<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Plan Page #</th>
<th>In Staff Report?</th>
<th>Testimony</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Discussion / Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>MoBike</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Hot to see “dual bikeways”, which include both an off-road bikeway (sidepath) and an on-road bikeway (conventional bike lanes or bike shoulders).</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>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 bike shoulders or bike lanes, we believe there is sufficient language in the plan to enable MCDOT to do so.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>MoBike</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>See response to Comment #155.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 157 | MoBike    | General     | Yes              | 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:  
• North Branch Trail/Upper Rock Creek Trail  
• Lake Frank/Lake Needwood trails  
• East Guide 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, Sigos Creek Trail, Capital Crescent Trail and Matthew Henson Trail, which are heavily used for transportation. |
| 158 | Holms     | General     | No               | Better integration with Trails Plan, including current and planned trail plan bicycle infrastructure (landscape and natural) as well as identifying targeted trails linking communities to services. | Disagree | Staff believes 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).  
• 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.  
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. 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. |
| 159 | Mahle, Peters | General     | No               | The plan should include existing and new park trails. | Disagree | See previous response. |
| 160 | WABA      | General     | No               | The plan miles too heavily on sidepaths. If built to standards of existing sidepaths they will not be attractive 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 | 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. 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. |
| 162 | Myslaff   | 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:  
“A countywide master plan cannot anticipate all opportunities to implement bikeways that might arise. A bikeway segment not identified in the Plan may be implemented if it advances the goals of the Plan. The following table provides default bikeway recommendations for streets where the Bicycle Master Plan does not recommend a bikeway. 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.” |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Plan Page #</th>
<th>In Staff Report?</th>
<th>Testimony</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Discussion / Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>Magdali</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Add language such as: “If during the design of a bikeway, the specific route or type is found to entail costs or impacts disproportionate 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.”</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>Wickels</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Provide bike lanes on Beach Drive and close to traffic on weekends / holidays.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Beach Drive is a park road and should be considered by the Department of Parks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>Tull</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Prefer 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.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>Knudsen</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Please coordinate with the rural/urban roads program and identify our most precious bikeways (such as Peach Tree Road, White Store Road), then create a bicycling preservation designation that 1) prevents these roads from being widened to run their scenic value and 2) create signage and pavement striping to alert motorists and inform cyclists that this is a Bike-First corridor.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Our understanding is that the Rustic Roads designation already accomplishes these objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>Warner</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Need bike lanes on Georgia Ave, especially between Seminary Pl and Wheaton.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>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 sidewalks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>Gerhard</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Get feedback from actual bicyclists and bicycle groups to make sure plan is feasible.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>Germain</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Competing objectives: How do we maintain affordability in housing if bikeway infrastructure increases project costs?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>While implementing bikeways may increase the cost of housing, it can also decrease the cost of transportation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>Hall</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Bikeway lighting needs to be improved.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>We agree that lighting needs to be improved.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Aspen Hill Policy Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Plan Page #</th>
<th>In Staff Report?</th>
<th>Testimony</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Discussion / Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>MCDOT</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Consider whether the Renn St sidepath should be extended eastward to Parkland Dr.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>We do not believe the Renn St sidepath needs to be extended to the west. Our analysis shows that Renn Rd east of Marriana Dr is a very low stress road and therefore does not need any improvements to be bikeable. Renn Dr west of Marriana Drive was rated as a low stress road, because it has a centerline, and therefore needs an improvement to be more bikeable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>MCDOT</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Bethesda CBD Policy Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Plan Page #</th>
<th>In Staff Report?</th>
<th>Testimony</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Discussion / Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>MCDOT</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Consider showing the ped/bike connection between Montgomery Ave the CCT / Lynn Dr as a more definitive path.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>Mobike</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Wisconsin Ave from Bradley to Nottingham Dr – Widem 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.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>This connection is no longer needed as the neighborhood greenway on Stratford Rd and Warwick Pl was removed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>Barron</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Show that Stratford is not an unofficial continuation of the Bikeway Trail and that folks should travel downtown to Capital Crescent Trail or out to Wisconsin Avenue.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Plan Page #</td>
<td>In Staff Report?</td>
<td>Testimony</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Discussion / Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>Filice</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Need a direct connection along Norwood Rd / Stratford Rd / Warwick Pl / Fallstone Ave / Vinton Park / Park Ave</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>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 Magee 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>Mobike</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>see response to Comment #178.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>Mobike</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>see response to Comment #178.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>Mobike</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Vinton Park Connector – I say again, this path is 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.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>see response to Comment #178.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>Gore</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Implement continuous bike lane on East West Hwy from Connecticut Ave to Wisconsin Ave.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>Larson</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The map is incorrect - there is no bikeway on Wisconsin Ave between Bethesda and Friendship Heights. (Larson)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>The side sidewalk on the east side of Wisconsin Ave meets Montgomery County’s definition of a shared use path / sidewalk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>WABA</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Provide a separated bikeway on East-West Highway from Downtown Bethesda to Beach Dr.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>Mobike</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Old Georgetown Rd from Greentree to Southack – Widens 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).