

Attachment B: Public Testimony and Summary Responses (Bikeway Comments Only)

#	Commentor	Plan Page #	In Staff Report?	Testimony	Response	Discussion / Recommendation
General Bikeway Recommendations						
155	MoBike	General		Would prefer to see "dual bikeways", which include both an off-road bikeway (sidepath) and an on-road bikeway (conventional bike lanes or bikeable shoulders).	Disagree	While staff agrees that unseparated bikeways (conventional bike lanes and bikeable shoulders) are beneficial to bicyclists who prefer to ride in the road, as a general rule they should not be added to the Bicycle Master Plan because doing so could make it more difficult to implement the low-stress, separated bikeway on the same road. If during implementation of the separated bikeway it is found to be feasible to preserve or install new bikeable shoulders or bike lanes, we believe there is sufficient language in the plan to enable MCDOT to so.
156	MoBike	General		Nuance on "qualified dual bikeways" – Where existing shoulders (or bike lanes) get frequent use, comprise parts of longer road routes, etc. but a separated bikeway (usually a path) is a "must have", I still want the plan to call for both facilities, with a note saying the path is higher priority. I call these "qualified dual bikeways". They are often connectors to rural areas or link distant centers. I know this isn't the plan's approach currently, but it's really equivalent. It's more likely to ensure that designers try to preserve the shoulders when adding a path or making intersection improvements. I'm trying hard to ensure no loss of existing shoulders on these important routes, while acknowledging the need for low stress facilities.	Disagree	See response to Comment #155.
157	MoBike	General		Trails shown in the plan – I don't know why Parks only wanted four trails shown on this plan, but some other hard surface trails are important to show, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • North Branch Trail/Upper Rock Creek Trail • Lake Frank/Lake Needwood trails • East Gude Drive-Lake Needwood connector trail • Northwest Branch Trail • Muddy Branch Trail 	Disagree	Staff recommends excluding natural surface and hard surface trails from the Bicycle Master Plan, with the exception of the Rock Creek Trail, Sligo Creek Trail, Capital Crescent Trail and Matthew Henson Trail, which are heavily used for transportation.
159	Helms	General		Better integration with Trails Plan, including current and planned trail plan bicycle infrastructure (hardscape and natural) as well as identifying targeted trails linking communities to services.	Disagree	The Bicycle Master Plan has been extensively coordinated with the Park Trails Plan. See previous response.
160	Malec, Peters	General		The plan should include existing and new park trails.	Disagree	See previous response.
161	WABA	General		The plan relies too heavily on sidepaths. If built to standards of existing sidepaths they will not be attraction for many bicyclists. MCDOT needs to implement sidepath to the standards recommended in plan. To alleviate this concern, the plan should recommend separated bike lanes in more locations.	Disagree	Staff believes that the decision to construct separated bike lanes or sidepaths should be based on the amount of pedestrian and bicycle activity that is expected in the area, not based on out-of-date construction standards that can change. While a perfect standard for determining where sidepaths and separated bike lanes should be constructed does not exist, our determination is based on zoning, proximity to rail stations and professional judgment (see page 64 of the draft plan). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Separated bike lanes (separated space for bicycling and walking) are needed in areas with high levels of activity, including areas that are zoned Commercial-Residential (CR), Life Sciences Center (LSC) or their floating zone equivalents, or that are located within 0.5 miles of a rail station. Areas that are zoned R-10, R-20, R-30 (multifamily residential zones) and RT (townhouse zones) are considered higher activity areas if they are adjacent to properties that are zoned CR, LSC or floating zones, or are near rail stations. • Sidepaths are acceptable in all other areas of the county. <p>WABA supports converting some of the recommended sidepaths in the plan to separated bike lanes because they believe they are constructed to a higher standard than sidepaths. While this is true if the separated bike lane is constructed in the road, as with the Spring Street / Cedar Street separated bike lanes, based on existing standards they are unlikely to be constructed differently from sidepaths when they are built outside of the road.</p> <p>Since the main issue of concern is the quality of sidepath construction, the focus should be on improving sidepath quality, not on constructing separated bike lanes, which are likely to cost more than sidepaths. Pages 121 – 122 of the plan recommends that Montgomery County improve its sidepath and trail design standards. MCDOT will be revising their road design standards over the coming months and sidepath quality will be an important issue to be addressed.</p>
162	Migdall	General	No	Add language such as: "A bikeway segment not identified in the Plan may be implemented if it offers significant benefit to the plan and its goals."	Disagree	We recommend incorporating this comment into page 64, first paragraph: <p>"A countywide master plan cannot anticipate all opportunities to implement bikeways that might arise. <u>A bikeway segment not identified in the plan may be implemented if it advances the goals of the plan.</u> The following table provides default bikeway recommendations for streets where the Bicycle Master Plan does not recommend a bikeway. <u>Additionally, while the bikeway recommendations in this plan recommend the state-of-the practice, they can be upgraded as the state-of-the-practice changes.</u>"</p>

Attachment B: Public Testimony and Summary Responses (Bikeway Comments Only)

#	Commentor	Plan Page #	In Staff Report?	Testimony	Response	Discussion / Recommendation
163	Migdall	General	No	Add language such as: "if during the design of a bikeway, the specific route or type is found to entail costs or impacts disproportion to its benefits, then an alternative route or type that serves the same general purpose and need may be built and would be consistent with this plan."	Disagree	While we agree with this recommendation, we do not believe it is needed for two reasons: 1) The plan recommends an extensive network of bikeways. If one bikeway is not implementable there are other bikeways that can be implemented, 2) Pages 64 - 65 provide the ability to implement a bikeway where the Bicycle Master Plan does not have a recommendation.
164	Nuckols	Multiple	No	Provide bike lanes on Beach Drive and close to traffic on weekends / holidays.	Disagree	Beach Drive is a park road and should be considered by the Department of Parks.
165	Tull	General	No	Prefers separated bike lanes outside of the curb as opposed to in the road. For example, why is Montgomery County considering separated bike lanes in the road on 2nd Avenue and Wayne Ave, when the Silver Spring Green Trail already exists as a separated bikeway (for example, along the Discovery Building). Providing separation with paint and flexible posts (as was done on Spring Street) represent a downgrade.	Agree	We agree that separated bike lanes with curbed separation provide a higher level of comfort than separated bike lanes with paint and flexible posts. The plan (pages 122 to 133) recommends a phased approach to implementing separated bike lanes with projects implemented by developers including curb separation, but projects implemented by MCDOT initially including paint and flex posts (which are cheaper and faster to implement) and are gradually upgraded over time.
166	Knudson	General	No	Please coordinate with the rural & rustic roads program and identify our most precious bikeways (such as Peach Tree Road, Whites Store Road), then create a bicycling preservation designation that 1) prevents these roads from being widened to ruin their scenic value and 2) create signage and pavement striping to alert motorists and inform cyclists that this is a Bikes-First corridor.	Disagree	Our understanding is that the Rustic Roads designation already accomplishes these objectives.
167	Warner	General	No	Need bike lanes on Georgia Ave, especially between Seminary Pl and Wheaton.	Disagree	Conventional bike lanes would not be comfortable for most people. Instead of recommending bike lanes on Georgia Ave, we have recommended a combination of neighborhood greenways on parallel streets, separated bike lanes through Montgomery Hills and a few segments with sidepaths.
168	Gerharz	General	No	Get feedback from actual bicyclists and bicycle groups to make sure plan is feasible.	Agree	We received a lot of feedback from bicyclists. A countywide bike plan cannot determine whether each bikeway recommendation is feasible. We believe many will be feasible, but it is also likely that some will be deemed infeasible.
171	Genn	General	No	Competing objectives: How do we maintain affordability in housing if bikeway infrastructure increases project costs?	N/A	While implementing bikeways may increase the cost of housing, it can also decrease the cost of transportation.
172	Hall	General	No	Bikeway lighting needs to be improved.	N/A	We agree that lighting needs to be improved.
Aspen Hill Policy Area						
173	MCDOT	226	No	Consider whether the Renn St Sidepath should be extended eastward to Parkland Dr.	Disagree	We do not believe the Renn St sidepath needs to be extended to the west. Our analysis shows that Renn Rd east of Marianna Dr is a very low stress road and therefore does not need any improvements to be bikeway. Renn Dr west of Marianna Drive was rated as a low stress road, because it has a centerline, and therefore needs an improvement to be more bikeable.
174	MCDOT	226	No	I'm not sure how these separated bikeways will fit within the existing paving section. It doesn't appear that additional ROW will be acquired as they are established neighborhoods. Also, the road classifications appears to be tertiary or secondary residential. A sidepath may be a better solution.	Disagree	Separated bike lanes are composed of separated bike lanes and sidepaths. In the Aspen Hill area, most of the separated bikeways are recommended to be sidepaths. Separated bike lanes are only recommended on sections of Connecticut Ave and Aspen Hill Rd where redevelopment is more likely.
Bethesda CBD Policy Area						
175	MCDOT	232	No	Consider showing the ped/bike connection between Montgomery Ave the CCT / Lynn Dr as a more definitive path.	Ongoing	The proposed trail between Montgomery Ave and Lynn Drive is not included because staff deemed this connection undesirable due to changes to the Purple Line project. The Maryland Transit Administration (MTA) believes that recent changes to the Purple Line make this a more viable connection. Staff is trying to set up a meeting with MTA to review this connection.
176	MoBike	232	No	Wisconsin Ave from Bradley to Nottingham Dr – Widen the sidewalk on the west side of Wisconsin for this block to help get riders from downtown Bethesda to Nottingham Drive so they can easily get to the Stratford/Warwick greenway.	Disagree	This connection is no longer needed as the neighborhood greenway on Stratford Rd and Warwick Pl was removed.
177	Barron	232		Show that Stratford is not an unofficial continuation of the Bike Trail and that folks should travel down the park to the Capital Crescent Trail or out to Wisconsin Avenue.	Agree	The map on page 232 of the plan does not accurately show the connection envisioned by staff. Staff recommends extending the trail to Norwood Drive and removing the arrow.

