed look at bicycling in Montgomery County. The current draft is very informational on this matter and has been researched extensively. Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of the County Executive</p> <p>Concerning the update to the Countywide Master Plan of Bikeways, I say thank you. It has been long in coming, but the document is generally well done and a significant advance, incorporating what has been learned in the past quarter century since the original plan debuted. Alan Migdall, on behalf of the Gaithersburg Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee</p>	<p>No comment.</p>	
205	<p>Much in the plan is good. The focus on bikeways that are uninterrupted, that actually go someplace useful, and that interconnect with other bikeways to form a network is welcome. This is what we must have if bicycles are to be routinely used by many people for purposeful trips. Wayne Phyllaier, on behalf of the Coalition for the Capital Crescent Trail</p>	<p>No comment.</p>	
206	<p>The priority for implementation is important, considering the limited resources available. The plan appropriately gives priority to bikeways that provide connections to transit stations and central business districts, that correct unsafe bicycling conditions and fill in a major gaps. Priority also should be given to bikeways that have already been started (e.g., Capital Crescent Trail). Wayne Phyllaier, on behalf of the Coalition for the Capital Crescent Trail</p>	<p>Bikeways already underway should receive priority for completion. The status column of Table 2-2 will highlight all bikeways currently underway or are likely to be improved – in part or whole— in the near future as part of roadway improvement projects.</p>	
207	<p>The Plan appropriately lists the Wayne Avenue Green Trail and the Metropolitan Branch Trail as high priorities. When these trails are complete, they will link to the Capital Crescent Trail to form one of the best bikeway networks in the country. Wayne Phyllaier, on behalf of the Coalition for the Capital Crescent Trail</p>	<p>No comment.</p>	
208	<p>[The Plan] represents a significant step forward towards the creation of a truly bikeable county. The routes identified in the plan reflect considerable effort, expertise and talent on the part of Chuck Kines, the staff bikeways planner. Not only has he met with cyclists and talked to community planners and researched all</p>	<p>A vision statement will be considered.</p>	

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

#	Public or Agency Comment	Staff Response	Recommendation
	<p>the issue, but he actually rode many of the roads he's put into the plan. Park and Planning has a clear vision regarding bikeways. Consider adding a vision statement at the beginning of the plan. A good vision might be "to make traveling by bicycle feasible, convenient and safe throughout the entire County." Jack Cochrane, on behalf of Montgomery Bicycle Advocates</p>		
209	<p>The concepts described in the introductory chapter are excellent. The plan frequently emphasizes continuity and access to important destinations. Jack Cochrane, on behalf of Montgomery Bicycle Advocates</p>	No comment.	
210	<p>MOBIKE applauds the recommendation for dual bikeways along certain roads. These roads will serve the needs of transportation bicyclists as well as pedestrians. Some study into appropriate signage may be required. Jack Cochrane, on behalf of Montgomery Bicycle Advocates</p>	The County DPWT is currently studying bikeway signage.	
211	<p>The Board is urged to adopt the Plan as an important investment in public health, transportation and economic development. Increasing opportunities for safe bicycling and walking is one of the most important investments that Montgomery County can make to improve public health. According to the U.S. Centers for Disease Control, moderate physical activity such as bicycling and walking can help Americans achieve and maintain a healthy weight while reducing the risk of type II diabetes, high blood pressure, colon cancer and death from coronary heart disease, among other health benefits. With epidemic rates of obesity and diabetes, and soaring health care expenditures, it is crucial that we provide county residents with more opportunities to be physically active. The Master Plan is an important part of this effort. By focusing on bicycling and walking routes that link people to jobs, shopping and recreation, the Plan can help make physical activity a normal part of everyday lives. Dusty Horwitt; Nick Griffin, Bruce Adams, Lisa Heinzerling; Jeff Jones</p>	No comment.	
212	<p>The plan could further promote public health by reducing air pollution. The plan will make it easier for residents to replace car trips with bicycling and walking trips. Fewer car trips can help</p>	No comment.	