</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Mr. Cochrane believes that it may be more feasible to connect the Bethesda Trolley Trail to the Grant St neighborhood greenway by providing a sidewalk along the west side of Old Georgetown Rd between Greentree Rd and Southack St than to provide a sidewalk 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>Mobike</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Old Georgetown Rd from Lincoln to McKinley - Widens 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.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>This is a short connection that links to Bethesda Trolley Trail to the Grant St neighborhood greenway at a signalized intersection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>Mobike</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>Mobike</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>This is a form of a one-way separated bike lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>Mobike</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>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 came 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.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>We believe the priority on Little Falls Parkway between the Capital Crescent Trail and Glenbrook Rd should be adding a sidewalk. Bikeable shoulders could be added if there is sufficient space, but they should not be master-planned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Commentor</td>
<td>Plan Page #</td>
<td>In Staff Report?</td>
<td>Testimony Response Discussion</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>Mobike</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>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 cyclists.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>For 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>Mobike</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>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 Hunted and protected bike lanes south of Hunted. South of Hunted, adding almost any bikeway would have impacts on the neighborhood. North of Hunted, 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 PBIs, 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 Hunted south, but getting to Inverseness is very important since that’s an alternate route to Jones Bridge and Manor Rd. South of Inverseness, it’s not quite as critical.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>Mobike</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Drafton St at Wisconsin Ave – Possibly improve this two-way cut-thru for bikes, since it’s one-way “in” (eastbound) for cars and narrow.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>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 Wisconsin St about 30 feet to the north.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>Barron</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The trail between Little Falls Trail and Chevy Chase Blvd includes a staircase that is not appropriate for bikes.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bethesda: Casual Chase West Policy Area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commentor</th>
<th>Plan Page #</th>
<th>In Staff Report?</th>
<th>Testimony Response Discussion</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>MCDOT</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>Add the Capital Crescent Trail to the MacArthur Connector.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>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”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>MCDOT</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>Consider whether Burdette Rd should have defined bike facilities, particularly between MD 190 (Roosevelt) and MD 191 (Bradley).</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>MCDOT</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>Consider whether a defined connection should be provided between the Fernwood sidewalk and MD 191 (Bradley).</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Staff recommends extending the Fernwood Road sidewalk to Bradley Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>MCDOT</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>Consider whether a defined connection should be provided between the Ewing Dr neighborhood greenway and MD 191 (Bradley).</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>We do not believe this is needed, especially since we agree that a connection between Fernwood Rd and Bradley Blvd is desirable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>MCDOT</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>Consider whether a defined connection should be provided along Sangamore Rd and Brooks La, connecting between MD 386 (Mass Ave) and MacArthur Blvd and improving access to the Intelligence Campus.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>Gerhardt</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>The MacArthur Blvd trail is insufficient and the bike lanes are too narrow.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>The Montgomery County Department of Transportation is upgrading the MacArthur Blvd sidewalk 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>MacArthur Blvd between Brickyard Rd and Falls Rd needs a shoulder in the uphill direction.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>Mellema</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>Continue the Fernwood Rd sidewalk to GreenTree Rd. Elevate the sidewalk to Tier 1.</td>
<td>Agree in part</td>
<td>We recommend extending the Fernwood Rd sidewalk but do not recommend elevating it to Tier 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>Mellema</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>Add a sidewalk between Fernwood Rd and Grant St. Make this a Tier 1 bikeway.</td>
<td>Agree in part</td>
<td>We recommend adding the Greenwood Rd sidewalk but do not recommend elevating it to Tier 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>An alternative path to avoid the steep hill on MacArthur Blvd is needed through the River Falls subdivision.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>We currently recommend a sidewalk on Brickyard Road between Falls Rd and Horsehoe La. There is no master-planned bikeway on Brickyard La between Horsehoe La and MacArthur Blvd because we believe that Horsehoe 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Plan Page #</td>
<td>In Staff Report?</td>
<td>Testimony</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>Mobike</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Testimony</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>Mobike</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Testimony</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>MCDOT</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Testimony</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>MCDOT</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Testimony</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>MCDOT</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Testimony</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>MCDOT</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Testimony</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>MCDOT</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Testimony</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>MCDOT</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Testimony</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>Kousheen</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Testimony</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>MCDOT</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Testimony</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>MCDOT</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Testimony</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>MCDOT</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Testimony</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>MCDOT</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Testimony</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227</td>
<td>WABA</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Testimony</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>Mobike</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Testimony</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Plan Page #</td>
<td>In Staff Report?</td>
<td>Testimony</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>Mobike</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Norbeck Rd (Layhill Rd to New Hampshire Ave) – Shoulders are worth explicitly requiring here due to the semi-urban 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 Regional Park).</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>Mobike</td>
<td>256</td>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td>Mobike</td>
<td>256</td>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232</td>
<td>Mobike</td>
<td>256</td>
<td></td>
<td>Farland 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).</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>Helms</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Bryans Nursery Neighborhood Bikeway - Norbeck - Old Orchard Neighborhood Bikeway Trail Connector FROM Bryans Nursery Neighborhood Bikeway TO Norbeck Hard Surface Trail</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>Helms</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Bryants Nursery FROM New Hampshire TO Norwood (Striped Bikeway)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>Helms</td>