Attachment B: Public Testimony and Summary Responses (Bikeway Comments Only)

#	Commentor	Plan Page #	In Staff Report?	Testimony	Response	Discussion / Recommendation
Bethesda-Chevy Chase East Policy Area						
178	Filice	236		Need a direct connection along Norwood Rd / Stratford Rd / Warwick Pl / Fallstone Ave / Vinton Park / Park Ave	Disagree	While staff believes a bikeway along Stratford Road and Warwick Place connecting the Bethesda CBD and the Friendship Heights CBD would be a very important addition to the bicycling network, we stand by our recommendation to exclude it from the Bicycle Master Plan due to opposition from the Village of Friendship Heights and the Village of Drummond. As an alternative, a sidepath could be considered on the west side of Wisconsin Avenue between Bradley Blvd and Dorset Avenue, though it will be very challenging to construct in some locations and has not been considered by the public.
179	MoBike	236		Stratford/Warwick Greenway (or whatever you want to call it) – What happened to this? It was in the previous plan draft and is important. These streets connect Norwood to Dorset and to the Vinton Park Connector to Friendship Heights at the south end. The cut-thru path from Hunt to Drummond is usable but should be made more bike-friendly is possible.	Disagree	See response to Comment #178.
180	MoBike	236		Norwood Neighborhood Connector (Chevy Chase Dr to Norwood Dr) – Needs to be shown on both the Bethesda CBD and Bethesda East maps, and it's split across tables which is a little confusing. While useful, this cut-thru is very narrow to be a major bike route. What's needed is a wide path on the west side of Wisconsin from Bradley to at least Nottingham, and a good path from the west end of Nottingham to the Norwood/Stratford intersection. Then cyclists can get on the Stratford/Warwick Greenway.	Disagree	See response to Comment #178.
181	MoBike	236		Vinton Park Connector – I say again, this path is of critical importance for access to Friendship Heights. It should be upgraded or at least acknowledged. Linking it to the Westbard Ave trail would be a bonus but would require a bridge.	Disagree	See response to Comment #178.
183	Sobel	236	No	Implement continuous bike lane on East West Hwy from Connecticut Ave to Wisconsin Ave.	Disagree	Adding a bikeway on East West Hwy between Wisconsin Ave and Connecticut Ave will be very challenging and costly. The Capital Crescent Trail is under construction and will largely serve the same users.
187	Larson	236	No	The map is incorrect - there is no bikeway on Wisconsin Ave between Bethesda and Friendship Heights. (Larson)	Disagree	The wide sidewalk on the east side of Wisconsin Ave meets Montgomery County's definition of a shared use path / sidepath.
188	WABA	236		Provide a separated bikeway on East-West Highway from Downtown Bethesda to Beach Dr.	Disagree	Adding a separated bikeway on East West Highway between Wisconsin Ave and Beach Drive will be challenging and costly. The Capital Crescent Trail is under construction and will serve many of the same users that would benefit from a bikeway on East-West Highway.
193	MoBike	236	No	Old Georgetown Rd from Greentree to Southwick – Widen the sidewalk on the WEST side to a full path in order to connect the Bethesda Trolley Trail to the Grant St greenway (in lieu of the Suburban Hospital cut-thru).	Agree	Mr. Cochrane believes that it may be more feasible to connect the Bethesda Trolley Trail to the Grant St neighborhood greenway by providing a sidepath along the west side of Old Georgetown Rd between Greentree Rd and Southwick St than to provide a sidepath on the south side of Greentree Rd between Grant St and Old Georgetown Rd. However, the presence of the Bethesda Community Store at the southwest corner of the intersection of Old Georgetown Rd and Greentree Rd will make it challenging to implement both recommendations. We therefore propose to provide flexibility by adding Mr. Cochrane's recommendation to the master plan.
195	MoBike	236	No	Old Georgetown Rd from Lincoln to McKinley – Widen the sidewalk on the EAST side to full path width to provide a quick connection from the Bethesda Trolley Trail to McKinley and thus Grant St.	Agree	This is a short connection that links to Bethesda Trolley Trail to the Grant St neighborhood greenway at a signalized intersection.
196	MoBike	236	No	Old Georgetown Rd from Lincoln to Battery Lane – Better yet, widen the sidewalk on the EAST side to full path width for this entire segment for better connectivity to McKinley, Grant, Park Lane, the CCT, (via Maple Ridge), Battery Lane, etc. It's also a BTT alternate, since the BTT is narrow and crowded on the NIH grounds. Richard Hoye is championing this, and SHA may already be on board.	Disagree	The Bethesda Trolley Trail is an existing conditions that would provide similar connectivity. Staff believes that efforts are better focused on upgrading this section of the Bethesda Trolley Trail.
197	MoBike	236	No	Glenbrook Road (south of Bradley Blvd) – This should be identified as a dual bikeway, because it's already a shared roadway southbound and has a contraflow bike lane northbound.	Disagree	This is a form of a one-way separated bike lane.
198	MoBike	236	No	Little Falls Parkway between the CCT and Glenbrook Rd – As I said in my previous round of comments, this should be planned as a shared roadway (shoulders) as well as a separated facility. You asked why both? It's an odd situation that requires some thought, but there's a LOT of existing pavement to work with, so the shoulders basically come for free, but it could be organized a little better. Bikeable shoulders are needed to match the rest of Little Falls, which gets a ton of use by moderately confident cyclists. But a separated bikeway is needed for CCT users wanting a low-stress connection between the CCT and neighborhoods along Bradley Blvd. This should be a path or two-way protected bike lane on the west side. In reality the southbound half of the protected bike lane and the southbound shoulder could be one and the same if it's done right, but that's a design detail. There's lots of room to make it work.	Disagree	We believe the priority on Little Falls Pkwy between the Capital Crescent Trail and Glenbrook Rd should be adding a sidepath. Bikeable shoulders could be added if there is sufficient space, but they should not be master-planned.

Attachment B: Public Testimony and Summary Responses (Bikeway Comments Only)

#	Commentor	Plan Page #	In Staff Report?	Testimony	Response	Discussion / Recommendation
199	MoBike	236	No	Little Falls Parkway south of the CCT – I said specify it as shared roadway in my last round of comments because I didn't realize we could specify bikeable shoulders. So please plan it as bikeable shoulders, because the shoulders get frequent use already. The CCT is the parallel alternative for interested but concerned cyclists.	Disagree	Per the Department of Parks, all bikeway and park trail investments in this area of the county – between Bethesda and Westbard – should and will focus on improvements to the Capital Crescent Trail.
201	MoBike	236	No	Kensington Parkway south of Beach Drive – This is another street with limited space that's difficult to master plan without more study, so facility type should be TBD. The new plan is contradictory, since the map says shared roadway, but the table says a shared use path north of Husted and protected bike lanes south of Husted. South of Husted, adding almost any bikeway would have impacts on the neighborhood. North of Husted, the best solution is one-way protected bike lanes, conventional bike lanes or shoulders – but please not just a shared use path or two-way PBLs, since this is traditionally an on-road route (and I fear I'm betraying my fellow road cyclists by saying protected bike lanes are okay). There are no easy answers from Husted south, but getting to Inverness is essential since that's an alternate route to Jones Bridge and Manor Rd. South of Inverness, it's not quite as critical.	Disagree	Kensington Pkwy is an important connection between Kensington and Chevy Chase Lake. The traffic speeds and traffic volumes are such that "road cyclists" should feel comfortable bicycling in the road. However, most people will require a separated bikeway to be comfortable bicycling on this road.
202	MoBike	236	No	Grafton St at Wisconsin Ave – Possibly improve this two-way cut-thru for bikes, since it's one-way "in" (eastbound) for cars and narrow.	Disagree	While this connection is narrow, staff does not believe it needs to be widened because the connection is very short and because there is an adequate connection via Hesketh St about 300 feet to the north.
203	Barron	236	No	The trail between Little Falls Trail and Chevy Chase Blvd includes a staircase that is not appropriate for bikes.	N/A	The existing off-street trail between the Little Falls Trail and Chevy Chase Blvd could be upgraded to be a more comfortable connection for bicycling.
Bethesda Chevy Chase West Policy Area						
204	MCDOT	242		Add the Capital Crescent Trail to the MacArthur Connector.	Agree	Staff recommends recognizing MCDOT's proposed trail between Broad Street and the Capital Crescent Trail but qualifying the recommendation to say that "The implementation of this proposal is contingent upon evaluation of potential impacts to park land. Further, it will be subject to the avoid, minimize, mitigate and compensate policy adopted by the Planning Board in the 2017 Parks, Recreation and Open Space (PROS) plan".
205	MCDOT	242	No	Consider whether Burdette Rd should have defined bikeway facilities, particularly between MD 190 (River) and MD 191 (Bradley).	Disagree	We do not believe that this recommendation would add connectivity for the community, since the road is already low stress, and the nearby residential streets are very low stress.
206	MCDOT	242		Consider whether a defined connection should be provided between the Fernwood sidepath and MD 191 (Bradley).	Agree	Staff recommends extending the Fernwood Road sidepath to Bradley Blvd.
207	MCDOT	242	No	Consider whether a defined connection should be provided between the Ewing Dr neighborhood greenway and MD 191 (Bradley).	Disagree	We do not believe this is needed, especially since we agree that a connection between Fernwood Rd and Bradley Blvd is desirable.
208	MCDOT	242	No	Consider whether a defined connection should be provided along Sangamore Rd and Brookes La, connecting between MD 386 (Mass Ave) and MacArthur Blvd and improving access to the Intelligence Campus.	Disagree	We think it will be very challenging to implement this bikeway, especially since there are no existing sidewalks on the northern segments. There is a parallel low-stress street network for much of the way that people could use. It's a bit of a detour, but not outside the realm of what we could expect bicyclists who are concerned about riding on Sangamore Road to use.
209	Gerharz	242	No	The MacArthur Blvd trail is insufficient and the bike lanes are too narrow.	Disagree	The Montgomery County Department of Transportation is upgrading the MacArthur Blvd sidepath on the bikeable shoulders in phases and widening them where possible. This is a very constrained environment and it is challenging to widen these bikeways.
210	Dennis	242	No	MacArthur Blvd between Brickyard Rd and Falls Rd needs a shoulder in the uphill direction.	Disagree	The Bicycle Master Plan is recommending a bikeable shoulder on this road. After more discussion with Ms. Dennis, she recommends upgrading the bikeable shoulders to separated bike lanes between the southern end of Brickyard Rd and Stable Ln, a distance of just under one mile. The recommendation for bikeable shoulders does not preclude upgrading the bikeway to separated bike lanes in implementation. But at this time we do not think it is necessary to upgrade the bikeway from bikeable shoulders to separated bike lanes.
211	Mellema	242	No	Continue the Fernwood Rd sidepath to Greentree Rd. Elevate the sidepath to Tier 1.	Agree in part	We recommend extending the Fernwood Rd sidepath but do not recommend elevating it to Tier 1.
212	Mellema	242	No	Add a sidepath between Fernwood Rd and Grant St. Make this a Tier 1 bikeway.	Agree in part	We recommend adding the Greenwood Rd sidepath but do not recommend elevating it to Tier 1.
213	Dennis	242	No	An alternative path to avoid the steep hill on MacArthur Blvd is needed through the River Falls subdivision.	Disagree	We currently recommend a sidepath on Brickyard Rd between Falls Rd and Horseshoe La. There is no master-planned bikeway on Brickyard La between Horseshoe La and MacArthur Blvd because we believe that Horseshoe La and Masters Dr would be an appropriate an appropriate route and that no changes are needed to those roads to make them bikeable, with the exception of a short connection between MacArthur Blvd and Masters Dr.

