

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

#	Public or Agency Comment	Staff Response	Recommendation
78	<p>Add shoulders to Glen Road west of Warts Branch and to Glen Road South. Keeping this road narrow (protected as a Rustic Road) makes it so unsafe for cyclists, pedestrians and equestrians that its "rustiness" can only be enjoyed from the confines of an automobile. <b>Jack Cochran, on behalf of Montgomery Bicycle Advocates (MOBIKE)</b></p>	<p>This plan does not recommend any changes to Rustic Road policies and designations. Adding shoulders to these roads would adversely impact the character and scenic qualities of the road.</p>	
79	<p>The Sierra Club objects to parts of the plan that provide links to the proposed Matthew Henson paved recreational trail as well as all connections to the proposed ICC bike path due to environmental and fiscal concerns. The group feels it is both economically and environmentally better to work with the State to connection communities from East to West across the County along roads that an expend so much on paving a bike road through sensitive habitats. <b>Jim Fary, on behalf of the Sierra Club, Montgomery County Group</b></p>	<p>The ICC bike path and the Matthew Henson Trail provide important recreational and transportation benefits, especially for novice and intermediate bicyclists. They each will serve as important bicycle corridors, offering connections to countywide destinations via on-road or along-road bikeways. The County intends to also work with the State to provide on-road east-west cross country connectivity for experienced bicyclists.</p>	
80	<p>The Georgetown Branch Trail should not be joined with the Metropolitan Branch Trail. <b>Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</b></p>	<p>The plan inadvertently linked these two trails as if they were one facility.</p>	<p>Any references to these trails in the plan will be changed to clarify the point that these are distinct trail facilities.</p>
81	<p>For safety reasons, we recommend identifying the service road along Strathmore Avenue as a shared use roadway rather than the main lines on Strathmore. <b>Suzanne Hudson, on behalf of the Garrett Park Estates-White Flint Park Citizens' Association.</b></p>	<p>Ample space exists along Strathmore Avenue for a signed shared roadway. Identifying the service road as the designated route along this road would cause operational problems for both eastbound cyclists who would have to cross the road to reach the service road and for westbound cyclists trying to reach the shared use path that connects to Grosvenor Metrorail station. For safety reasons, it is better to encourage bicyclists to ride with traffic to limit the need to cross travel lanes to reach the service road. The back and forth movements that would be required to</p>	

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

#	Public or Agency Comment	Staff Response	Recommendation
		reach the service road are discouraged by transportation engineers.	
	<b>CHAPTER 3 – Bikeway Facility Design Guidelines (specific comments)</b>		
82	DPWT believes bicycles are allowed on Clara Barton Parkway. This needs to be verified. <b>Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</b>	Bicyclists are allowed on Clara Barton Parkway.	The reference on page 1 will be modified to reflect this information.
83	The “County’s road code” needs to be better defined. The public will not understand this term. <b>Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</b>	Staff agrees that the public may not understand this term.	A more complete definition of the County’s road code will be included in the new glossary of terms, which will be added as an appendix per other comments from the County Executive. Staff will present this new glossary at Worksession #2.
84	The plan recommends a 3-6 foot landscape panel and in the same paragraph states it should meet AASHTO standards. AASHTO standards recommend a 5-foot separation from the road or a barrier if less than five feet. These inconsistencies are confusing. DPWT recommends that AASHTO be the guiding standard. <b>Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</b>	The <i>AASHTO Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities</i> (“AASHTO Guide”) will be the guiding standard, however, the County’s roadway design manual requires a six-foot minimum width to allow for the planting of trees.	The reference to three-foot landscape panels will be deleted from the plan. While some roadway standards have three-foot panels, none apply to bikeway recommendations in this plan.
85	The State code does not allow bicycles on sidewalks. The statement that the 2002 Maryland Vehicle Code “defines a bikeway as...a sidewalk” is not consistent. <b>Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</b>	This is direct quote from p. 356 of the 2002 edition of The Maryland Vehicle Law.	
86	Page 48, under Pavement Width and Clearance Zones, these data do not correspond with AASHTO. <b>Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</b>	See pages 35-36 of the AASHTO Guide. 10 feet is preferred, 8 feet is acceptable, 12 feet may be desired in high bike/pedestrian traffic areas.	
87	Page 49, Under Landscape Panel, AASHTO has a typo. <b>Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</b>	Agree	The typo will be corrected.
88	Page 49, Under Curb Cuts and Crosswalks, this paragraph needs to be reworded. It should be retitled “Curb Ramps and Crosswalks” and should state that all curb ramps should be eight	Staff concurs. “Curb Ramps” is more correct than “Curb Cuts”.	The title of the section will be changed and language will be added reflecting the recommended 8’ curb ramps for all