<td>256</td>
<td></td>
<td>Carona FROM Notley TO Bonifant (Striped Bikeway)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>Helms</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Cloverly Park Trail Connector FROM Rainbow TO Gallaudet (Striped Bikeway)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>Helms</td>
<td>256</td>
<td></td>
<td>Crest Hill FROM Briggs Chaney TO Paint Branch Trail-North (Striped Bikeway)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>Helms</td>
<td>256</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gallaudet FROM Cloverly Park Trail Connector TO New Hampshire (Striped Bikeway)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>Helms</td>
<td>256</td>
<td></td>
<td>Harding FROM Harding-Good Hope Trail Connector TO New Hampshire (Striped Bikeway)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>Helms</td>
<td>256</td>
<td></td>
<td>Harding-Good Hope Trail Connector FROM Harding TO Good Hope (Striped Bikeway)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>Helms</td>
<td>256</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hillsgard-Peachtree- Seibel FROM Peach Orchard TO Timberlake (Striped Bikeway)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>Helms</td>
<td>256</td>
<td></td>
<td>Holly Spring-Kaywood FROM Peach Orchard TO Kaywood-Miles Trail Connector (Striped Bikeway)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>Helms</td>
<td>256</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hopefield-Kings House FROM Good Hope TO Kings House Trail Connector (Striped Bikeway)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td>Helms</td>
<td>256</td>
<td></td>
<td>Johnson-Nalley FROM Norbeck TO Bonifant (Striped Bikeway)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>Helms</td>
<td>256</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kaywood-Miles Trail Connector FROM Holly Spring- Kaywood TO Miles (Hard Surface Trail)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246</td>
<td>Helms</td>
<td>256</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kings House FROM Kings House Trail Connector TO Peach Orchard (Striped Bikeway)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
<td>Helms</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Kings House Trail Connector FROM Hopefield-Kings House TO Peach Orchard (Hard Surface Trail)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248</td>
<td>Helms</td>
<td>256</td>
<td></td>
<td>Murphy FROM Good Hope TO Paint Branch Trail-North (Striped Bikeway)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249</td>
<td>Helms</td>
<td>256</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pamela Trail Connector FROM Rainbow TO Harding (Striped Bikeway)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>Helms</td>
<td>256</td>
<td></td>
<td>Paint Branch Trail Farland/Briggs Chaney (West) Trail Extension FROM Murphy TO Farland (Hard Surface Trail)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
<td>Helms</td>
<td>256</td>
<td></td>
<td>Paint Branch Trail Farland/Briggs Chaney Trail Extension- Bert/Ansted Spur FROM Paint Branch Trail-ICC Trail TO Briggs Chaney (Hard Surface Trail)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Plan Page #</td>
<td>In Staff Report?</td>
<td>Testimony</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td>Helm</td>
<td>255</td>
<td></td>
<td>Paint Branch Trail Fairland/Brushie Chancy Trail Extension-East Hill Spur FROM Paint Branch Trail-ICC Trail TO Briggs Chancy (Hard Surface Trail)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253</td>
<td>Helm</td>
<td>256</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rainbow FROM Cloverly Park Trail Connector TO Good Hope (Striped Bikeway)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
<td>Helm</td>
<td>256</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thompson FROM 254 Helms 256 Rainbow (Striped Bikeway)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255</td>
<td>Helm</td>
<td>256</td>
<td></td>
<td>Timberlake FROM Timberlake-Irons Den Trail Connector TO Hildegard- Peachstone-Seibel (Striped Bikeway)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>Helm</td>
<td>256</td>
<td></td>
<td>Timberlake-Irons Den Trail Connector FROM Timberlake TO Lions Den (Hard Surface Trail)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257</td>
<td>Helm</td>
<td>256</td>
<td></td>
<td>Timberlake-Perrywood Trail Connector FROM Hildegard- Peachstone-Seibel TO Perrywood (Hard Surface Trail)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>MCDOT</td>
<td>258</td>
<td></td>
<td>Consider whether the Oak Dr sidewalk should be extended either to the utility ROW (per comment), or along the full length of Oak Dr.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>MCDOT</td>
<td>258</td>
<td></td>
<td>Consider whether the utility ROW in this area might be proposed for a trail linking Clearsping Rd, Conrad Ct, MD 27, and Oak Dr to points westward, into Clarksburg Town Center and potentially Sugarloaf Mtn.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>MCDOT</td>
<td>260</td>
<td></td>
<td>Consider extending the Needwood Rd sidewalk to Timbercrest Dr / Bethayres Rd, across the trail connector to Malabar St, and linking into Shady Grove Rd's sidewalk.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td>MCDOT</td>
<td>260</td>
<td></td>
<td>Consider highlighting trails around Needwood Lake.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>Palakovich-Carr</td>
<td>260</td>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>MCDOT</td>
<td>264</td>
<td></td>
<td>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).</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>MCDOT</td>
<td>264</td>
<td></td>
<td>Consider a bikeway connection between Cannon Rd and Randolph Rd.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265</td>
<td>Helm</td>
<td>264</td>
<td></td>
<td>Paint Branch Trail-Menke Trail Connector FROM Paint Branch Trail-MLK-OLP-WK Trail Connector TO Paint Branch Trail-Menke-Milestone-Stewart Bikeway Connector (Striped Bikeway)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>Helm</td>
<td>264</td>
<td></td>
<td>Perrywood FROM Timberlake- Perrywood Trail Connector TO Miles- Friendlywood- Carson- Oakhurst (Striped Bikeway)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>Helm</td>
<td>264</td>
<td></td>
<td>Robey Sr Thomas Trail Connector FROM Robey TO Sr Thomas (Hard Surface Trail)</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>Helm</td>
<td>264</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ballinger FROM Robey TO Weehall (Striped Bikeway)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269</td>
<td>Helm</td>
<td>264</td>
<td></td>
<td>BranchOff Manor Way FROM Miles- Friendlywood- Carson-Oakhurst TO Lions Den (Striped Bikeway)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Plan Page #</td>
<td>In Staff Report?</td>
<td>Testimony</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>Helms</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Briggs Chaney - Tapestry Trail FROM Briggs Chaney TO Parkhall (Hard Surface Trail)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>Helms</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Cannon Road/Shaw Road/Springloch Dr/Springtree Dr FROM Randolph TO E Randolph</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>272</td>
<td>Helms</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Castle FROM Briggs Chaney TO Ballinger (Striped Bikeway)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273</td>
<td>Helms</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Castle-Ballinger Trail Connector FROM Castle TO Ballinger (Hard Surface Trail)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274</td>
<td>Helms</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Cotton Tree Lane/Blackbus/Tolson FROM N-PF Trail TO Old Columbia Pike (Striped Bikeway)</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>Helms</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yardley FROM Miles TO Briggs Chaney (Striped Bikeway)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276</td>
<td>Helms</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Subway FROM Fairland TO Calverton (Striped Bikeway)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277</td>
<td>Helms</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Leister/Birlington Rd/Laurie/Montclair/Downs FROM E Randolph TO Jackson (Striped Bikeway)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>Helms</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lions Den FROM Timberlake-Lions Den Trail Connector TO Spencerville (Striped Bikeway)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>Helms</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>McKnew/Cotton Tree Trail Bridge FROM N Fairland Regional Park Trail TO Sparrow House/Mcknew (Hard Surface Trail)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>Helms</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Miles FROM Kaywood-Miles Trail Connector TO Old Columba Pike (Striped Bikeway)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281</td>