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

#	Public or Agency Comment	Staff Response	Recommendation
213	<p>reduce emissions that contribute to asthma, lung cancer and deteriorating water quality. Dusty Horwitt; Nick Griffin, Bruce Adams, Lisa Heinzerling; Jeff Jones</p> <p>Increased bicycling and walking opportunities promote affordable, convenient transportation and can increase pedestrian traffic, and increase potential customers, near retail stores. The Capital Crescent Trail demonstrates the great demand for first-class bicycling and walking facilities. The trails and routes proposed in the master plan will be an important investment that will be well-used by county residents. Dusty Horwitt; Nick Griffin, Bruce Adams, Lisa Heinzerling; Jeff Jones</p>	No comment.	
214	<p>The Sierra Club, Montgomery County Group, commends staff, especially Charles Kines, for their hard work in putting together a meaningful, practical and implementable master plan for bicycle transportation. It is a very large step in achieving some balance between serious bicycle transportation and the overwhelming emphasis that has been placed on expensive and environmentally degrading paved recreational bike trails through our parks, forests, wetlands and stream buffers. By focusing on realistic destinations, the master plan will allow people to get out of their cars to run short errands on a bike to the shopping center or library. It even will allow people to ride a bike to Metro stations.</p> <p>Jim Fary, on behalf of the Sierra Club, Montgomery County chapter</p>	No comment.	
215	<p>The plan's recognition of the wide variety of bicycle riders is applauded. Alan Migdall, Gaithersburg Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee</p>	No comment.	
216	<p>I applaud what the Board and the Department of Park and Planning staff have done to support bike and pedestrian transportation in Montgomery County. The Bikeway Master Plan is an excellent document! Robert Fireovid</p>	No comment.	
217	<p>The plan has not promised a bikeway in every corridor, but its bold recommendations should be applauded. The Planning Board should be supportive of the plan's recommendations now and during implementation. Robert Fireovid</p>	No comment.	

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

#	Public or Agency Comment	Staff Response	Recommendation
218	<p>I support the Countywide Bikeways Functional Master Plan and urge the County to adopt it. In my lifetime, the health of our citizens has declined. Failure to get adequate exercise is usually cited as among the important reasons for rising obesity and declining health. Despite our County's wealth, well-educated citizens, excellent public schools and numerous physical fitness opportunities, our health is still declining. A very convenient way to get daily moderate exercise is to walk or bicycle for short trips.</p> <p>William Miche</p>	<p>No comment.</p>	
219	<p>WABA [the Washington Area Bicyclist Association] strongly supports the Countywide Bikeways Master Plan. This document lays out a comprehensive plan for a bikeways system of over 500 miles to serve the entire County. Five hundred miles of bikeways sounds like a big number. But that number must be placed in the context of a large, heavily populated, urban/suburban county which has grown rapidly over the past 20 years with no slow down in sight.</p> <p>When the 1978 Master Plan was first approved, bicyclists could generally ride safely on the majority of county roads and highways. Most bicyclists disdained the poorly designed shared use paths of those days. Further, there was little need to avoid traffic; alternative routes were always available. Not so today. The Master Plan of 2004 documents the high priority need for over 100 bikeway projects. That is the measure of displacement of bicyclists from Montgomery County's roads and highways. In other words, the Master Plan is really a plan to catch-up, not only expand cycling opportunities in new areas, but to restore bicycle access to routes overtaken by motor traffic. And that is why it may seem overwhelming, and perhaps over-demanding to some.</p> <p>In evaluating the proposed plan, the Commission should assess the plan for its usefulness when meeting the overall development requirements of the community for housing, businesses, jobs, recreation and transportation.</p>	<p>No comment.</p>	