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

#	Public or Agency Comment	Staff Response	Recommendation
89	<p>feet wide (instead of four or five for typical sidewalk). <b>Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</b></p> <p>Under Signs for Bicyclists, since most bicyclists know that they will be in conflict with motorists on a road right-of-way, this section should be reduced. It should state to follow MUTCD recommendations and signs should be installed where unexpected conflicts may arise. In addition, these recommendations would be very costly and difficult to implement. The same comment holds for the Signs for Motorists section. <b>Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</b></p>	<p>Staff agrees this section could be reduced to a few sentences. As a 20-year plan, cost should not be a determining factor for deciding whether to include or not include plan recommendations.</p>	<p>shared use paths.</p> <p>These sections will be rewritten in cooperation with DPWT staff. Staff will present modified language for this section at Worksession #2.</p>
90	<p>Page 50 under Lighting, add a statement referring to the DPWT lighting policy. <b>Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</b></p>	<p>Agree</p>	<p>The DPWT Lighting Policy will be referenced in this section.</p>
91	<p>Figure 3-9 shows a raised bike lane. The County does not have a standard for this; DPWT does not recommend it for safety reasons and request that it be deleted. <b>Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</b></p>	<p>The discussion about raised bike lanes was added to raise the awareness about less traditional design solutions to difficult issues. The concept is implemented in other jurisdictions (Oregon) and has potential application in the County.</p>	
92	<p>Under Bike Lanes, in general design characteristics, the pavement markings should be bike logo or bike lane lettering and arrow. The pavement marking references in Figure 3-7 do not correspond. <b>Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</b></p>	<p>These changes should be made to clarify current DPWT practice and to clarify the document.</p>	<p>The phrase "bike lane lettering" will be added to that bulleted item. An additional figure will be added depicting a roadway with bike lane lettering and an arrow.</p>
93	<p>Page 51 under Width Standards, note the professional document being referenced. A clear riding zone of four feet is desirable and bike lanes wider than six feet may be desirable. DPWT recommends that these be deleted unless the document can be cited. <b>Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</b></p>	<p>See Pages 22-23 of the AASHTO Guide.</p>	
94	<p>Page 51 under Pavement Markings and Signs, implementation details such as six inch wide stripe, dimensions, lengths, etc. should be directly referred to the professional document so that errors can be minimized and the plan will not be outdated if the requirements</p>	<p>See Page 23 of the AASHTO Guide.</p>	