Attachment B: Public Testimony and Summary Responses (Bikeway Comments Only)

#	Commentor	Plan Page #	In Staff Report?	Testimony	Response	Discussion / Recommendation
214	MoBike	242		Fernwood Road (Democracy Blvd to Marywood) – This might become a project very soon based on urgings of myself and the Fernwood community. Try not to predetermine the design now. The draft plan calls for a shared use path on the east side here, but it's a primary street that has numerous driveways, relatively slow speeds and traffic calming. Better solutions than just a path are possible. There's more flexibility north of I-495 where either protected bike lanes or a dual bikeway (path + shoulders) would work with some extra pavement. South of I-495 and on the overpass, protected bike lanes that allow pedestrian use might work as an innovation. Or try a hybrid solution, like a shared use path on the east side and a shoulder on the west side. Hard to figure all this out in a master plan. ALSO... make this Tier 1 priority. Poor WSSC restriping in the past few months has really brought this to a head.	Disagree	See response to Comment #156. We disagree that this bikeway should be elevated to a Tier 1 bikeway.
215	MoBike	242	No	River Road west of Westbard – Dave Anspacher's response to my request for a dual bikeway was "I'm okay with adding a second recommendation to this road, but we should state that it is either bike lanes or bikeable shoulders." Please say path + bike lanes. They're already marked as bike lanes. Also call for the path, which can be built if cost is reasonable. Touring/training cyclists ride to Potomac on this route, and even the strong and fearless probably don't want to take the lane here.	Disagree	See response to Comment #156.
Burtonsville Policy Area						
216	MCDOT	246	No	Show the Burtonsville Access Road and any connector streets between the BAR and MD 198. Identify any proposed bike facilities for these streets.	Agree	We recommend adding the Burtonsville Access Road and connector streets to the map. We recommend adding a sidepath on a TBD side of the road.
Chevy Chase Lake Policy Area						
217	MCDOT	248		Jones Mill Road has very high existing bicycle volumes. Consider context as to why this route is shown only as "bikeable shoulder" while there are many other roadways with lower existing volumes that are recommended as separated bikeway or striped bikeway.	Disagree	Staff did not recommend a low-stress bikeway on Jones Mill Road because it is a very constrained environment, is heavily used by bicyclists who prefer to ride in the road and there are parallel low-stress bikeways, including the Rock Creek Trail and the proposed separated bikeways along Kensington Parkway and Connecticut Avenue.
Clarksburg Policy Area						
218	MCDOT	250	No	It may be helpful to have a blow-up image of the area around Gateway Center Dr + Roberts Tavern Dr.	Agree	We recommend expanding the blow-up image on page 251 to include Gateway Center Drive and Roberts Tavern Dr.
219	MCDOT	250	No	Consider showing that the bikeway along B-10 (PB-10) and the bikeway along A-304/307 (PB-11) connect.	Disagree	The arrows are intended to show that they will connect, without specifying how. The Parks Department requested some flexibility in the alignment.
220	MCDOT	250	No	Consider a connection along Clarksburg Square Road, at least between Overlook Park Dr and Burdette Forest Rd; perhaps along a longer span.	Disagree	Clarksburg Square Road is already a very low stress road for bicycling and therefore does not need an improvement.
221	MCDOT	250	No	Recently completed separated bikeway should be shown as Existing on Stringtown Road east of Overlook Park Drive	Agree	The plan should show that the sidepath has been constructed on Stringtown Road east of Overlook Park Dr.
222	Knudson	250	No	Connect Street B-10 bikeway to Cabin Branch neighborhoods	Disagree	We agree that Street B-10 should be connected to the Cabin Branch neighborhoods, but we have not include a specific location at the request of the Department of Parks, which would like to maintain flexibility in its locations.
Cloverly Policy Area						
223	MCDOT	256	No	Consider whether there should be a short trail connection between Old Orchard Rd and Norbeck Rd.	N/A	We have recommended a neighborhood connector at this location. Most neighborhood connectors are short and hard to see on a policy area map, so they are identified in Appendix J.
224	MCDOT	256	No	There appears to be an existing trail connection between Notley Rd and Johnson Rd that is not reflected on this map.	N/A	We have recommended a neighborhood connector at this location. Most neighborhood connectors are short and hard to see on a policy area map, but they are on the online map and they are identified in Appendix J.
225	MCDOT	256	No	Consider whether any connections may be feasible between Gladbeck Lane and the ICC Trail, or Crest Hill La and the ICC Trail.	Disagree	The ICC Trail is proposed to be on the south side of the ICC, so a connection from these streets would require a bridge. While this would reduce travel time by some residents, we do not believe the benefits would justify the costs.
226	MCDOT	256	No	Consider connecting the Notley Rd bikeway with the end of the Stonegate Dr bikeway.	Disagree	The section of Notley Road between Stonegate Dr and Bonifant Rd is already a very low stress road, so a bikeway improvement is not needed. This could be a signed route.
227	WABA	256	No	Ednor Rd from Norwood Rd to New Hampshire Ave should be a separated bikeway, not bikeable shoulders.	N/A	The plan already includes a separated bikeway on Ednor Rd between Norwood Rd and New Hampshire Ave, so no change is needed.
228	MoBike	256	No	Bonifant Rd – I'll reiterate what I said last year. Robust sidepathing is needed, but where to put it is the question. Either say the side (north or south) is TBD or say the path should be on the south side from Notley to Pebblestone and on the north side from Pebblestone to the ICC trail, in order to avoid driveways, provide access to the ICC trail, and cross Bonifant at a signal (Pebblestone). Whether or where to build the rest of the path west of the ICC should be TBD, depending on ICC trail analysis that's probably not in the scope of this plan.	Disagree	Staff believes its important to identify a side of the road for sidepaths whenever possible, so that developers can be required to implement them as part of their development approvals. Since Bonifant Street becomes Bel Pre Rd to the west and already has a sidepath on the south side, we believe it makes sense to continue the sidepath on the south side of Bonifant St. MCDOT can consider a different side of the road during implementation.

Attachment B: Public Testimony and Summary Responses (Bikeway Comments Only)

#	Commentor	Plan Page #	In Staff Report?	Testimony	Response	Discussion / Recommendation
229	MoBike	256	No	Norbeck Rd (Layhill Rd to New Hampshire Ave) – Shoulders are worth explicitly requiring here due to the semi-rural character and role in the network. The plan was updated to note shoulders east of New Hampshire but still doesn't note them west of New Hampshire. The dual facility already exists here, and the recommended second path (on the other side of the street) seems lower priority, except between Norwood and Layhill (in front of Northwest Branch Regional Park).	Agree	Staff recommends adding bikeable shoulders on Norbeck Rd between Layhill Rd and New Hampshire Ave. These shoulders already exist along much of the road and unlikely to impact the provision of a sidepath.
230	MoBike	256		Briggs Chaney Road – This merits a dual bikeway (shoulders + path) if at all possible. It's part of a fast on-road connection between distant centers and has rural cycling implications.	Disagree	See response to Comment #156.
231	MoBike	256		Norwood Road – Qualified dual bikeway. Provides rural access and has existing shoulders, so the plan should recommend keeping the shoulders as well as adding a path. The path may be identified as higher priority.	Disagree	See response to Comment #156.
232	MoBike	256		Fairland Road - Qualified dual bikeway. Has fairly important existing shoulders, so the plan should recommend keeping the shoulders as well as adding a path. The path may be identified as higher priority (qualified dual bikeway).	Disagree	See response to Comment #156.
233	Helms	256	No	Bryans Nursery Neighborhood Bikeway- Norbeck -Old Orchard Neighborhood Bikeway Trail Connector FROM Bryans Nursery Neighborhood Bikeway TO Norbeck (Hard Surface Trail)	N/A	We previously added this as a neighborhood connector, per Mr. Helms request.
234	Helms	256	No	Bryants Nursery FROM New Hampshire TO Norwood (Striped Bikeway)	Disagree	Adding bike lanes would require widening the road, which is not possible as long as this is designated as a rustic road.
235	Helms	256		Carona FROM Notley TO Bonifant (Striped Bikeway)	Disagree	As a general rule, the Bicycle Master Plan does not recommend bikeways on roads that are considered to be very low-stress. These roads may be appropriate for signed bike routes, which could be installed by MCDOT without a master plan recommendation.
236	Helms	256	No	Cloverly Park Trail Connector FROM Rainbow TO Gallaudet (Striped Bikeway)	Disagree	We have an existing recommendation on Briggs Chaney Road that addresses the same connection and is only a short distance away.
237	Helms	256		Crest Hill FROM Briggs Chaney TO Paint Branch Trail-N(north) (Striped Bikeway)	Disagree	See response to Comment #235.
238	Helms	256		Gallaudet FROM Cloverly Park Trail Connector TO New Hampshire (Striped Bikeway)	Disagree	See response to Comment #235.
239	Helms	256		Harding FROM Harding-Good Hope Trail Connector TO New Hampshire (Striped Bikeway)	Disagree	See response to Comment #235.
240	Helms	256		Harding-Good Hope Trail Connector FROM Harding TO Good Hope (Striped Bikeway)	Disagree	See response to Comment #235.
241	Helms	256		Hildegard-Peachstone- Seibel FROM Peach Orchard TO Timberlake (Striped Bikeway)	Disagree	See response to Comment #235.
242	Helms	256		Holly Spring-Kaywood FROM Peach Orchard TO Kaywood-Miles Trail Connector (Striped Bikeway)	Disagree	See response to Comment #235.
243	Helms	256		Hopefield-Kings House FROM Good Hope TO Kings House Trail Connector (Striped Bikeway)	Disagree	See response to Comment #235.
244	Helms	256		Johnson-Notley FROM Norbeck TO Bonifant (Striped Bikeway)	Disagree	See response to Comment #235.
245	Helms	256		Kaywood-Miles Trail Connector FROM Holly Spring- Kaywood TO Miles (Hard Surface Trail)	Disagree	It is not appropriate, and would be duplicative, to include all hard surface park trails in the Bicycle Master Plan. M-NCPPC Montgomery County Department of Parks recognizes that many hard surface park trails are used for bicycle transportation. Bicycle commuters regularly use many park trails, particularly down-county, and therefore the Bicycle Master Plan includes stream valley trails as a bikeway type. But decisions about stream valley park trails are primarily governed by the 2016 Countywide Park Trails Plan, as well as other operational policies of M-NCPPC Montgomery Parks.
246	Helms	256		Kings House FROM Kings House Trail Connector TO Peach Orchard (Striped Bikeway)	Disagree	See response to Comment #235.
247	Helms	256	No	Kings House Trail Connector FROM Hopefield-Kings House TO Peach Orchard (Hard Surface Trail)	N/A	This is an existing recommendation in the plan.
248	Helms	256		Murphy FROM Good Hope TO Paint Branch Trail-N(west) (Striped Bikeway)	Disagree	See response to Comment #235.
249	Helms	256		Pamela Trail Connector FROM Rainbow TO Harding (Striped Bikeway)	N/A	This is already recommended as a neighborhood connector.
250	Helms	256		Paint Branch Trail Fairland2Briggs Chaney (West) Trail Extension FROM Murphy TO Fairland (Hard Surface Trail)	Disagree	It is not appropriate, and would be duplicative, to include all hard surface park trails in the Bicycle Master Plan. M-NCPPC Montgomery County Department of Parks recognizes that many hard surface park trails are used for bicycle transportation. Bicycle commuters regularly use many park trails, particularly down-county, and therefore the Bicycle Master Plan includes stream valley trails as a bikeway type. But decisions about stream valley park trails are primarily governed by the 2016 Countywide Park Trails Plan, as well as other operational policies of M-NCPPC Montgomery Parks.
251	Helms	256		Paint Branch Trail Fairland2Briggs Chaney Trail Extension- Bart/Ansted Spur FROM Paint Branch Trail-ICC Trail TO Briggs Chaney (Hard Surface Trail)	Disagree	It is not appropriate, and would be duplicative, to include all hard surface park trails in the Bicycle Master Plan. M-NCPPC Montgomery County Department of Parks recognizes that many hard surface park trails are used for bicycle transportation. Bicycle commuters regularly use many park trails, particularly down-county, and therefore the Bicycle Master Plan includes stream valley trails as a bikeway type. But decisions about stream valley park trails are primarily governed by the 2016 Countywide Park Trails Plan, as well as other operational policies of M-NCPPC Montgomery Parks.

