



THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

MCPB
Item No. 4
4-22-04

April 15, 2004

MEMORANDUM

TO: Montgomery County Planning Board

VIA: Jeffrey Zyontz, Chief
Countywide Planning Division

Richard Hawthorne, Acting Chief
Development Review Division *R Hawthorne*

FROM: Charles S. Kines *CSK* (301-495-2184) for the Park and Planning Department

SUBJECT: Worksession #3 for Countywide Bikeways Functional Master Plan

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Review and comment on the final public hearing draft of the plan that incorporates all Board-recommended changes and additions to-date, devoting particular attention to the following elements:
 - a. Executive Summary
 - b. Glossary of Terms
 - c. Planning process and history of plan, including relationship to 1998 Countywide Park Trails Plan
 - d. Page-size maps of complex bikeway routes
 - e. Page-size maps showing detailed bikeway network for densely developed areas
 - f. Map showing both countywide bikeways and local bikeways
 - g. List of shared use paths providing significant pedestrian benefits
 - h. Major document restructuring and minor editing, per staff recommendations at Worksessions #1 and #2

2. Approve this final public hearing draft, incorporating any Planning Board changes made during Worksession #3, as the Planning Board (Final) Draft and recommend transmittal to the County Council and the County Executive.

DISCUSSION

During the previous two Worksessions on the plan, the Planning Board requested several additions and changes to the plan document and endorsed staff recommendations for changes to the bikeway network. Attached is a full copy of the final Public Hearing Draft for your final review. This final draft incorporates all Board-recommended changes and additions, including the following more significant items.

A. Executive Summary

At the request of the Planning Board at the October 23, 2003 presentation of the staff draft, an Executive Summary is now included at the beginning of Chapter 1 on pages 1-2.

B. Glossary of Terms

At Worksession #1, the Planning Board requested a glossary of terms be added to the Plan, and that it appear early in the document rather than as an appendix. The new glossary of bicycle- and bikeway-related terms, that also includes descriptions of acronyms that appear throughout the document, is now part of the plan's preface on pages xiv to xvi.

C. Planning Process and Relation to 1998 Countywide Park Trails Plan

The Planning Board agreed with the staff recommendation at Worksession #1 to remove the table describing the planning process (p.16 of public hearing draft) and replace it with a narrative describing the history of the plan and its relationship to the 1998 Countywide Park Trails Plan (CPTP). This new narrative can be found on pages 17-18 of the attached draft. In addition, the table describing 1998 CPTP bikeway-related recommendations and CBFMP responses was moved to Appendix B as the Board considered this supplementary information more suitable as an appendix.

D. Page-size Maps of Complex Routes

At Worksession #1, the Board agreed with the staff recommendation to include page-size maps of several complex routes that are difficult to follow because they travel along neighborhood and local streets. Maps of SR-10 (NIH-CCT Connector), SR-11 (NIH-Georgetown Branch Trail connector), SR-17 (Connecticut Avenue corridor), SR19 and SR-20 (Georgia Avenue and Georgia Avenue alternative) and SR-21 (Veirs Mill Road alternative) were added as Figures 2-4 through 2-6 at the end of Chapter 2 on pages 31-33.

E. Page-Size Maps Showing Detailed Countywide Bikeway Networks in Densely Developed Areas of the County.

At the October 23, 2003 presentation of the staff draft, the Planning Board commented that the countywide bikeway network is difficult to interpret and decipher in the more densely developed areas of the County. The bikeway lines on the large-scale map overlap or are impossible to distinguish one from another. Page-size maps of the following eight areas are now included as Figures 2-8 through 2-15 near the end of Chapter 2: Bethesda/Friendship Heights, Silver Spring/Takoma Park, North Bethesda/White Flint, Wheaton/Aspen Hill, Greater Rockville, Greater Gaithersburg, Germantown and Clarksburg.

F. Map Showing Countywide Bikeway Network and Local Bikeway Network

At Worksession #1, the Board asked to see a basic map showing the local bikeway network with the countywide bikeway network. This map is included in the plan as Figure 2-7 on page 34. At the Board's

request, language also has been added to the Countywide Bikeway map that informs readers that this plan only addresses major bikeways and to refer to the appropriate community plan or sector plan for more information about local bikeways in specific planning areas, communities or neighborhoods.