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

#	Public or Agency Comment	Staff Response	Recommendation
95	<p>change. <b>Gail Tait-Nouri</b>, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</p> <p>Page 51, the Extruded Curbs section should be deleted. <b>Gail Tait-Nouri</b>, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</p>	<p>This section was taken from The Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan. Parking curb stops have been implemented in the County. They are unsafe, especially in poorly lit areas and their application and use should cease.</p> <p>Agree</p>	<p>The section will be retained.</p>
96	<p>Page 51, under Reflectors and Raised Pavement Markers, a generic statement about the undesirability of raised reflectors is sufficient. Reflective pavement devices are not used to separate motor vehicle travel space from bicycle travel space. DPWT does not know if a beveled edge is satisfactory to cyclists or not. <b>Gail Tait-Nouri</b>, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</p>	<p>Agree</p>	<p>The section will be condensed to one or two generic sentences. Staff will present revised text at Worksession #2.</p>
97	<p>Page 51, Two Way Bike Lanes section. Two-way bike lanes are highly unusual and do not warrant so much description. A generic sentence or two about their undesirability is sufficient. Wrong-way riding causes highest accident rate in Maryland. Delete the last two bullets. The centerline crown of a roadway and other factors limit what improvements can be made to accommodate bike lanes or shoulders and should be evaluated on a case by case basis. <b>Gail Tait-Nouri</b>, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</p>	<p>Agree</p>	<p>The description will be simplified to a generic sentence or two about their undesirability. Staff will present revised text at Worksession #2.</p>
98	<p>Page 52, Bike Lanes at Intersections, Delete "for traffic engineers." Describe a pocket lane. <b>Gail Tait-Nouri</b>, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</p>	<p>Staff agrees pocket lanes should be described in this plan.</p>	<p>The phrase "for traffic engineers" will be deleted. A description of pocket lanes will be added. Staff will present revised text at Worksession #2.</p>
99	<p>Page 52, Note, make it a subheading such as "Space Constraints" <b>Gail Tait-Nouri</b>, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</p>	<p>Staff agrees this item should have its own heading.</p>	<p>The bulleted item under the Bike Lanes at Intersections section will become a separate section with the subheading "Constraints."</p>
100	<p>Page 53, Shoulder bikeways, the document is the Montgomery County DPWT Roadway Design Standards Manual. Shoulder dimensions should be AASHTO. A simplified table for all the types of bikeways would be good. <b>Gail Tait-Nouri</b>, on behalf of</p>	<p>Staff agrees a table would be useful.</p>	<p>The document will be correctly identified. A table will be created for succinctly describing bikeway types and characteristics. This would be a</p>

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

#	Public or Agency Comment	Staff Response	Recommendation
	Montgomery County Executive.		valuable addition to the plan. Staff will present the proposed summary table and modified text at Worksession #2.
101	Page 54, Local Street, the last sentence is missing words. <b>Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</b>	Agree	The word "signs" will be added to the end of this sentence.
102	Page 54, Hiker-Biker trails, this section is too long and not necessary for this document. Refer readers to the Countywide Park Trails Plan. Information is repetitive to page 18. The Figure 3-9 reference is incorrect. <b>Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</b>	A description of hiker-biker trails is necessary so that readers do not confuse them with shared use paths.	. The referenced figure should be 3-14, not 3-9. This will be corrected.
103	Page 54, Sidewalk Bikeways, just call this section sidewalks. Don't mention bikeways. This section should be one paragraph. <b>Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</b>	Staff agrees. This section should discuss sidewalks only and not confuse readers with the concept of concrete shared use paths.	This section will be reworded and condensed and retitled as suggested. Some portions may be moved to more relevant sections of the plan. Staff will present revised text at Worksession #2.
104	Page 55, Railroad Crossings, delete the statements referring to locations within the County and make it generic. There is a railroad crossing on Randolph Road and a bike path crossing into Garrett Park. <b>Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</b>	Staff agrees a generic statement makes more sense.	The statement about locations in the County will be changed to make it more generic. Staff will present revised text at Worksession #2.
105	Page 56, Smoothness, the Railroad determines type of material used. A generic statement would suffice. The Railroad headings are confusing with the "Other Design Considerations since they all appear to be related to Railroad. The Railroad issues should be condensed and consolidated. <b>Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</b>	Staff agrees a generic statement makes more sense.	A generic statement will be made about smoothness of railroad crossings. The three sub-subheadings under Railroad Crossings will be bulleted to clarify this section. The section on railroad crossings will be condensed. Staff will present revised text at Worksession #2.
106	Page 56, Shared Use Path on Bridges, this would be very costly. <b>Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</b>	This is an AASHTO recommendation.	
107	Page 56, Rumble Strips, most cyclists dislike rumble strips of any type particularly the grooved type. <b>Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</b>	Agree	This section will be rewritten to clarify that use of rumble strips is determined by the implementing agency and will be made on a case-by-case basis. This will allow implementing agencies flexibility. Staff will present modified