<td>Helms</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Miles-Friendlywood-Carron -Oakhurst FROM Fairdale TO Oakhurst -Prasner -Brickliff Manor Trail Connector (Striped Bikeway)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td>Helms</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>North Extension Fairland Regional Park Trail (N FRP) FROM Cotton Tree/Blackburn TO Greenscote (Hard Surface Trail)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>Helms</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Nolley FROM New Hampshire TO I-395 (Striped Bikeway)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>Helms</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Northwest Branch Trail-West Trail TO Springbrook Dr Bridge Connector FROM Northwest Branch Trail TO Springbrook (Hard Surface Trail)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>Helms</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Oakhurst FROM Miles- Friendlywood-Carron-Oakhurst TO Old Columbia Pike (Striped Bikeway)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td>Helms</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Oakhurst-Prasner-Brickliff Manor Trail Connector FROM Miles- Friendlywood-CarronOakhurst TO Briarcliff Manor Way (Hard Surface Trail)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287</td>
<td>Helms</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Paint Branch Trail-Miller-Millstone- Stewart Bikeway Connector FROM Stewart TO Paint Branch Trail (Striped Bikeway)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>Helms</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Paint Branch Trail-MU-OCP-WO Underpass US50 FROM Paint Branch Trail TO Old Columbia Pike (Hard Surface Trail)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td>Helms</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Paint Branch Trail-MU-OCP-WO Trail Connector FROM Jackson TO Old Columbia Pike (Hard Surface Trail)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>Helms</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Quaint Acres FROM Northwest Branch Trail TO New Hampshire (Striped Bikeway)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291</td>
<td>Helms</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Serpentine Way FROM Fairland TO E Randolph (Striped Bikeway)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Commentor</td>
<td>Plan Page #</td>
<td>In Staff Report?</td>
<td>Testimony</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>Helms</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Springfield FROM Northwest Branch Trail Bridge TO New Hampshire (Striped Bikeway)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293</td>
<td>Helms</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Tamarrack FROM Fairland TO E Randolph (Striped Bikeway)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294</td>
<td>Helms</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>US29/Bikeway Milestone Hillwood Extension FROM Stewart TO Lockwood (Separated Bikeway)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295</td>
<td>Helms</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>US29-Red Cedar Trail Connector FROM Red Cedar TO US29 (Hard Surface Trail)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td>Helms</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Darlington-Scott-Lockley-Randolph FROM Nolaby TO Randolph (Striped Bikeway)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>Helms</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Wardhall FROM N-PRP Trail TO US29 (Striped Bikeway)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>Ozgan</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Would support neighborhood greenway on Autumn Dr if: 1) neighborhood safety is maintained and on-street parking is preserved</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Investigate a crossing of Northwest Branch between Coleville Rd and Randolph Rd.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Friendship Heights CB 8 Policy Area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commentor</th>
<th>Plan Page #</th>
<th>In Staff Report?</th>
<th>Testimony</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Discussion / Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>Village of Friendship Heights</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>The separated bike lanes are recommended to be on the south side of Willard Ave.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Germantown East Policy Area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commentor</th>
<th>Plan Page #</th>
<th>In Staff Report?</th>
<th>Testimony</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Discussion / Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>McBee</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Germantown Rd/Watkins Mill Rd (MD 355 to Steadwick 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.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>See response to Comment #156.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Germantown Town Center Policy Area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commentor</th>
<th>Plan Page #</th>
<th>In Staff Report?</th>
<th>Testimony</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Discussion / Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>MoDOT</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Middlebrook Locust 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?</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>The bikeway on the west side is included in the Germantown - Life Sciences Center Breezeway recommendations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>WABA</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>There should be bikeways on both sides of Germantown Road to avoid forcing bicyclists to cross the road.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Germantown West Policy Area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commentor</th>
<th>Plan Page #</th>
<th>In Staff Report?</th>
<th>Testimony</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Discussion / Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td>WABA</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>There should be bikeways on both sides of Germantown Road to avoid forcing bicyclists to cross the road.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>See response to Comment #1310.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312</td>
<td>WABA</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>There should be bikeways on both sides of Great Seneca Hwy to avoid forcing bicyclists to cross the road.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>While we have recommended a sidewalk on both sides of Great Seneca Hwy between Middlebrook Rd and Richter Farm Rd, south of Richter Farm Rd we have recommended a sidewalk on only the east side of the road because there is little land use for a distance of about 2 miles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313</td>
<td>WABA</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>There should be bikeways on both sides of Middlebrook Rd to avoid forcing bicyclists to cross the road.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>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 sidewalk on the south side of Middlebrook Road between Observation Dr and Midcounty Hwy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314</td>
<td>McBee</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Corridor Cities Transitway Trail - Is this not going to be a quality trail that could be identified as a Breezeway?</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>McBee</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Schaeffer Rd (Upjohn 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.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>See response to Comment #136.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Glenmont Policy Area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commentor</th>
<th>Plan Page #</th>
<th>In Staff Report?</th>
<th>Testimony</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Discussion / Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>316</td>
<td>MoDOT</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Parts of Layhill Road Path and bicycle lanes are existing between Glenellan and Briggs</td>
<td>Agree in part</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317</td>
<td>MoDOT</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not to necessarily disagree with the proposed routing, but clarify the benefits of the bikeway being offset along Flack St instead of remaining continuously along Georgia Ave.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>The benefit is that the bikeway will be located on a calm residential street.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Greenvale Policy Area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commentor</th>
<th>Plan Page #</th>
<th>In Staff Report?</th>
<th>Testimony</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Discussion / Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Commentator</td>
<td>Plan Page</td>
<td>In Staff Report?</td>
<td>Testimony</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Discussion / Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319</td>
<td>MDOT</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>We recommend adding a blow-up map of the Forest Glen metro area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320</td>