Attachment B: Public Testimony and Summary Responses (Bikeway Comments Only)

#	Commentor	Plan Page #	In Staff Report?	Testimony	Response	Discussion / Recommendation
252	Helms	256		Paint Branch Trail Fairland2Briggs Chaney Trail Extension- Crest Hill Spur FROM Paint Branch Trail-ICC Trail TO Briggs Chaney (Hard Surface Trail)	Disagree	It is not appropriate, and would be duplicative, to include all hard surface park trails in the Bicycle Master Plan. M-NCPPC Montgomery County Department of Parks recognizes that many hard surface park trails are used for bicycle transportation. Bicycle commuters regularly use many park trails, particularly down-county, and therefore the Bicycle Master Plan includes stream valley trails as a bikeway type. But decisions about stream valley park trails are primarily governed by the 2016 Countywide Park Trails Plan, as well as other operational policies of M-NCPPC Montgomery Parks.
253	Helms	256		Rainbow FROM Cloverly Park Trail Connector TO Good Hope (Striped Bikeway)	Disagree	See response to Comment #235.
254	Helms	256		Thompson FROM Spencerville TO Rainbow (Striped Bikeway)	Disagree	See response to Comment #235.
255	Helms	256		Timberlake FROM Timberlake-Lions Den Trail Connector TO Hildegard- Peachstone-Seibel (Striped Bikeway)	Disagree	See response to Comment #235.
256	Helms	256		Timberlake-Lions Den Trail Connector FROM Timberlake TO Lions Den (Hard Surface Trail)	Disagree	It is not appropriate, and would be duplicative, to include all hard surface park trails in the Bicycle Master Plan. M-NCPPC Montgomery County Department of Parks recognizes that many hard surface park trails are used for bicycle transportation. Bicycle commuters regularly use many park trails, particularly down-county, and therefore the Bicycle Master Plan includes stream valley trails as a bikeway type. But decisions about stream valley park trails are primarily governed by the 2016 Countywide Park Trails Plan, as well as other operational policies of M-NCPPC Montgomery Parks.
257	Helms	256		Timberlake-Perrywood Trail Connector FROM Hildegard- Peachstone- Seibel TO Perrywood (Hard Surface Trail)	Disagree	It is not appropriate, and would be duplicative, to include all hard surface park trails in the Bicycle Master Plan. M-NCPPC Montgomery County Department of Parks recognizes that many hard surface park trails are used for bicycle transportation. Bicycle commuters regularly use many park trails, particularly down-county, and therefore the Bicycle Master Plan includes stream valley trails as a bikeway type. But decisions about stream valley park trails are primarily governed by the 2016 Countywide Park Trails Plan, as well as other operational policies of M-NCPPC Montgomery Parks.
Damascus Policy Area						
258	MCDOT	258		Consider whether the Oak Dr sidepath should be extended either to the utility ROW (per next comment), or along the full length of Oak Dr.	Disagree	We recommend maintaining the existing recommendation for a sidepath between John T Baker Middle School and Ridge Rd.
259	MCDOT	258		Consider whether the utility ROW in this area might be proposed for a trail linking Clearspring Rd, Conrad Ct, MD 27, and Oak Dr to points westward, into Clarksburg Town Center and potentially Sugarloaf Mtn.	Disagree	Staff does not support a bikeway on this corridor because the proposed Ridge Rd (MD 27) sidepath would provide similar connectivity but would also provide connectivity to the adjacent neighborhoods and Cedar Grove ES.
Derwood Policy Area						
260	MCDOT	260	No	Consider extending the Needwood Rd sidepath to Timbercrest Dr / Bethayres Rd, across the trail connector to Malabar St, and linking into Shady Grove Rd's sidepath.	Agree	We recommend adding this existing connection to the map.
261	MCDOT	260	No	Consider highlighting trails around Needwood Lake.	Disagree	It is not appropriate to include natural surface trails or hard surface trails in the Bicycle Master Plan. While many natural surface trails are used for bicycle transportation, they are designed and constructed for sustainable, natural resource-based recreation. M-NCPPC Montgomery County Department of Parks recognizes that many hard surface park trails are used for bicycle transportation. Bicycle commuters regularly use many park trails, particularly down-county, and therefore the Bicycle Master Plan includes stream valley trails as a bikeway type. But decisions about stream valley park trails are primarily governed by the 2016 Countywide Park Trails Plan, as well as other operational policies of M-NCPPC Montgomery Parks.
262	Palakovich-Carr	260		Recommends two-way separated bike lanes on the east side of Frederick Rd, between Shady Grove Road and College Parkway to be consistent with City of Rockville recommendations.	Agree	We do not believe there is an inconsistency between the Bicycle Master Plan and the City of Rockville's Bikeway Master Plan, since the Bicycle Master Plan recommendation is on the east side of Frederick Road and the City of Rockville's recommendation is likely intended for the west side of Frederick Road. We have reached out to City staff to confirm our assumption and have not heard back. We will update our recommendation if needed after confirming with City staff.
Fairland-Colesville Policy Area						
263	MCDOT	264	No	Consider showing the Paint Branch Trail, and whether any connectivity across the stream may be warranted (perhaps extending Jackson to Cedar Hill, or connecting Pilgrim Hill Local Park and Featherwood St).	Disagree	It is not appropriate to include natural surface trails or hard surface trails in the Bicycle Master Plan. While many natural surface trails are used for bicycle transportation, they are designed and constructed for sustainable, natural resource-based recreation. M-NCPPC Montgomery County Department of Parks recognizes that many hard surface park trails are used for bicycle transportation. Bicycle commuters regularly use many park trails, particularly down-county, and therefore the Bicycle Master Plan includes stream valley trails as a bikeway type. But decisions about stream valley park trails are primarily governed by the 2016 Countywide Park Trails Plan, as well as other operational policies of M-NCPPC Montgomery Parks.
264	MCDOT	264	No	Consider a bikeway connection between Cannon Rd and Randolph Rd.	Disagree	We consider but rejected this bikeway because it would require substantial property acquisition from one property and there are already nearby connections to Randolph Road that connect to signalized intersections.
265	Helms	264	No	Paint Branch Trail-Menlee Trail Connector FROM Paint Branch Trail-MLK-OCP-WO Trail Connector TO Paint Branch Trail-Menlee- Milestone- Stewart Bikeway Connector (Striped Bikeway)	Disagree	M-NCPPC Montgomery Parks is currently working on a limited natural surface trails plan for the Upper Paint Branch stream valley parks. This plan will be focused on providing managed access to parks in this area of the county, while minimizing impacts to sensitive natural resources.
266	Helms	264		Perrywood FROM Timberlake- Perrywood Trail Connector TO Miles- Friendlywood-Carson- Oakhurst (Striped Bikeway)	Disagree	See response to Comment #235.
267	Helms	264	No	Robey -Sir Thomas Trail Connector FROM Robey TO Sir Thomas (Hard Surface Trail)	Agree	This can be added as a neighborhood connector.
268	Helms	264	No	Ballinger FROM Robey TO Wexhall (Striped Bikeway)	N/A	We previously added conventional bike lanes in response to comment from Mr. Helms.
269	Helms	264		Briarcliff Manor Way FROM Miles- Friendlywood- Carson-Oakhurst TO Lions Den (Striped Bikeway)	Disagree	See response to Comment #235.

Attachment B: Public Testimony and Summary Responses (Bikeway Comments Only)

#	Commentor	Plan Page #	In Staff Report?	Testimony	Response	Discussion / Recommendation
270	Helms	264	No	Briggs Chaney-Tapestry Trail FROM Briggs Chaney TO Wexhall (Hard Surface Trail)	N/A	We previously added this as a sidepath, per Mr. Helms request.
271	Helms	264	No	Cannon Road/Shaw Road/Springloch Dr/Springtree Dr FROM Randolph TO E Randolph (Striped Bikeway)	Disagree	We already have a recommendation on Cannon Rd. Shaw Rd / Springlock Dr / Springtree Dr are all very low stress roads. We considered designating them as a neighborhood greenway, but the road is steep and there recommendation a sidepath on Randolph Rd.
272	Helms	264	No	Castle FROM Briggs Chaney TO Ballinger (Striped Bikeway)	N/A	We previously added this as a sidepath, per Mr. Helms request, between Briggs Chaney Rd and Castle Ridge Cir. The remaining section of road is already low stress.
273	Helms	264	No	Castle-Ballinger Trail Connector FROM Castle TO Ballinger (Hard Surface Trail)	Disagree	This is an existing recommendation in the plan.
274	Helms	264		Cotton Tree Lane/Blackburn/Tolson FROM N-FRP Trail TO Old Columbia Pike (Striped Bikeway)	Agree	See response to Comment #235.
275	Helms	264		Fairdale FROM Miles TO Briggs Chaney (Striped Bikeway)	Disagree	See response to Comment #235.
276	Helms	264	No	Galway FROM Fairland TO Calverton (Striped Bikeway)	Disagree	This road is designated as a sidepath between Fairland Rd and Galway ES. We don't believe there is much value in extending sidepath to Calverton Blvd as it is already a low-stress street and there are parallel very low-stress streets.
277	Helms	264		Leister/Billington Rd/Laurie/Montclair/Downs FROM E Randolph TO Jackson (Striped Bikeway)	Disagree	See response to Comment #235.
278	Helms	264		Lions Den FROM Timberlake-Lions Den Trail Connector TO Spencerville (Striped Bikeway)	Disagree	See response to Comment #235.
279	Helms	264		McKnew/Cotton Tree Trail Bridge FROM N-Fairland Regional Park Trail TO Sparrow House/McKnee (Hard Surface Trail)	Disagree	It is not appropriate, and would be duplicative, to include all hard surface park trails in the Bicycle Master Plan. M-NCPPC Montgomery County Department of Parks recognizes that many hard surface park trails are used for bicycle transportation. Bicycle commuters regularly use many park trails, particularly down-county, and therefore the Bicycle Master Plan includes stream valley trails as a bikeway type. But decisions about stream valley park trails are primarily governed by the 2016 Countywide Park Trails Plan, as well as other operational policies of M-NCPPC Montgomery Parks.
280	Helms	264		Miles FROM Kaywood-Miles Trail Connector TO Old Columbia Pike (Striped Bikeway)	Disagree	See response to Comment #235.
281	Helms	264		Miles-Friendlywood-Carson- Oakhurst FROM Fairdale TO Oakhurst- Praisner- Briarcliff Manor Trail Connector (Striped Bikeway)	Disagree	See response to Comment #235.
282	Helms	264		North Extension Fairland Regional Park Trail (N- FRPT) FROM Cotton Tree/Blackburn TO Greencastle (Hard Surface Trail)	Disagree	It is not appropriate, and would be duplicative, to include all hard surface park trails in the Bicycle Master Plan. M-NCPPC Montgomery County Department of Parks recognizes that many hard surface park trails are used for bicycle transportation. Bicycle commuters regularly use many park trails, particularly down-county, and therefore the Bicycle Master Plan includes stream valley trails as a bikeway type. But decisions about stream valley park trails are primarily governed by the 2016 Countywide Park Trails Plan, as well as other operational policies of M-NCPPC Montgomery Parks.
283	Helms	264	No	Notley FROM New Hampshire TO ICC (Striped Bikeway)	N/A	This is an existing recommendation.
284	Helms	264	No	Northwest Branch Trail-West Trail to Springbrook Dr Bridge Connector FROM Northwest Branch Trail TO Springbrook (Hard Surface Trail)	Disagree	A new paved trail or bikeway crossing the park would cause unacceptable impacts to natural resources. This stretch of Northwest Branch Stream Valley Park is a best natural area, featuring plants and wildlife habitat not found anywhere else in the M-NCPPC park system. As such, this park is managed to maximize natural resource protection, and also to provide opportunities for natural resource based recreational on natural surface park trails.
285	Helms	264		Oakhurst FROM Miles- Friendlywood- Carson-Oakhurst TO Old Columbia Pike (Striped Bikeway)	Disagree	See response to Comment #235.
286	Helms	264		Oakhurst-Praisner-Briarcliff Manor Trail Connector FROM Miles- Friendlywood- Carson-Oakhurst TO Briarcliff Manor Way (Hard Surface Trail)	Disagree	It is not appropriate, and would be duplicative, to include all hard surface park trails in the Bicycle Master Plan. M-NCPPC Montgomery County Department of Parks recognizes that many hard surface park trails are used for bicycle transportation. Bicycle commuters regularly use many park trails, particularly down-county, and therefore the Bicycle Master Plan includes stream valley trails as a bikeway type. But decisions about stream valley park trails are primarily governed by the 2016 Countywide Park Trails Plan, as well as other operational policies of M-NCPPC Montgomery Parks.
287	Helms	264	No	Paint Branch Trail-Menlee-Milestone- Stewart Bikeway Connector FROM Stewart TO Paint Branch Trail (Striped Bikeway)	Disagree	We have a sidepath recommendation on the west side of US 29.
288	Helms	264		Paint Branch Trail-MLB-OCP-WO Underpass US29 FROM Paint Branch Trail TO Old Columbia Pike (Hard Surface Trail)	Disagree	It is not appropriate, and would be duplicative, to include all hard surface park trails in the Bicycle Master Plan. M-NCPPC Montgomery County Department of Parks recognizes that many hard surface park trails are used for bicycle transportation. Bicycle commuters regularly use many park trails, particularly down-county, and therefore the Bicycle Master Plan includes stream valley trails as a bikeway type. But decisions about stream valley park trails are primarily governed by the 2016 Countywide Park Trails Plan, as well as other operational policies of M-NCPPC Montgomery Parks.
289	Helms	264		Paint Branch Trail-MLK-OCP-WO Trail Connector FROM Jackson TO Old Columbia Pike (Hard Surface Trail)	Disagree	It is not appropriate, and would be duplicative, to include all hard surface park trails in the Bicycle Master Plan. M-NCPPC Montgomery County Department of Parks recognizes that many hard surface park trails are used for bicycle transportation. Bicycle commuters regularly use many park trails, particularly down-county, and therefore the Bicycle Master Plan includes stream valley trails as a bikeway type. But decisions about stream valley park trails are primarily governed by the 2016 Countywide Park Trails Plan, as well as other operational policies of M-NCPPC Montgomery Parks.
290	Helms	264	No	Quaint Acres FROM Northwest Branch Trail TO New Hampshire (Striped Bikeway)	Disagree	A new paved trail or bikeway crossing the park would cause unacceptable impacts to natural resources. This stretch of Northwest Branch Stream Valley Park is a best natural area, featuring plants and wildlife habitat not found anywhere else in the M-NCPPC park system. As such, this park is managed to maximize natural resource protection, and also to provide opportunities for natural resource based recreational on natural surface park trails.
291	Helms	264	No	Serpentine Way FROM Fairland TO E Randolph (Striped Bikeway)	N/A	This is a existing recommendation.