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

#	Public or Agency Comment	Staff Response	Recommendation
108	Page 56, Bicycle Boulevards, this concept is very complex and therefore very unlikely ever to be implemented. It should be placed in an appendix. <b>Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</b>	Staff agrees that this concept is very complex and its application in the County is limited. However, it should remain a potential solution for bikeway implementation that also involved traffic calming issues.	text at Worksession #2. The concept will be placed in the appendix on bikeway design. Staff will present revised text for this appendix at Worksession #2.
109	Page 59, Diagonal Parking, Montgomery County does not allow diagonal parking. This section should be deleted or a minimal statement or two should be made in case a municipality is considering it. <b>Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</b>	Staff agrees this has limited application in the County. However, it should remain a potential solution for bikeway implementation.	The section will be reduced to a few sentences and moved to the appendix on bikeway design. Staff will present revised text at Worksession #2.
110	Page 60, Bike Lanes & Bus Lanes, it is questionable whether bikes and buses can really co-exist. This issue should be researched more thoroughly since we have busways proposed in Montgomery County. Or the section should be deleted. <b>Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</b>	Buses and bicycles undoubtedly will compete for increasingly limited space on the County's roads, especially roads on which bus rapid transit is proposed, such as Viers Mill Road (MD 586). This section is valid and relevant to Montgomery County	The text will mention that the issue is complex and requires further research by implementing agencies. Staff will present revised text at Worksession #2.
111	<b>Shared Use Paths – Other Design Considerations (pp.48-50)</b> Add a subsection addressing bike paths on bridges. Path width on a bridge should be 10 feet, preferably 14 feet. <b>John Fauerby</b>	See discussion of shared use paths on bridges on page 56. However, this section is slated to be moved to an appendix on bikeway design.	
112	The curb cut for a shared use path should be the width of the path, not a standard curb cut for a sidewalk. <b>John Fauerby</b>	See discussion of curb cuts on page 49.	
113	<b>Bike Lanes – Other Design Considerations (pp.50-52)</b> Consider traffic signal bicycle loop detectors at signalized intersections. An appropriate pavement marking should be indicated on the pavement where the detector is sensitive. In addition, all vehicle detectors also should detect bicycles. <b>John Fauerby</b>	Bicycle loop detectors and vehicle detectors sensitive enough to also detect bicycles, are only relevant and economical in urban locations where high bicycle use along a particular road is expected.	A few sentences about the concept will be added to the appendix on bikeway design. Staff will present revised text at Worksession #2.
114	Lighting for bikeways should be glare free and full cutoff to improve safety and limit light pollution. <b>John Fauerby</b>	Agree	The section on lighting, currently on page 50, will mention the need for

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

#	Public or Agency Comment	Staff Response	Recommendation
			glare-free lighting. Staff will present revised text at Worksession #2.
115	<b>Signed Shared Roadways (pp. 53-54)</b> Bikeable shoulders should have its own section at the same level as signed shared roadways. <b>John Fauerby</b>	The plan highlights shoulder bikeways as a distinct type of signed shared roadway. See page 53. This is consistent with the AASHTO Guide. This plan is designed to be consistent with AASHTO. Therefore, bikeable shoulders will not be highlighted in this plan as a separate type of bikeway.	Table 2-2 will highlight the desired type of signed shared roadway for all SR bikeways.
116	Bikeable shoulders should be of the same pavement quality and condition as motor vehicle travel lanes. Similarly, when travel lanes are repaved, shoulders also should be repaved so that the new is level between the travel lanes and shoulder. <b>John Fauerby</b>	While this is largely a maintenance and implementation issue, staff recognizes the importance of pavement quality for shoulder bikeways and for wide curb lanes.	The plan will include language in the shoulder bikeways section that specifies the need for smooth pavement along shoulders for roads on which a signed shared roadway is recommended.
117	The plan should recommend painting shared use path crosswalks in a bright solid color as Rockville has started doing. <b>Jack Cochrane, on behalf of Montgomery Bicycle Advocates.</b>	Painted crosswalks are an innovative solution to alerting motorists of intersections with high levels of pedestrian and/or bicycle travel.	The concept is worth further study by the County and will be added to the appendix on bikeway design. Staff will present revised text at Worksession #2.
	<b>CHAPTER 4 – Implementation (specific comments)</b>		
118	Page 61, note that the bike lanes on Old Columbia Pike were an independent retrofit CIP project. <b>Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</b>	Agree	The information will be noted.
119	Page 61, Prioritization. DPWT does not want the priority list to be reviewed by the Planning Board. DPWT does not want the priority to list a time period. It will be difficult to implement moderate priority projects ahead of high priority projects. <b>Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</b>	The plan highlights the bikeways intended to meet the largest number of potential bicyclists as quickly as possible, which is a plan objective. A system of prioritization is needed to give both the County and the State an idea of which bikeways are more important and have the potential to meet the needs of a	The language about opportunistic bikeways” is buried in the text and will be highlighted/bolded for emphasis.