<td>MDOT</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Consider a blow-up of the Kensington area, which is slightly too busy to discern each line with reliable acuity.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>We recommend adding a blow-up map of the Kensington area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321</td>
<td>Helms</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lamberton Dr. Greenscane Ridge FROM Lamberton Square TO Greenscane Ridge (Hard Surface Trail)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>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 trail parks 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322</td>
<td>Helms</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Northwest Branch Trail West Trail FROM Northwest Branch Trail Bridge Connector 2 TO Kemp Mill (Hard Surface Trail)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323</td>
<td>Helms</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Alberton-Privet Lake FROM Bonifant TO Randolph (Striped Bikeway)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Sidepath recommended from Bonifant Rd to Matthew Henson Trail and from Redspire Dr to Randolph Rd. Section in between is already low-stress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324</td>
<td>Helms</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Brookhaven-Stonington- Hemleigh FROM Northwest Branch Trail TO Kemp Mill (Striped Bikeway)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>See response to Comment #335.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325</td>
<td>Helms</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lamberton FROM Anola TO Northwest Branch Trail (Striped Bikeway)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>See response to Comment #335.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>326</td>
<td>Helms</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Monticello-Conn NWC-Gaddington-Walenbrook FROM Lamberton TO Dennis (Striped Bikeway)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>See response to Comment #335.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327</td>
<td>Helms</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Northwest Branch Trail Bridge Connector 2 FROM Quartz Acres TO Lambertont (Hard Surface Trail)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>329</td>
<td>Busholtz</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The proposed bikeway on Capitol View Ave should follow the existing road alignment, not the alignment in the 1982 Capitol View Sector Plan.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330</td>
<td>Warner</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Need a bikeway on Capitol View Ave.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>The plan recommends a sidepath on Capitol View Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331</td>
<td>MoBike</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Priority shared lane markings are not recommended on Kensington Pkwy north of Beach Dr. Traffic is too heavy for advisory bike lanes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332</td>
<td>Warner</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Need a safe crossing of Connecticut Ave in Kensington.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>While the plan has general guidance on improving crossings, master plans do not typically recommend improving specific intersections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>333</td>
<td>Warner</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Need a hard surface trail from Shorefield Rd / Orelbaugh Ave to Glenallen Ave via Wheaton Regional Park.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>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 Orelbaugh Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335</td>
<td>Herr</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>336</td>
<td>Reis</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Would like designated space for bicycling in the road on Randolph Road between New Hampshire and Georgia Avenue, particularly in the downhill direction.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>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 33 mph. However, the plan also supports adding conventional bike lanes where is sufficient space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>337</td>
<td>MoBike</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>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 old 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.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>See response to Comment #156.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338</td>
<td>MoBike</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Plyers Mill Road Path (Plyers Mill Rd to Beach Drive) – This important connector is not shown on the plan map.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>We recommend adding this trail connection between the end of Plyers Mill Rd and Beach Dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>339</td>
<td>MoBike</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Plyers Mill Road (Georgia to Amber) – If Plyers Mill west of Georgia is a separated bikeway, this segment probably should be too, due to traffic volume and turning movements.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>We recommend changing the recommendation from neighborhood greenway to sidepath for the one block on Plyers Mill Rd between Georgia Ave and Amber Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340</td>
<td>MoBike</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>We recommend a neighborhood greenway on Orelbaugh Ave between the terminus of the Sligo Creek Trail and Wheaton Regional Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Commentator</td>
<td>Plan Page #</td>
<td>In Staff Report?</td>
<td>Testimony</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Discussion / Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCDOT</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>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).</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Much of the land is Neighborhood Conservation Park or development communities and so implementing this could be very difficult.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCDOT</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>We recommend adding a neighborhood connector to connect to segments of Calypso Ln at Nike Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Bethesda-Twinbrook Policy Area</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Update map to show that trail between Fisher La and Veirs Mill Rd is complete.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>We recommend modifying the map to show that the trail is now complete.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoBike</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>312</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dulles 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.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>See response to Comment #156.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olney Policy Area</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>314</td>
<td></td>
<td>Consider extending Utility Corridor #3 from Bowie Mill Rd northward, alongside Wixman Rd &amp; Zion Rd, connecting into the Germantown-Butonsville Breezeway.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>We considered this, but rejected it because it would duplicate the proposed MD 108 sidewalk and would create a midblock crossing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCDOT</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>314</td>
<td></td>
<td>Consider extending Utility Corridor #4 from Georgia Ave / Prince Philip northward, connecting into the Germantown-Butonsville Breezeway.</td>
<td>Agree in part</td>
<td>We disagree with extending Utility Corridor #4 to the Germantown-Butonsville 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCDOT</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>314</td>
<td></td>
<td>Show the Georgia Ave bikeway as extending to the Brookeville Bypass' southern roundabout / Brookeville Town Limits; not terminating at Gold Mine Rd.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>We recommend extending the Georgia Ave sidewalk from Gold Mine Rd to the Longwood Recreation Center on the west side of the road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCDOT</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>314</td>
<td></td>
<td>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 &quot;might&quot; already exist.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>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).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCDOT</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>314</td>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>We recommend adding those bikeways shown in the larger map on page 315 to the insert map on page 314 for consistency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCDOT</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>314</td>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Staff believes that the appropriate type of bikeway on Batchellors Forest Road is a sidewalk and that this bikeway is needed to provide access to Olney Manor Recreation Park, Batchellors Forest Local Park and Farquhar Middle School, among other locations. However, staff also recognizes that current policy does not permit sidewalks to be constructed along Batchellors Forest Road, so that to implement the sidewalk, 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: &quot;This bikeway recommendation is advisory only until the Rustic Road designation is removed or the Rustic Roads policy changes.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pease-Feo, Snee, Smith</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>314</td>