Attachment B: Public Testimony and Summary Responses (Bikeway Comments Only)

#	Commentor	Plan Page #	In Staff Report?	Testimony	Response	Discussion / Recommendation
292	Helms	264		Springbrook FROM Northwest Branch Trail Bridge TO New Hampshire (Striped Bikeway)	Disagree	See response to Comment #235.
293	Helms	264		Tamarack FROM Fairland TO E Randolph (Striped Bikeway)	Disagree	See response to Comment #235.
294	Helms	264	No	US29 Bikeway Milestone- Hillwood Extension FROM Stewart TO Lockwood (Separated Bikeway)	Disagree	Unclear where this is located.
295	Helms	264	No	US29-Red Cedar Trail Connector FROM Red Cedar TO US29 (Hard Surface Trail)	Disagree	This would require land from one or more single-family homes.
296	Helms	264		Vierling-Scott-Locksley- Hawkesbury FROM Notley TO Randolph (Striped Bikeway)	Disagree	See response to Comment #235.
297	Helms	264	No	Wexhall FROM N-FRP Trail TO US29 (Striped Bikeway)	N/A	Added conventional bike lanes in response to previous comment from Mr. Helms.
301	Deegan	264	No	Would support neighborhood greenway on Autumn Dr if: 1) neighborhood safety is maintained and on-street parking is preserved.	Agree	Neighborhood greenways do not have to remove on-street parking and are intended to create a safe environment for all road users, not just bicyclists.
302	Winter	264	No	Investigate a crossing of Northwest Branch between Colesville Rd and Randolph Rd.	Disagree	A new paved trail or bikeway crossing the park would cause unacceptable impacts to natural resources. This stretch of Northwest Branch Stream Valley Park is a best natural area, featuring plants and wildlife habitat not found anywhere else in the M-NCPPC park system. As such, this park is managed to maximize natural resource protection, and also to provide opportunities for natural resource based recreational on natural surface park trails.
Friendship Heights CBD Policy Area						
307	Village of Friendship Heights	268	No	Concerned that separated bike lanes on the north side of Willard Ave will conflict with truck access to buildings on the north side of the street.	N/A	The separated bike lanes are recommended to be on the south side of Willard Ave.
Germantown East Policy Area						
308	MoBike	274		Germantown Rd/Watkins Mill Rd (MD 355 to Stedwick Rd) – Qualified dual bikeway. Important Gaithersburg-Germantown link and occasional rural connector. Plan should probably recommend shoulders as well as the path, though path is higher priority. This is not a critical dual bikeway however.	Disagree	See response to Comment #156.
Germantown Town Center Policy Area						
309	MCDOT	278	No	Middlebrook Locbury to Crystal Rock notes TWO-way Separated Bikeway on east side of Roadway but Seneca Valley HS is on west side. Should we have bikeway on west side?	Disagree	The bikeway on the west side is included in the Germantown - Life Sciences Center Breezeway recommendations.
310	WABA	278	No	There should be bikeways on both sides of Germantown Road road to avoid forcing bicyclists to cross the road.	Disagree	While we generally support bikeways on both sides of the road on wide roads, we believe it is better to focus on providing a very high-quality bikeway on the north side of Germantown Road, which has on- and off-ramps from I-270.
Germantown West Policy Area						
311	WABA	282	No	There should be bikeways on both sides of Germantown Road to avoid forcing bicyclists to cross the road.	Disagree	See response to Comment#310.
312	WABA	282	No	There should be bikeways on both sides of Great Seneca Hwy to avoid forcing bicyclists to cross the road.	Disagree	While we have recommended a sidepath on both sides of Great Senecay Hwy between Middlebrook Rd and Richter Farm Rd, south of Richter Farm Rd we have recommended a sidepath on only the east side of the road because there is little land use for a distance of about 2 miles.
313	WABA	282	No	There should be bikeways on both sides of Middlebrook Rd to avoid forcing bicyclists to cross the road.	Disagree	While we generally support bikeways on both sides of the road on wide roads, we believe it is better to focus on providing a very high-quality bikeway on the south side of Middlebrook Road, which has on- and off-ramps from I-270. This bikeway would connect to the existing sidepath on the south side of Middlebrook Road between Observation Dr and Midcounty Hwy.
314	MoBike	282		Corridor Cities Transitway Trail – Is this not going to be a quality trail that could be identified as a breezeway?	Disagree	The Corridor Cities Transitway Trail was not recommended to be part of the Breezeway Network because nearby parallel roads are already designated as part of the Breezeway Network, including MD 355 and Great Seneca Highway. It is unlikely that Phase 2 of the Corridor Cities Transitway will be constructed in the next 20 years, so designating the Corridor Cities Transitway Trail as part of the Breezeway Network could be considered in the future.
315	MoBike	282		Schaeffer Rd (Clopper Rd to Richter Farm Rd) – Qualified dual bikeway (path higher priority) if not an actual full dual bikeway. Important rural connector. Plan should recommend keeping existing shoulders as well as adding a path.	Disagree	See response to Comment #156.
Glenmont Policy Area						
316	MCDOT	286	No	Parts of Layhill Road Path and bicycle lanes are existing between Glenallan and Briggs	Agree in part	The maps inadvertently left off the existing conventional bike lanes. These will be added to the map. There is no existing shared use path in this location.
317	MCDOT	286	No	Not to necessarily disagree with the proposed routing, but clarify the benefits of the Breezeway being offset along Flack St instead of remaining continuously along Georgia Ave.	Disagree	The benefit is that the bikeway will be located on a calm residential street.
Grosvenor Policy Area						

Attachment B: Public Testimony and Summary Responses (Bikeway Comments Only)