G. Shared Use Paths Providing Significant Pedestrian Benefits

At Worksession #1, the Planning Board requested a list of shared use paths, particularly those near transit stations, which might also provide significant pedestrian benefits and may merit a higher priority than other shared use paths. This list is now included in the Implementation Chapter on pages 78-79.

H. Major Document Restructuring and Minor Changes to Plan Text

At both Worksessions #1 and #2, the Planning Board agreed with staff recommendations to make minor edits to the plan text as well major structural changes to the document. The more significant changes are summarized in the following table.

Recommended change to plan	Result
Combine "Plan Scope" sections in Chapters 1 and 2	Plan Scope section in Chapter 2 was removed, simplified and merged with Plan Scope section in Chapter 1. (p.3)
Clarify Background and Definitions in Chapter 2	Key sentences have been bolded for emphasis. Definitions have been moved to new section titled "Bikeway Types and Desirable Applications" on pages 20-23.
Create table showing bikeway types and desirable applications, to replace Bikeway Facility Selection Guidelines, found on pages 24-26 of the public hearing draft.	This table was presented at Worksession #2 and endorsed the Board. The table was inserted near the beginning of Chapter 2 on pages 20-23, and the selection guidelines where deleted.
Remove non-bikeways from design chapter. Clarify relationship between shared use paths and hiker-hiker trails.	Discussion of hiker-biker trails and sidewalks were simplified and moved from Chapter 3 to Chapter 2 under a new heading titled "Other Bikeway-Related Facilities" (p.24). Language in the plan distinguishing hiker biker trails from shared use paths removed. Hiker-Biker Park trails are now only very briefly discussed as part of Chapter 2. This distinction from bikeways in necessary because the Planning Board approved the Countywide Park Trails Plan in 1998 which addresses hiker-biker trails located in parkland. This bikeways plan does not recommend any changes to the park trail system and simply recognizes the important role of these facilities in the bikeways network.
Clarify discussion on the State Highway Administration's "Bicycle Areas" concept	This section was slightly reworded to clarify the concept and moved to section on "Other Bikeway-Related Facilities" (p.24)
Clarify relationship between local bikeway planning and countywide bikeway planning	Appendix C, Local Bikeway Plan Guidance", in the public hearing draft was moved to Chapter 2 (p.28) to emphasize its role in guiding future plans and planning policy.
Clarify the purpose and goals of Bikeway Design Guidelines	The purpose and goals of bikeway design were included in the board packet for Worksession #2. This section have now been added to the beginning of Chapter 3 (p. 63-64)
Clarify relation of design guidelines to the County's Road Code	A section has been added to the plan as part of Chapter 3 (p.65).

Recommended change to plan	Result
Remove details about bikeway design not supported by the County's Department of Public Works and Transportation, move non-supported items to an appendix	Descriptions and basic design principles for three main types of bikeways have been retained as part of Chapter 3 on pages 67-74. The section on Innovative Designs" is now Appendix C (p.91-94). Language was added to the beginning of this new appendix indicating that these concepts are not yet supported or applied by DPWT, but merit further study.
Clarify the Implementation Chapter, emphasize plan policies. Remove details directing DPWT to perform certain tasks in a certain manner, particularly those related to bicycle parking and bikeway maintenance.	Section on "Plan Policies Regarding Bicycle Facilities" was rewritten, moved from Chapter 2 to the beginning of Chapter 4 (p. 73) and bolded for emphasis. The new prioritization strategy approved by the Planning Board at Worksession #2 also was added to the beginning of Chapter 4. Strongly worded recommendations were softened and details about implementation techniques removed.
Move Chapter 5 to an appendix and remove details directing DPWT and other agencies to perform certain tasks in a certain manner. Clarify purpose of including this information in the plan.	Chapter 5 is now Appendix A, beginning on page 83. Strongly worded recommendations were softened. Text was added to the beginning of the Appendix to explain the purpose of including information about related policies and programs in the plan.
Move table describing bikeway recommendations from 1998 Countywide Park Trails Plan with CBFMP responses to the Appendix. The Board considered this supplementary information.	The former Table 2-1 is now Appendix B, beginning on page 87.

CK:kcw
Attachment

CBFMP memo wrkssn 3.doc