<td></td>
<td>Supports proposed alignment on Batchellor's Forest Rd.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>see response to Comment #351.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tworkowski</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>314</td>
<td></td>
<td>Since Batchelor's Forest Rd is a rustic road, provide a natural surface trail instead of a sidewalk.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>see response to Comment #351.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potomac Policy Area</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Consider extending Brickyard Rd's sidewalk to MacArthur Blvd.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>We considered extending the bikeway to MacArthur Blvd, but ultimately left it out because there are parallel low stress roads that bicyclists can use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCDOT</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>We recommend changing the recommendation from a sidewalk and bikeable shoulders to only a sidewalk. This project has been in the capital budget as a sidewalk for many years and does not include bikeable shoulders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoBike</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>PEPCO Trail – It’s 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?</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoBike</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Falls Mill Rd (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).</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>see response to Comment #156.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Commentor</td>
<td>Plan Page #</td>
<td>In Staff Report?</td>
<td>Testimony</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Discussion / Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>358</td>
<td>Mobilio</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>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: constiuency of road cyclists who use it frequently. It’s important to retain a network of on-road biking conduits for fast cycling in a way that paths and protected bike lanes simply are not. 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. 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 easier 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 sidewalk seems most compatible with this goal, as it would be more comfortable for children and families than protected bike lanes.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>See response to Comment #156.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**R&D Village Policy Area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commentor</th>
<th>Plan Page #</th>
<th>In Staff Report?</th>
<th>Testimony</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Discussion / Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>360</td>
<td>MCDOT</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>H&amp;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 sidewalk is along the north side.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>We recommend making this visual change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>361</td>
<td>MCDOT</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>H&amp;D Village - Ensure LSC Loop recommendations are reflected in table (understanding that in some segments it will be separated bike lanes AND sidewalk.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>We recommend calling out the LSC Loop as a separated bikeway, much like the “Germantown - Life Sciences Center Bikeway”, 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, Discovery Dr, Falls Rd and Omega Dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>362</td>
<td>Mobilio</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>See response to Comment #156.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rural East corridor Policy Area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commentor</th>
<th>Plan Page #</th>
<th>In Staff Report?</th>
<th>Testimony</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Discussion / Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>363</td>
<td>MCDOT</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Consider Shoulder Bikeway along the remainder of Bordily Drive to Brighton Dam Road</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>We do not see much value in extending this bikeway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>364</td>
<td>Helms</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Riding Stable Inter- County Connector FROM Prince Georges County TO Spencerville (Striped Bikeway)</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>There is value in this as a connection to Laurel, but since this road currently lacks sidewalks, a sidewalk recommendation would be more appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>365</td>
<td>Helms</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Amina-Dustin FROM (XLION-PEPCO ROW East Trail TO Old Columbia Pike (Striped Bikeway)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>See response to Comment #215.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Plan Page #</td>
<td>In Staff Report?</td>
<td>Testimony</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Discussion / Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>366</td>
<td>Helms</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Ednor Road: Inter-County Connector FROM New Hampshire TO Howard County Bikeable Shoulder</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Adding a trail is against county policy as long as this is designated as a rustic road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>368</td>
<td>Helms</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>EXELON-PEPCO ROW East Trail FROM Spencer Creek TO Armina-Dustin (Hard Surface Trail)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>We previously added the utility corridor as a trail per Mr. Helm’s recommendation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>369</td>
<td>Helms</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>EXELON-PEPCO ROW West Trail FROM Old Columbia Pike TO Ednor (Hard Surface Trail)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>We previously added the utility corridor as a trail per Mr. Helm’s recommendation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>370</td>
<td>Helms</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Krehm FROM Spencer Creek TO EXELON - PEPCO ROW West Trail (Striped Bikeway)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>See response to Comment #235.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>371</td>
<td>Helms</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Oak Hill FROM Spencer Creek TO EXELON - PEPCO ROW West Trail (Striped Bikeway)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Adding bike lanes would require widening the road, which is not possible as long as this is designated as a rustic road.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rural West Policy Area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>MCDOT</th>
<th>334</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>We recommend extending Utility Corridor #1 to the C&amp;O Canal Towpath near Dickerson.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>372</td>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>334</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>While this trail would provide substantial value as a connection between Germantown and the C&amp;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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>374</td>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>334</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree in part</td>
<td>Staff recommends extending the sidewalk on River Road to Seneca Road (#1 above). We disagree with adding sidewalks on Germantown Road, Banneker Road and Seneca Road, as these would substantially change the rural character of these roads and the demand is likely to be low.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>375</td>
<td>Kozlowski</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>These are rustic roads—old, very narrow, and in need of some preservation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>376</td>
<td>Kozlowski</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Shady Grove Policy Area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>MCDOT</th>
<th>338</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Disagree with changes</th>
<th>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.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>377</td>
<td>Patokovitch-Carr</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Silver Spring C&D Policy Area**

| #   | Weinstein | 340         | Separated bike lanes are needed on 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. |