#	Commentor	Plan Page #	In Staff Report?	Testimony	Response	Discussion / Recommendation
Kensington-Wheaton Policy Area						
319	MCDOT	292	No	Consider a blow-up of the Forest Glen Metro area. It is not clear where the separated bikeway along Georgia is intended to be, nor the trail shown immediately east of it.	Agree	We recommend adding a blow-up map of the Forest Glen metro area.
320	MCDOT	292	No	Consider a blow-up of the Kensington area, which is slightly too busy to discern each line with reliable acuity.	Agree	We recommend adding a blow-up map of the Kensington area.
321	Helms	292		Lamberton Sq - Greencastle Ridge FROM Lamberton Square TO Greencastle Ridge (Hard Surface Trail)	Disagree	It is not appropriate, and would be duplicative, to include all hard surface park trails in the Bicycle Master Plan. M-NCPPC Montgomery County Department of Parks recognizes that many hard surface park trails are used for bicycle transportation. Bicycle commuters regularly use many park trails, particularly down-county, and therefore the Bicycle Master Plan includes stream valley trails as a bikeway type. But decisions about stream valley park trails are primarily governed by the 2016 Countywide Park Trails Plan, as well as other operational policies of M-NCPPC Montgomery Parks.
322	Helms	292		Northwest Branch Trail-West Trail FROM Northwest Branch Trail Bridge Connector 2 TO Kemp Mill (Hard Surface Trail)	Disagree	It is not appropriate, and would be duplicative, to include all hard surface park trails in the Bicycle Master Plan. M-NCPPC Montgomery County Department of Parks recognizes that many hard surface park trails are used for bicycle transportation. Bicycle commuters regularly use many park trails, particularly down-county, and therefore the Bicycle Master Plan includes stream valley trails as a bikeway type. But decisions about stream valley park trails are primarily governed by the 2016 Countywide Park Trails Plan, as well as other operational policies of M-NCPPC Montgomery Parks.
323	Helms	292	No	Alderton-Trivoli Lake FROM Bonifant TO Randolph (Striped Bikeway)	Disagree	Sidepath recommended from Bonifant Rd to Matthew Henson Trail and from Redspire Dr to Randolph Rd. Section in between is already low-stress.
324	Helms	292		Brookhaven-Stonington- Hermleigh FROM Northwest Branch Trail TO Kemp Mill (Striped Bikeway)	Disagree	See response to Comment #235.
325	Helms	292		Lamberton FROM Arcola TO Northwest Branch Trail (Striped Bikeway)	Disagree	See response to Comment #235.
326	Helms	292		Monticello-Conti-NHS- Caddington-Gabel-Tenbrook FROM Lamberton TO Dennis (Striped Bikeway)	Disagree	See response to Comment #235.
327	Helms	292	No	Northwest Branch Trail Bridge Connector 2 FROM Quant Acres TO Lamberton (Hard Surface Trail)	Disagree	A new paved trail or bikeway crossing the park would cause unacceptable impacts to natural resources. This stretch of Northwest Branch Stream Valley Park is a best natural area, featuring plants and wildlife habitat not found anywhere else in the M-NCPPC park system. As such, this park is managed to maximize natural resource protection, and also to provide opportunities for natural resource based recreational on natural surface park trails.
329	Bucholz	292		The proposed bikeway on Capitol View Ave should follow the existing road alignment, not the alignment in the 1982 Capitol View Sector Plan.	Disagree	The 1982 Capitol View Sector Plan recommends straightening Capitol View Avenue. The proposed sidepath follows the master-planned alignment of the road. Staff believes that the sidepath should continue to be located along the master-planned alignment of the road. A future update to the 1982 Capitol View Sector Plan would likely consider whether to retain the master-planned alignment of Capitol View Avenue. If the master-planned alignment is modified, the bikeway would need to be modified as well.
330	Warner	292	No	Need a bikeway on Capitol View Ave.	Agree	The plan recommends a sidepath on Capitol View Ave.
331	MoBike	292	No	Kensington Parkway north of Beach Drive – Were priority shared lanes going to be the recommendation, as hinted by your response to my previous comment on this road? If not, would advisory bike lanes work, or is traffic too heavy?	N/A	Priority shared lane markings are not recommended on Kensington Pkwy north of Beach Dr. Traffic is too heavy for advisory bike lanes.
332	Warner	292	No	Need a safe crossing of Connecticut Ave in Kensington.	Agree	While the plan has general guidance on improving crossings, master plans do not typically recommend improving specific intersections.
333	Warner	292	No	Need a hard surface trail from Shorefield Rd / Orebaugh Ave to Glenallen Ave via Wheaton Regional Park.	Disagree	While we agree this connection would be beneficial, the Wheaton Regional Park plan is the appropriate plan to consider trail connections between Shorefield Rd and Orebaugh Ave.
335	Herr	292	No	Add a new bike path from the terminus of Kenton Drive, through the western portion of Pleasant View park to the public parking lot at the end of Upton Drive.	Disagree	This level of detail is not appropriate for a countywide functional master plan. If and when this park is funded for major renovations, widening and upgrading trails are typically considered.
336	Reis	292	No	Would like designated space for bicycling in the road on Randolph Road between New Hampshire and Georgia Avenue, particularly in the downhill direction.	Disagree	The plan recommends a sidepath on the north side of Randolph Road between New Hampshire and Georgia Avenue, which would be more comfort for most bicyclists than conventional bike lanes given that this road has a posted speed limit of 35 mph. However, the plan also supports adding conventional bike lanes where is sufficient space.
337	MoBike	292		Knowles Ave (Beach to Summit) – Explicitly recommend shoulders, as the earlier draft did. This is a road biking route from Beach Drive to Kensington (Plyers Mill path is the off-road alternative). But if a path is still needed, put it on the north side and leave the uphill shoulder as a climbing lane on the south side of the roadway. FYI, the road runs east-west, not north-south. Cyclists can use the travel lane downhill.	Disagree	See response to Comment #156.
338	MoBike	292	No	Plyers Mill Road Path (Plyers Mill Rd to Beach Drive) – This important connector is not shown on the plan map.	Agree	We recommend adding this trail connection between the end of Plyers Mill Rd and Beach Dr.
339	MoBike	292	No	Plyers Mill Road (Georgia to Amherst) – If Plyers Mill west of Georgia is a separated bikeway, this segment probably should be too, due to traffic volume and turning movements.	Agree	We recommend changing the recommendation from neighborhood greenway to sidepath for the one block on Plyers Mill Rd between Georgia Ave and Amherst Ave.
340	MoBike	292	No	Sligo Creek Trail – I still don't see the segment extending to Wheaton Regional Park on the map. The Kensington/Wheaton map is rather small and cluttered.	Agree	We recommend a neighborhood greenway on Orebaugh Ave between the terminus of the Sligo Creek Trail and Wheaton Regional Park.

Attachment B: Public Testimony and Summary Responses (Bikeway Comments Only)

#	Commentor	Plan Page #	In Staff Report?	Testimony	Response	Discussion / Recommendation
Montgomery Village Policy Area						
341	MCDOT	302	No	Consider whether a series of trail connectors might unite the limited-outlet neighborhoods east of the Stewartown Rd terminus (effectively allowing a shared street continuation of Stewartown Rd to Snouffer School Rd).	Disagree	Much of the land is Neighborhood Conservation Park or development communities and so implementing this could be very difficult.
342	MCDOT	302	No	Show the Trail Connector along Calypso Lane by Nike Park, and consider whether a shared lane route might extend Flower Hill Way to Strawberry Knoll Rd.	Agree	We recommend adding a neighborhood connector to connect to segments of Calypso Ln at Nike Park.
North Bethesda-Twinbrook Policy Area						
344	McClane	306	No	Update map to show that trail between Fisher La and Veirs Mill Rd is complete.	Agree	We recommend modifying the map to show that the trail is now complete.
North Potomac Policy Area						
345	MoBike	312		Dufief Mill Rd – Qualified dual bikeway. Nice existing shoulders make this a good rural biking connection. Plan should recommend keeping existing shoulders as well as a path, though path can be higher priority.	Disagree	See response to Comment #156.
Olney Policy Area						
346	MCDOT	314		Consider extending Utility Corridor #3 from Bowie Mill Rd northward, alongside Wickman Rd & Zion Rd, connecting into the Germantown-Burtonsville Breezeway.	Disagree	We considered this, but rejected it because it would duplicate the proposed MD 108 sidepath and would create a midblock crossing.
347	MCDOT	314		Consider extending Utility Corridor #4 from Georgia Ave / Prince Philip northward, connecting into the Germantown-Burtonsville Breezeway.	Agree in part	We disagree with extending Utility Corridor #4 to the Germantown-Burtonsville Breezeway as it would duplicate the Georgia Ave to Gold Mine Rd bikeway. Instead, we recommend extending the Gold Mine Rd bikeway to the Germantown - Burtonsville Breezeway. A portion of this bikeway is included in the design of the Gold Mine Rd bridge replacement project.
348	MCDOT	314	No	Show the Georgia Ave bikeway as extending to the Brookeville Bypass' southern roundabout / Brookeville Town Limits; not terminating at Gold Mine Rd.	Agree	We recommend extending the Georgia Ave sidepath from Gold Mine Rd to the Longwood Recreation Center on the west side of the road.
349	MCDOT	314	No	Consider a Trail Connector between Brooke Grove Rd and Hickory Knoll Rd, and perhaps shared roadway linking the Spartan Dr bikeway with the Brooke Rd bikeway. It appears such a connector *might* already exist.	Disagree	We do not support this connection because we anticipate it would have a very low use (due to the location and topography) and the cost could be high (since we do not have much right-of-way).
350	MCDOT	314	No	The insert shows a number of connections not shown on the larger map. In other cases where inserts are used it appears that the larger map nonetheless shows all connections.	Agree	We recommend adding those bikeways shown in the larger map on page 315 to the insert map on page 314 for consistency.
351	MCDOT	314		Batchellors Forest Rd is a Rustic Rd, and the delineated segment of Emory Church Rd has also been under consideration for Rustic status. While we don't dispute the need for the facilities, these facilities cannot be implemented as proposed for as long as these designations remain.	Agree	Staff believes that the appropriate type of bikeway on Batchellors Forest Road is a sidepath and that this bikeway is needed to provide access to Olney Manor Recreational Park, Batchellors Forest Local Park and Farquhar Middle School, among other locations. However, staff also recognizes that current policy does not permit sidepaths to be constructed along Batchellors Forest Road, so that to implement the sidepath, either the Rustic Road policy needs to be changed or the Rustic Road designation needs to be removed from this road. Since it is beyond the scope of the Bicycle Master Plan to weigh in on Rustic Roads policy or designation, staff recommends adding a note to the Batchellors Forest Road recommendation that says: "This bikeway recommendation is advisory only until the Rustic Road designation is removed or the Rustic Roads policy changes."
352	Pease-Fye, Snee, Smith	314		Supports proposed alignment on Batchellors Forest Rd.	Agree	See response to Comment #351.
353	Tworowski	314		Since Batchellor's Forest Rd is a rustic road, provide a natural surface trail instead of a sidepath.	Disagree	See response to Comment #351.
Potomac Policy Area						
354	MCDOT	320	No	Consider extending Brickyard Rd's sidepath to MacArthur Blvd.	Disagree	We considered extending the bikeway to MacArthur Blvd, but ultimately left it out because there are parallel low stress roads that bicyclists can use.
355	MoBike	320	No	Falls Road (River Road to Dunster) – Adding both shoulders and a path to Falls Road between Dunster and River Road would be all but impossible. DOT was even having trouble just adding a path. Call for either bikeable shoulders or a path, not both.	Agree	We recommend changing the recommendation from a sidepath and bikeable shoulders to only a sidepath. This project has been in the capital budget as a sidepath for many years and does not include bikeable shoulders.
356	MoBike	320		PEPCO Trail – I'll just reiterate my point that this should start at Westlake Drive. Don't give up just because some committee made a judgement in 2017. Since when was guaranteed feasibility required in this plan?	Disagree	The original concept for the PEPCO Trail was to travel along the utility corridor from Germantown to Westlake Dr near Montgomery Mall. An advisory group including M-NCPPC and MCDOT staff recommended removing the trail from the segment between Tuckerman La and Westlake Dr due to very steep slopes and to instead route the trail along Tuckerman La and Westlake Dr. Staff continues to support this approach.
357	MoBike	320		Bells Mill Road (Gainsborough Rd to Falls Rd) – Qualified dual bikeway. The nice existing shoulders in this section allow it to serve as a bypass of the high stress part of Democracy Blvd and it's another gateway to rural routes. The plan should strongly recommend keeping the shoulders as well as adding a path. The path may be identified as higher priority (qualified dual bikeway). But east of Gainsborough, only a path needs to be recommended (shoulders will likely remain anyway).	Disagree	See response to Comment #156.