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

#	Public or Agency Comment	Staff Response	Recommendation
120	<p>Page 62, delete the paragraph referring to other funding programs.  <b>Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</b></p>	<p>large number of current and future bicyclists.</p> <p>The plan includes language about instances for which the County or State can implement moderate priority bikeways (or bikeways not recommended in this plan) ahead of higher priority bikeways. The plan calls these "opportunistic bikeways". See first paragraph on page 62.</p> <p>This paragraph simply highlights the various means by which bicycle safety is often improved as part of non-bicycle projects. It is important for the public to understand the various means by which bicycle safety is improved.</p>	
121	<p>Page 62, Recommendations. An attempt should be made to initiate the highest priority projects first. Delete second bulleted item. DPWT will not sign all of these signed shared roadways because of costs. No reference to timing should be made. <b>Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</b></p>	<p>Agree</p> <p>The County should make a commitment to implementing the bikeways highlighted in this plan. This is a twenty-year plan. It is reasonable to expect all signed shared roadways to be implemented within the next 20 years and perhaps within 10 years. Implementation costs are a function of the County budget, which is determined by the County Executive and County Council. Therefore the commitment to implement this plan is ultimately made by the County Council, which approves the budget.</p>	<p>The second bulleted item will be deleted.</p>
122	<p>Page 62, Moderate Priority section, no reference to specific timing of implementation should be made. It is impractical to recommend Franklin Avenue as a shared use path. Under recommendations,</p>	<p>Agree</p>	<p>The second bulleted item will be deleted.</p>



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

#	Public or Agency Comment	Staff Response	Recommendation
	no reference to timing should be made. Delete second bulleted item. <b>Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</b>	The reference to a shared use path on Franklin Avenue is an error; a shared use path is not recommended for this road, it is a proposed signed shared roadway. A more suitable example will be used. A reference to at least general timing is necessary in order to achieve the goals of this plan.	Regarding the reference to Franklin Avenue, a more suitable example will be used.
123	Page 63, On-Going Implementation, a statement should be made regarding costs of such a signing program. <b>Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</b>	A master plan typically does not include cost estimates. However, the plan does include a section on Estimating Bikeway Costs (page 64), which provides readers with a general idea of bikeway implementation costs.	
124	Page 63, Recommendations, Delete first bulleted item. A cost study needs to be performed to determine what level of effort should be funded. Then the second bulleted item could be implemented but not until the overall costs have been approved. <b>Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</b>	The first and last sentences will be retained; they help the public understand the primary manner local bikeways are implemented (Annual Bikeways Program).	The middle sentences will be deleted, as will the criteria for determining local bikeway implementation priority.
125	Page 63, Funding For Bikeways. Delete entire section. The language is inappropriate for a master plan. <b>Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</b>	This section helps the public understand bikeway implementation, but it does not make recommended changes in policy. It could be moved to an appendix for informational purposes only.	The section will be combined with the section on Understanding Bikeway Implementation and retained as a new appendix. Staff will present revised text for this new appendix at Worksession #2.
126	Page 64, About Facility Planning, delete "prior to inclusion in the CIP." Phase II, not Phase I, includes cost estimates. Delete "into the CIP" and add after stand alone project "in the CIP." <b>Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</b>	These comments simply reflect the author's limited understanding of the facility planning process.	These changes will be made.
127	Page 65, State of Maryland, all references to the Access 2000 project as it relates to an on-going program should be deleted. The program was dropped for lack of funding after the first year. <b>Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</b>	Agree	All references to Access 2000 will be deleted from the plan.
128	Page 65, Federal Government, delete reference to Access 2000. <b>Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</b>	Agree	All references to Access 2000 will be deleted from the plan.