|-----|-----------|-------------|--------------------------|----------|------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| 382| Weinstein | 340         | Separated bike lanes are needed on Georgia Avenue. | Agree | While separated bike lanes would be beneficial on Georgia Avenue, there are many constraints in the right-of-way (such as key reasons, 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| Minzari   | 340         | No                       | 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. |

**Spencerville ROW**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>367</td>
<td>PEPCO Bikeway</td>
<td>Spencerville TO Darnestown (Striped Bikeway)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>We added utility corridor as a trail per Mr. Helm’s recommendation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>369</td>
<td>PEPCO Bikeway</td>
<td>Darnestown TO Dickerson (Striped Bikeway)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>We added utility corridor as a trail per Mr. Helm’s recommendation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Commentor</td>
<td>Plan Page #</td>
<td>In Staff Report?</td>
<td>Testimony</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Discussion / Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>385</td>
<td>MCDOT</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Consider a connection between E Franklin Ave and Oakview Dr, across the Northwest Branch Trail.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>The Bicycle Master Plan is not recommending new bikeways through park land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>386</td>
<td>MCDOT</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Show Trail Connectors across Long Branch, linking each side of Melbourne, as well as linking Schuyler/Wayne-Buckingham.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>We recommend showing these existing trail connections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>387</td>
<td>MCDOT</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Consider extending the Philadelphia Ave bikeway to connect the Takoma Park ES with the Pinney Branch Rd bikeway.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>We added this bikeway at the request of the City of Takoma Park, which specifically asked for the bikeway to stop at Holly Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>388</td>
<td>Helms</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Northwest Branch Trail-WDO-FDA Trail 1495 Overpass Connector FROM Deweere TO E Light (Hard Surface Trail)</td>
<td>Defend</td>
<td>It is not appropriate, and would be duplicative, to include all hard surface park trails in the Bicycle Master Plan. M-NCPCP 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 Parks Trails Plan, as well as other operational policies of M-NCPCP Montgomery Parks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>389</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Show Northwest Branch Trail on map.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>390</td>
<td>WABA, Norman</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Shown Carroll Ave separated or buffered bike lanes are more appropriate.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>While we agree that separated or buffered bike lanes are more appropriate, Carroll Ave is a very constrained street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>393</td>
<td>Cochrane</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Elsworth Dr between Cedar and Fenton -- Here the plan calls for two-way protected bike lanes on one side of the street, but the Elsworth segments surrounding it are shared roadway or contraflow bike lane, so won't this require needles switching from one side of the street to the other?</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>While two-way separated bike lanes on Elsworth Dr would require switching the side of the street, this is the only way to implement separated bike lanes on this road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>394</td>
<td>MCDOT</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>For the line for East West Hwy between Rock Creek &amp; Grubb Rd: consider noting that the contra-flow bike lane is (presumably) along the north side's service road.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>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”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>395</td>
<td>WABA, Norman</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Extend the separated bike lanes on Dale Dr from Woodland Dr to Pinney Branch Rd. (EXTRA, Norman)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Extending the separated bike lanes on Dale Dr from Woodland Dr to Pinney 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>396</td>
<td>Cochrane</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>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 DTT for these protected bike lanes ASAP since this is the official GBT detour.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>397</td>
<td>Reed</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Show Capital Crescent Trail in the Silver Spring / Takoma Park (West) map as unbuilt.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>The Capital Crescent Trail is now under construction and can be shown as proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>398</td>
<td>Herr</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Grandview Ave is not a high-speed road and may not need a separated bike path.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>Greater Colesville Citizens Assoc</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401</td>
<td>MCDOT</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>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 2023).</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>See response to Comment #400.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402</td>
<td>MCDOT</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Add a ** to the &quot;White Oak - FDA Connector&quot;</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>We recommend making this change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403</td>
<td>Helms</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>FDA-0229 BRT Connector FROM FDA TO Lockwood (Hard Surface Trail)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>This is an existing recommendation in the plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Plan Page</td>
<td>In Staff Report</td>
<td>Testimony</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Discussion / Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404</td>
<td>Helms</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lockwood-MH(MD050) Ped &amp; Bike Bridge FROM Lockwood TO Lockwood (Hard Surface Trail)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>We do not support a bridge crossing New Hampshire Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405</td>
<td>Helms</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Northwest Branch Trail-WO-FDA Trail I95 Underpass Connector FROM Northwest branch Trail TO Duvens (Hard Surface Trail)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>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 Operations policies of M-NCPPC Montgomery Parks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406</td>
<td>Helms</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Old Columbia Pike Tech Road Ped &amp; Bike US2 Bridge FROM Old Columbia Pike TO industrial (Hard Surface Trail)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>We do not support a bridge crossing US 29 at this location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>407</td>
<td>Helms</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>US29-Lookwood Ped &amp; Bike Bridge FROM Lockwood TO US29 (Hard Surface Trail)</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>We do not support a bridge crossing US 29 at this location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>408</td>
<td>Greater Colesville Citizens Assoc</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>On Calverton Blvd the plan proposes a sidewalk on the south side but separated bike lanes already exist of both sides.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>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 &quot;sidewalk to &quot;conventional bike lanes.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>409</td>
<td>Greater Colesville Citizens Assoc</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The plan indicates a separated bikeway doesn’t exist on Broadbirch Dr, but it already exists.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>While narrow conventional bike lanes exist on Broadbirch Dr, they do not create a low-stress bicycling environment. We therefore recommend retaining the sidewalk recommendation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410</td>
<td>Greater Colesville Citizens Assoc</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>On Old Columbia Pike the plan recommends a sidewalk but conventional bike lanes already exist.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>While narrow conventional bike lanes exist on Broadbirch Dr, they do not create a low-stress bicycling environment. We therefore recommend retaining the sidewalk recommendation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>411</td>