Attachment B: Public Testimony and Summary Responses (Bikeway Comments Only)

#	Commentor	Plan Page #	In Staff Report?	Testimony	Response	Discussion / Recommendation
358	MoBike	320		<p>Tuckerman Lane (Old Georgetown Rd to Falls Rd) – I'll go into detail because this exemplifies the issue of preserving shoulders that are popular with road cyclists. DOT has NOT picked a design yet. This is a summary of my input to DOT on that project: constituency of road cyclists who use it frequently. It's important to retain a network of on-road biking routes conducive for fast cycling in a way that paths and protected bike lanes simply are not.</p> <p>Tuckerman can be thought of as two separate segments. East of Westlake Drive (to Old Georgetown Road), it is more like a park road, with relatively few homes or at-grade crossings along it. But west of Westlake Drive, it has Cabin John Park, the Cabin John shopping center, a high school, a middle school, and many homes with driveways. The need for local bike connectivity is much higher west of Westlake Drive.</p> <p>I recommended a few alternative solutions for DOT's Tuckerman Lane bike improvement project, all of them dual facilities to avoid forcing road cyclists onto paths or protected bike lanes, which can be cumbersome and limiting for these cyclists. All my solutions called for a shared use path on one side of the street and, west of Cabin John Park, a sidewalk on the other side as well. While it is possible to add conventional bike lanes, the easiest of my solutions would leave the road pretty mostly unchanged (cars can park in the shoulders but it's not onerous for cyclists) as well as provide the path (and sidewalk). This is similar to one of DOT's alternatives. As its so-called short term solution, DOT could add a sidewalk or path west of Westlake Drive on just the north side only, since school students (including my kids) often walk along Tuckerman. Another consideration is the need to link the PEPCO Trail at Tuckerman to Cabin John Park. A sidepath seems most compatible with this goal, as it would be more comfortable for children and families than protected bike lanes.</p>	Disagree	See response to Comment #156.
359				<p>Parking is allowed in the shoulders in several places, so cyclists would be sharing the shoulders with parked cars, as they do today. The shoulders become turn lanes at the intersections but confident cyclists can manage easily enough.</p> <p>Tuckerman Lane between Old Georgetown Road and Falls Road is very popular with road cyclists, whether for transportation or recreation. That's because its shoulders allow for fast and safe cycling over a considerable distance. There are no other east-west road routes crossing I-270/I-495 between Rockville and Bethesda that are as suitable for road riders. Tuckerman serves an important transportation function for riders who are willing to ride somewhat longer distances to work and other destinations. But it's equally important for fast recreational cyclists, and notably it's a gateway route from the east to Potomac routes which in turn lead to the rural west. So Tuckerman has an existing</p>		
R&D Village Policy Area						
360	MCDOT	324	No	R&D Village - Recognizing that the lines are not always shown to be representative of what side of a street the facility is intended to be on, for ease of use: consider swapping the two lines along Darnestown Rd, as the sidepath is along the north side.	Agree	We recommend making this visual change.
361	MCDOT	324	No	R&D Village - Ensure LSC Loop recommendations are reflected in table (understanding that in some segments it will be separated bike lanes AND sidepath.	Agree	We recommend calling out the LSC Loop as a separated bikeway, much like the "Germantown - Life Sciences Center Breezeway", as it is envisioned as a loop trail. This bikeway would include the "inner" side of Medical Center Dr, Medical Center Dr Ext, Johns Hopkins Dr, Belward Campus Dr, Decoverly Dr, Fields Rd and Omega Dr.
362	MoBike	324		Key West Ave – The MD 28 dual bikeway (thank you) should be noted as starting at the intersection of Key West Ave and Shady Grove Road, not at the Darnestown Rd/Key West split. This segment currently exists.	Disagree	See response to Comment #156.
Rural East (East) Policy Area						
363	MCDOT	328	No	Consider Shoulder Bikeway along the remainder of Bordly Drive to Brighton Dam Road	Disagree	We do not see much value in extending this bikeway.
364	Helms	328	No	Riding Stable Inter- County Connector FROM Prince Georges County TO Spencerville (Striped Bikeway)	Agree	There is value in this as a connection to Laurel, but since this road currently lacks sidewalks, a sidepath recommendation would be more appropriate.
365	Helms	328		Amina-Dustin FROM EXELON-PEPCO ROW East Trail TO Old Columbia Pike (Striped Bikeway)	Disagree	See response to Comment #235.

Attachment B: Public Testimony and Summary Responses (Bikeway Comments Only)

#	Commentor	Plan Page #	In Staff Report?	Testimony	Response	Discussion / Recommendation
366	Helms	328	No	Batson FROM Spencerville TO EXELON- PEPCO ROW West Trail (Striped Bikeway)	Disagree	Adding a trail is against county policy as long as this is designated as a rustic road.
367	Helms	328	No	Ednor Road Inter- County Connector FROM New Hampshire TO Howard County (Bikeable Shoulder)	N/A	Bikeable shoulders were previously added to Ednor Rd in response to Mr. Helm's comment.
368	Helms	328		EXELON-PEPCO ROW East Trail FROM Spencerville TO Amina-Dustin (Hard Surface Trail)	N/A	We previously added the utility corridor as a trail per Mr. Helm's recommendation.
369	Helms	328		EXELON-PEPCO ROW West Trail FROM Old Columbia Pike TO Ednor (Hard Surface Trail)	N/A	We previously added the utility corridor as a trail per Mr. Helm's recommendation.
370	Helms	328		Kruhm FROM Spencerville TO EXELON- PEPCO ROW West Trail (Striped Bikeway)	Disagree	See response to Comment #235.
371	Helms	328	No	Oak Hill FROM Spencerville TO EXELON- PEPCO ROW West Trail (Striped Bikeway)	Disagree	Adding bike lanes would require widening the road, which is not possible as long as this is designated as a rustic road.
Rural West Policy Area						
372	MCDOT	334		Consider whether any potential connections might be made between Rural West and the C&O Canal Towpath, recognizing that many of the roads are Rustic Roads. Perhaps extend Utility Corridor #1 toward the Dickerson Generating Station?	Agree	We recommend extending Utility Corridor #1 to the C&O Canal Towpath near Dickerson.
373	Dennis	334		Extend the Germantown - Burtonsville Breezeway to River Rd.	Disagree	While this trail would provide substantial value as a connection between Germantown and the C&O Canal Towpath, it would travel on a utility corridor through the Muddy Branch Stream Valley Park and the Blockhouse Point Conservation Park. Because of the potential impacts to water quality, the Countywide Park Trails Plan recommends natural surface trails in this location.
374	Allen	334		The plan includes insufficient connectivity to C&O Canal Towpath. Extend River Rd sidepath to Pennyfield Lock Rd, add sidepath on Seneca Rd and River Rd connecting Darnestown Rd to Violettes Lock Rd, extend sidepath on Germantown Rd and Darnestown Rd connecting PEPCO trail to Seneca Rd.	Agree in part	Staff recommends extending the sidepath on River Road to Seneca Road (#1 above). We disagree with adding sidepaths on Germantown Road, Darnestown Road and Seneca Road, as these would substantially change the rural character of these roads and the demand is likely to be low.
375	Knudson	334	No	Add bikeways to Barnesville Road, Comus Road and Old Hundred Road.	Disagree	These are rustic roads in a very rural area and are unlikely to have much use.
376	Knudson	334	No	Extend Bucklodge-White Ground Connector trail to Dickerson	Disagree	We do not recommend extending the bikeway along the railroad tracks from its current terminus north of the Boyd MARC station to Dickerson MARC station, a distance of 5 miles, due to high cost and low demand.
Shady Grove Policy Area						
377	MCDOT	338	No	The 355 Breezeway stops at the City of Rockville, several hundred feet short of the signal at Ridgemont Ave. Consider extending this facility at least to Ridgemont; preferably to Redland Rd (with Rockville's concurrence), or shifting the Breezeway to the east side of MD 355.	Disagree with changes	We recommend keeping the MD 355 Breezeway on the west side of MD 355. The Breezeway stops at the City of Rockville border. The MD 355 Breezeway should be shown in the table on page 339.
378	Palakovich-Carr	338		Recommends two-way separated bike lanes on the east side of Frederick Rd, between Shady Grove Road and College Parkway to be consistent with City of Rockville recommendations.	Agree	We do not believe there is an inconsistency between the Bicycle Master Plan and the City of Rockville's Bikeway Master Plan, since the Bicycle Master Plan recommendation is on the east side of Frederick Road and the City of Rockville's recommendation is likely intended for the west side of Frederick Road. We have reached out to City staff to confirm our assumption and have not heard back. We will update our recommendation if needed after confirming with City staff.
Silver Spring CBD Policy Area						
382	Weinstein	340		Separated bike lanes are needed on Colesville Road between Georgia Avenue and Fenton Street.	Disagree	While staff agrees that separated bike lanes are beneficial on Colesville Road between Georgia Avenue and Fenton Street, there is insufficient space to implement the bikeway without removing traffic lanes and / or narrowing the sidewalks.
383	Weinstein	340		Separated bike lanes are needed on Georgia Avenue.	Agree	While separated bike lanes would be very beneficial on Georgia Avenue, there are many constraints in the right-of-way (such as lay-bys, bus shelters and planters) and full dedication to the master-planned right-of-way will take a very long time. Alternative bikeways are proposed on parallel streets on both sides of Georgia Avenue. Separated bike lanes on 2nd Avenue are likely to be constructed in 2018 and separated bike lanes on Fenton Street are under consideration by MCDOT. That said, the master-planned right-of-way is wide enough to enable implementation of two-way separated bike lanes outside of the curb and there is nothing in the plan that would prevent MCDOT from implementing separated bike lanes on Georgia Avenue after more dedication occurs. We therefore support adding two-way separated bike lanes on the east side of Georgia Avenue.
384	Meszaros	340	No	Does not support the floating bus stop in the Spring Street / Cedar Street separated bike lanes because they cause congestion, which is bad for business. Believes that floating bus stops favor bicyclists over buses and traffic and that buses and bikes can share the same space.	Disagree	The Bicycle Master Plan supports floating bus stops as a generally concept, because sharing space with buses can be uncomfortable for bicyclists. However, it is the responsibility of the Montgomery County Department of Transportation to determine where they should be implemented.

Attachment B: Public Testimony and Summary Responses (Bikeway Comments Only)