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

#	Public or Agency Comment	Staff Response	Recommendation
220	<p>WABA is pleased the plan establishes a framework for understanding what we have in place and for setting priorities.</p> <p>Helen Zitomer, on behalf of the Washington Area Bicyclists Association.</p> <p>We are pleased that the County is amending the 1978 Master Plan of Bikeways to include previous amendments to the Plan as well as bicycle facilities identified in the adopted sector plans. This Master Plan will help guide the enhancement of the existing bicycle transportation network, which is a model in Maryland. This will go a great way toward enhancing the bicycle-friendly environment both for those who use bicycles for transportation and recreation and fitness.</p> <p>The County's approach can provide direction for the State and neighboring jurisdictions to coordinate planned bicycle improvement projects and programs with Montgomery County.</p> <p>We support the County in the adoption of this plan and its implementation through the proposed policy initiatives. The Department will coordinate with the County and other state agencies during our review of bicycle related policies, regulations, programs and projects to help Montgomery County achieve the plan's goals and objectives.</p>	No comment.	
221	<p>David Whitaker, on behalf of the Maryland Department of Planning</p> <p>I would like to add my two cents in favor of the Functional Master Plan for Bikeways. I have been biking in the County for over 60 years. Cars and health have greatly reduced my biking, but Countywide Bikeways are now my salvation and all improvements would be greatly appreciated. Paul Fineran, Silver Spring</p>	No comment.	
222	<p>I commend Montgomery County for the continued progress toward a truly connected bikeway system. As a cyclist and frequent visitor to Montgomery County, I recognize the potential</p>	No comment.	

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

#	Public or Agency Comment	Staff Response	Recommendation
223	<p>benefits of the plan and I encourage the County to fully implement all of the proposed improvements and initiatives. Thanks again for supporting cycling in the community! Randall Buxbaum, Middletown, MD</p> <p>I support the Countywide Bikeways Functional Master Plan. I understand this plan is up for approval and that it will provide increased off-road paths (shared use paths) in Montgomery County. While I am not a resident, I am a cyclist who rides in the County via the Capital Crescent Trail and Rock Creek Trail. I am looking forward to exploring more of your trails and spending more time in Montgomery County. Jonathan Krall, Arlington, VA.</p>	<p>No comment.</p>	
224	<p>Garrett Park Estates-White Flint Citizens Association recognizes the importance of the Countywide Bikeways Functional Master Plan and its efforts to provide a framework for a countywide bikeway network. We support policies and actions that will encourage bicycle usage. We believe that the clear identification of bicycle routes in the first step in encouraging more bicycle usage and providing safer routes for bicycles and automobiles. Suzanne Hudson, on behalf of the Garrett Park Estates-White Flint Citizens Association</p>	<p>No comment.</p>	
225	<p>I am writing to express my overall support for the bikeways plan. It is well considered and our county will be a better place once it is implemented. I am pleased to see that bike lanes are on the plan for Executive Boulevard. This road is perfect for bike lanes, with its wide outside lane. The lanes will also help to protect the many pedestrians we have along this road, by marginally slowing the traffic and providing a better buffer between the curb and car traffic. Carl Henn, on behalf of the NIH Bicycle Commuter Club</p>	<p>No comment.</p>	
Other comments			
226	<p>Recognize that achieving the plan's vision, goals and objectives may require building trails where neighbors oppose them or taking out street trees to widen shoulders. Jack Cochrane, on behalf of</p>	<p>These issues are only addressed as part of facility planning and will not be highlighted in this plan.</p>	

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

#	Public or Agency Comment	Staff Response	Recommendation
227	<p>Montgomery Bicycle Advocates</p> <p>In my experience as a bicycle commuter, I have found that many motor vehicle drivers do not know that bikes have the same rights as cars to the roads. I have had several experiences when car drivers have angrily honked their horns and deliberately swiped me because I have been on the road. I suggest the County provide bikers who are victims of anti-biker rage with a phone number to report such incidents and the County follows up by sending a letter to the alleged offender with information about bicyclists' rights. Robert Fireovid</p>	<p>This is not a master plan issue</p>	<p>The concept should be forwarded to the County Executive for consideration.</p>