<td>Greater Colesville Citizens Assoc</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>On Cherry Hill Rd separated bike lanes are not needed on south side of road because sidewalk exists on north side of road.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Since most of the commercial activity is on the south side of the road, a sidewalk is need on the south side.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>412</td>
<td>Greater Colesville Citizens Assoc</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>On Gracefield Rd between Plum Orchard Rd and Calverton Blvd, the plan indicates a sidewalk does not exist but it does. Bicyclists can ride in the road.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>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 sidewalk.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Park Coordination Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Plan Page</th>
<th>In Staff Report</th>
<th>Testimony</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Discussion / Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>413</td>
<td>Planning Staff</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Extend Utility Corridor #4 from Heartwood Dr to Muncaster Mill Rd and add sidewalk on the east side of Muncaster Mill Rd between Bowie Mill Road and Utility Corridor #4.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>This is an error. The map shows an alignment to the east side of the trail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>414</td>
<td>Planning Staff</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>This was an error. The map shows an alignment to the east side of the road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415</td>
<td>Planning Staff</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>SHFS sidewalk from the US 29 east ramp on the east side to Prosperity Dr.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>This is an error. The map shows an alignment to the east side of the road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>416</td>
<td>Planning Staff</td>
<td>226, 292, 306</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>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 sidewalk 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.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>This was an error. The map shows an alignment to the east side of the road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>417</td>
<td>Planning Staff</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Extend the sidewalk on north side of Veirs Mill Road from Parkland Drive to the City of Rockville.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>This was an error. The map shows an alignment to the west side of the road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>418</td>
<td>Planning Staff</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Add a sidewalk on the east side of Havard Street between Veirs Mill Road and Coles Drive.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>This was an error. The map shows an alignment to the west side of the road.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Corrections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Plan Page</th>
<th>In Staff Report</th>
<th>Testimony</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Discussion / Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>429</td>
<td>MCDOT</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The text ‘Retail’ under long-term / Work is top-aligned rather than center-aligned.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Make this change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>430</td>
<td>MCDOT</td>
<td>88-89</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>DANAC is shown on p80 as having a long-term bike station, but on p89 no long-term parking needs are identified.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>This was a mistake. Remove the DANAC station from the map.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>431</td>
<td>Planning Staff</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Add Bicycles to the bicycle parking stations map.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>This was a mistake. Add bike stations to the map.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432</td>
<td>Planning Staff</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The bikeway on Johns Hopkins Dr should be Tier 1 priority.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>This was an error. Tier the bikeway to Tier 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>433</td>
<td>Planning Staff</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>In Objective 2.3, change “transit station” to “bikeway.”</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>This was an error. Correct the language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>434</td>
<td>MCDOT</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>There appears to be a graphic discrepancy in the Matthew Henson Trail immediately west of MD 97. It appears the existing trail spans between the Holderidge/Kitburn connection and MD 97, though no such green line is apparent.</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>This has been addressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>435</td>
<td>Planning Staff</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Show Striegnown Road sidewalk on north side as existing between MD 355 and Snowden Farm Parkway.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>This was an error. Remove the sidewalk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>436</td>
<td>Greater Colesville Citizens Assoc</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Segment of the recommended sidewalk exist on Greenscastle Rd to the east and west of US 29.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>This was an error. Correct these segments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>437</td>
<td>WABA, Smith</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Map does not show Germantown - Life Sciences Center Breezeway on Middlebrook Rd</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>This was an error. The map should show the Breezeway designation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Commentor</td>
<td>Plan Page #</td>
<td>In Staff Report?</td>
<td>Testimony</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Discussion / Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>428</td>
<td>Planning Staff</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The Dutsey Mill Rd sidepath between Century Blvd and R-250 should be located on the north side of the road, not the south side as indicated.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Trails should be at least 8 feet wide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>429</td>
<td>Herr</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The path through Pleasant View Park should be shown as proposed. It is an existing sidewalk that needs to be upgraded.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>We will make this change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>430</td>
<td>MCDOT</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>&quot;Flanders Ave&quot; is misspelled as &quot;Flanders Ave&quot;</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>431</td>
<td>MoBike</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>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 = &quot;Separated Bikeway and Bikeable Shoulders&quot;. Bikeway Type = &quot;Sidepath (East Side) and Bikeable Shoulders&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432</td>
<td>Planning Staff</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Show Darnestown Rd as existing.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>This is an error and should be corrected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>433</td>
<td>MoBike</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Democracy Blvd (west of Seven Locks Rd) – The bikeway identified in the table (shoulders + path) is correct but the map is wrong.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>434</td>
<td>MoBike</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Westlake Terrace – The bikeway table says bikeable shoulders + path under &quot;bike way type&quot; column but just a path under &quot;facility type&quot; 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 M&amp;L.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>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 = &quot;Separated Bikeway and Bikeable Shoulders&quot;. Bikeway Type = &quot;Sidepath (East Side) and Bikeable Shoulders&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>435</td>
<td>Planning Staff</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Perimeter Road should be shown as green to match the recommendation for an off-street trail on page 365.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>This is an error and should be corrected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>436</td>
<td>MCDOT</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>White Oak – Confirm the intention of US 29 as a shared roadway. Perhaps at least a bikeable shoulder?</td>
<td>Agree in part</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>437</td>
<td>Planning Staff</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>US 29 should be shown as having two-way separated bike lanes on both sides of the road.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>438</td>
<td>Planning Staff</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>