#	Commentor	Plan Page #	In Staff Report?	Testimony	Response	Discussion / Recommendation
Silver Spring - Takoma Park (East) Policy Area						
385	MCDOT	344	No	Consider a connection between E Franklin Ave and Oakview Dr, across the Northwest Branch Trail.	Disagree	The Bicycle Master Plan is not recommending new bikeways through park land.
386	MCDOT	344	No	Show Trail Connectors across Long Branch, linking each side of Melbourne, as well as linking Schuyler-Wayne-Buckingham.	Agree	We recommend showing these existing trail connections.
387	MCDOT	344	No	Consider extending the Philadelphia Ave bikeway to connect the Takoma Park ES with the Piney Branch Rd bikeway.	Disagree	We added this bikeway at the request of the City of Takoma Park, which specifically asked for the bikeway to stop at Holly Ave.
388	Helms	344		Northwest Branch Trail-WO-FDA Trail I495 Overpass Connector FROM Devere TO E Light (Hard Surface Trail)	Disagree	It is not appropriate, and would be duplicative, to include all hard surface park trails in the Bicycle Master Plan. M-NCPPC Montgomery County Department of Parks recognizes that many hard surface park trails are used for bicycle transportation. Bicycle commuters regularly use many park trails, particularly down-county, and therefore the Bicycle Master Plan includes stream valley trails as a bikeway type. But decisions about stream valley park trails are primarily governed by the 2016 Countywide Park Trails Plan, as well as other operational policies of M-NCPPC Montgomery Parks.
389	Winter	344	No	Show Northwest Branch Trail on map.	Disagree	The Bicycle Master Plan is currently only showing the four park trails that have substantial transportation use on the maps: Rock Creek Trail, Sligo Creek Trail, Capital Crescent Trail and Matthew Henson Trail.
390	WABA	344	No	On Carroll Ave separated or buffered bike lanes are more appropriate.	Agree	While we agree that separated or buffered bike lanes are more appropriate, Carroll Ave is a very constrained street.
393	Cochrane	344	No	Ellsworth Dr between Cedar and Fenton – Here the plan calls for two-way protected bike lanes on one side of the street, but the Ellsworth segments surrounding it are shared roadway or contraflow bike lane, so won't this require needless switching from one side of the street to the other?	Disagree	While two-way separated bike lanes on Ellsworth Dr would require switching the side of the street, this is the only way to implement separated bike lanes on this road.
Silver Spring - Takoma Park (West) Policy Area						
394	MCDOT	350	No	For the line for East West Hwy between Rock Creek & Grubb Rd: consider noting that the contra-flow bike lane is (presumably) along the north side's service road.	Agree	The recommendation is to implement a contra-flow bike lane on the East-West Hwy service road. To clarify this, we recommend changing the street name from "East-West Hwy" to "East-West Hwy Service Rd".
395	WABA, Norman	350	No	Extend the separated bike lanes on Dale Dr from Woodland Dr to Piney Branch Rd. (WABA, Norman)	Disagree	Extending the separated bike lanes on Dale Dr from Woodland Dr to Piney Branch Rd would be very challenging. The plan could instead recommend a sidepath, which would still be challenging to implement, but would take up less space than separated bike lanes.
396	Cochrane	350	No	Brookville Road in Silver Spring – The proposed path on the east side from Stewart Ave to Seminary Rd is a good thought, but please add a note saying it may be implemented as a two-way protected bike lane from Stewart to Warren if deemed optimal, because there is a huge amount of pavement width (for trucks AND bikes), very few parking spaces, and little space for a path. I'm asking DOT for these protected bike lanes ASAP since this is the official GBT detour.	Disagree	While there are some sections of Brookville Rd between Stewart Ave and Seminary Rd with wide lanes, most of the road is narrow. We therefore continue to recommend a sidepath on this road.
397	Reed	350	No	Show Capital Crescent Trail in the Silver Spring / Takoma Park (West) map as unbuilt.	Agree	The Capital Crescent Trail is now under construction and can be shown as proposed.
Wheaton Policy Area						
398	Herr	356	No	Grandview Ave is not a high-speed road and may not need a separated bike path.	Disagree	While Grandview Ave is not a high-speed road, it has a moderate amount traffic and a fair amount of curbside activity, including vehicles entering /exiting driveways and vehicles pulling in and out of on-street parking.
White Flint Policy Area						
White Oak Policy Area						
400	Greater Colesville Citizens Assoc	364	No	The White Oak Local Area Transportation Improvement Plan (LATIP) includes eight bikeways. The Council decided that because of cost shared-use paths (essentially a sidepath) would be used rather than separated bike lanes, which operate in the road. The only exception is when the separated bike lane can be built more cost effectively. The BMP is recommending what the council decided against in a number of spots, including Industrial Parkway, Tech Road, Broadbirch Rd, Plum Orchard Rd, and Cherry Hill Rd.	Disagree	Planning staff discussed the inconsistencies between the bikeways included in the White Oak LATIP and the recommendations in the Bicycle Master Plan while the LATIP was under discussion because the plan is largely about identifying required funding.
401	MCDOT	364	No	My current expectation is that these would be added into the White Oak LATIP numerator as part of the 6-year reanalysis (next expected to occur in 2023). Council action would be required if these are to be included in one of the 2-year updates (next expected in 2019).	N/A	See response to Comment #400.
402	MCDOT	364	No	Add a ** to the "White Oak - FDA Connector"	Agree	We recommend making this change.
403	Helms	364	No	FDA-US29 BRT Connector FROM FDA TO Lockwood (Hard Surface Trail)	N/A	This is an existing recommendation in the plan.

Attachment B: Public Testimony and Summary Responses (Bikeway Comments Only)

#	Commentor	Plan Page #	In Staff Report?	Testimony	Response	Discussion / Recommendation
404	Helms	364	No	Lockwood-NH(MD650) Ped & Bike Bridge FROM Lockwood TO Lockwood (Hard Surface Trail)	Disagree	We do not support a bridge crossing New Hampshire Ave.
405	Helms	364		Northwest Branch Trail-WO-FDA Trail I495 Underpass Connector FROM Northwest Branch Trail TO Devere (Hard Surface Trail)	Disagree	It is not appropriate, and would be duplicative, to include all hard surface park trails in the Bicycle Master Plan. M-NCPPC Montgomery County Department of Parks recognizes that many hard surface park trails are used for bicycle transportation. Bicycle commuters regularly use many park trails, particularly down-county, and therefore the Bicycle Master Plan includes stream valley trails as a bikeway type. But decisions about stream valley park trails are primarily governed by the 2016 Countywide Park Trails Plan, as well as other operational policies of M-NCPPC Montgomery Parks.
406	Helms	364	No	Old Columbia Pike-Tech Road Ped & Bike US29 Bridge FROM Old Columbia Pike TO Industrial (Hard Surface Trail)	Disagree	We do not support a bridge crossing US 29 at this location.
407	Helms	364	No	US29-Lockwood Ped & Bike Bridge FROM Lockwood TO US29 (Hard Surface Trail)	Disagree	We do not support a bridge crossing US 29 at this location.
408	Greater Colesville Citizens Assoc	364	No	On Calverton Blvd the plan proposes a sidepath on the south side but separated bike lanes already exist of both sides.	Agree	Conventional bike lanes are an appropriate bikeway for Calverton Blvd and exist on much of the road in Montgomery County. We therefore recommend changing the bikeway from "sidepath" to "conventional bike lanes".
409	Greater Colesville Citizens Assoc	364	No	The plan indicates a separated bikeway doesn't exist on Broadbirch Dr, but it already exists.	Disagree	While narrow conventional bike lanes exist on Broadbirch Dr, they do not create a low-stress bicycling environment. We therefore recommend retaining the sidepath recommendation.
410	Greater Colesville Citizens Assoc	364	No	On Old Columbia Pike the plan recommends a sidepath but conventional bike lanes already exist.	Disagree	While narrow conventional bike lanes exist on Broadbirch Dr, they do not create a low-stress bicycling environment. We therefore recommend retaining the sidepath recommendation.
411	Greater Colesville Citizens Assoc	364	No	On Cherry Hill Rd, separated bike lanes are not needed on south side of road because sidepath exists on north side of road.	Disagree	Since most of the commercial activity is on the south side of the road, a bikeway is need on the south side.
412	Greater Colesville Citizens Assoc	364	No	On Gracefield Rd between Plum Orchard Rd and Calverton Blvd, the plan indicates a sidepath does not exist but it does. Bicyclists can ride in the road.	Disagree	While a narrow asphalt path exists on Gracefield Rd between Plum Orchard Rd and Calverton Rd, it would need to be widened to be considered a sidepath.
Project Coordination Changes						
413	Planning Staff	314		Extend Utility Corridor #4 trail from Heartwood Dr to Muncaster Mill Rd and add sidepath on the east side of Muncaster Mill Rd between Bowie Mill Road and Utility Corridor #4.		
414	Planning Staff	226		On Leland St between Wisconsin Ave and 46th St, specify that the separated bike lanes should be two-way on the north side of the street to align with MCDOT project on Woodmont Ave and to reduce spatial requirements of the bikeway.		
415	Planning Staff	364		Shift sidepath from the US 29 exit ramp on the east side to Prosperity Dr.		
416	Planning Staff	226, 292, 306		• On the south side of Veirs Mill Road, provide continuous two-way separated bike lanes from Montrose Parkway East / Parkland Drive to the Wheaton CBD, except between Newport Mill Road and Pendleton Drive where a sidepath is recommended due to limited right-of-way. The Bicycle Master Plan currently recommends a mix of sidepaths and two-way separated bike lanes on the south side of Veirs Mill Road, with separated bike lanes proposed along commercial frontage and sidepaths proposed everywhere else.		
417	Planning Staff	226		Extend the sidepath on north side of Veirs Mill Road from Parkland Drive to the City of Rockville.		
418	Planning Staff	292		Add a sidepath on the east side of Havard Street between Veirs Mill Road and Colie Drive.		
Corrections						
419	MCDOT	81	No	The text "Retail" under Long-Term / Work is top-aligned rather than center-aligned.	Agree	Make this change.
420	MCDOT	88-89	No	DANAC is shown on p90 as having a long-term bike station, but on p89 no long-term parking needs are identified.	Agree	This was an error. Remove the DANAC station from the map.
421	Planning Staff	90	No	Add Boyds to the bicycle parking stations map.		
422	Planning Staff	179	No	The bikeway on Johns Hopkins Dr should be Tier 1 priority.		
423	Planning Staff	192	No	In Objective 2.3, change "transit station" to "school"		
424	MCDOT	226	No	There appears to be a graphic discontinuity in the Matthew Henson Trail immediately west of MD 97. It appears the existing trail spans between the Holdridge/Kilburn connection and MD 97, though no such green line is apparent.	Disagree	This has been addressed.
425	Planning Staff	250	No	Show Stringtown Road sidepath on north side as existing between MD 355 and Snowden Farm Pkwy.	Agree	This is an error and should be corrected.
426	Greater Colesville Citizens Assoc	264	No	Segments of the recommended sidepath exist on Greencastle Rd to the east and west of US 29.	Agree	Correct. These maps should be updated.
427	WABA, Smith	282	No	Map does not show Germantown - Life Sciences Center Breezeway on Middlebrook Rd	Agree	This is an error. The map should show the Breezeway designation.

Attachment B: Public Testimony and Summary Responses (Bikeway Comments Only)

#	Commentor	Plan Page #	In Staff Report?	Testimony	Response	Discussion / Recommendation
428	Planning Staff	283	No	The Dorsey Mill Rd sidepath between Century Blvd and I-270 should be located on the north side of the road, not the south side as indicated.		
429	Herr	292	No	The path through Pleasant View Park should be shown as proposed. It is an existing sidewalk that needs to be upgraded.	Agree	Trails should be at least 8 feet wide.
430	MCDOT	306	No	"Flanders Ave" is misspelled as "Flonders Ave"	Agree	We will make this change.
431	MCDOT	312	No	Recognizing that the lines are not always shown to be representative of what side of a street the facility is intended to be on, for ease of use: consider swapping the two lines along Darnestown Rd, as the sidepath is along the north side.	Agree	Making this change will clarify the recommendation.
432	Planning Staff	314	No	Show Olney #5 as existing.		
433	MoBike	320	No	Democracy Blvd (west of Seven Locks Rd) – The bikeway identified in the table (shoulders + path) is correct but the map is wrong.	Agree	We recommend correcting the map on page 320 to show both a sidepath (orange) and bikeable shoulders (aqua) on Democracy Blvd between Falls Rd and Seven Locks Rd.
434	MoBike	320	No	Westlake Drive – The bikeway table says bikeable shoulders + path under "bikeway type" column but just a path under "facility type" column and on the map. Dual facility already exists north of Westlake Terrace. Path would be built on the EAST side south of Westlake Terrace (and shoulders added) according to signed agreement with Montgomery Mall.	Agree	This is an error that should be corrected. On page 320, bikeable shoulders should be added to Westlake Dr. On page 322, the Westlake Dr recommendation should be: Facility Type = "Separated Bikeway and Bikeable Shoulders" Bikeway Type = "Sidepath (East Side) and Bikeable Shoulders".
435	Planning Staff	364	No	Perimeter Road should be shown as green to match the recommendation for an off-street trail on page 365.	Agree	This is an error and should be corrected.
436	MCDOT	364	No	White Oak - Confirm the intention of US 29 as a shared roadway. Perhaps at least a bikeable shoulder?	Agree in part	This is an error. The bikeway is intended to be a sidepath and we will change the color from red to orange to match the table on page 365.
437	Planning Staff	365	No	FDA Blvd should be shown as having two-way separated bike lanes on both sides of the road.		
438	Planning Staff	340	No	Add separated bike lanes on the south side of Colesville Rd between Wayne Ave and Georgia Ave to the table on page 341 to match map.		