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

#	Public or Agency Comment	Staff Response	Recommendation
129	<p>Page 66, Recommendations, detailed language as to how to implement funding programs is inappropriate for a master plan. 'A dedicated retrofit bicycle parking program should be created and funded' statement would be more appropriate. Potential sources could be DPWT's Commuter Services and Bikeway Programs. Bicycle racks and lockers should be purchased and a prioritization system should be developed for distribution, installation and maintenance. <b>Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</b></p>	<p>Agree</p>	<p>The language will be modified to make it more generalized. Staff will present revised text at Worksession #2.</p>
130	<p>Page 66, Funding for Bikeway Maintenance, detailed language as to how to implement funding programs is inappropriate for a master plan. Statements such as 'there is a need for a maintenance program for bikeways' are reasonable.' Delete entire section unless it can be reworded to identify the needs and not direct programming for other agencies. Certain CIP programs cannot provide for maintenance needs. It is up to other agencies to decide how to implement and program their use of funds. Delete the last bulleted item. <b>Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</b></p>	<p>Staff concurs a more general statement would suffice. However, the first sentence is important; it highlights the importance of continued funding for the Annual Bikeways Program. It will be retained.</p>	<p>The language will be modified to make it more generalized as suggested. Staff will present revised text at Worksession #2. The last sentence of the last bullet will be deleted.</p>
131	<p>Page 68, Bicycle Education Program should explain what needs could be met, that it be comprehensive, but not go into the level of detail of how to implement it, particularly the advisory committee. <b>Gail Tait-Nouri, on behalf of Montgomery County Executive.</b></p>	<p>Staff concurs a more general statement would suffice.</p>	<p>Details of this section will be removed. The section will be rewritten to make it more generalized. Staff will present revised text at Worksession #2.</p>
132	<p>The prioritization scheme is a superb idea. One suggestion would be to clarify the distinction between priority based on need versus priority based on external factors such as construction of the Inner Purple Line. The plan should not downgrade from high to moderate priority simply because it depends on such external factors. On the other hand, an attempt should be made to reduce priority where there are multiple parallel bikeways. <b>Jack Cochrane, on behalf of Montgomery Bicycle Advocates.</b></p>	<p>Staff concurs that language could be added to the Prioritization scheme to help the public understand the many complexities involved in bikeway implementation (i.e., bikeways that are part of larger transportation projects like the BiCounty Transitway). The presence of parallel alternative routes is an important consideration in bikeway implementation and will be added to the discussion on prioritization.</p>	<p>Staff will present revised text at Worksession #2.</p>
133	<p>A substandard route already used by bicyclists should be a high priority (Seven Locks Road, Beach Drive, MacArthur Boulevard).</p>	<p>Staff concurs the prioritization discussion should highlight the need to</p>	<p>Staff will present revised text at Worksession #2.</p>

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

#	Public or Agency Comment	Staff Response	Recommendation
134	<p><b>Jack Cochrane, on behalf of Montgomery Bicycle Advocates.</b></p> <p>A road that is likely to serve more users (and function as a backbone for the bikeway network) also deserves higher priority even if it does not connect to any specific destination besides other bikeways. A bikeway that provides the only route through a particular part of the County (with no viable parallel routes) also might deserve higher priority. <b>Jack Cochrane, on behalf of Montgomery Bicycle Advocates.</b></p>	<p>upgrade substandard routes currently used by bicyclists.</p> <p>Bikeways that provide direct connections to major destinations as defined in this plan receive higher priority. These bikeways are more likely to serve more users. Bikeways with few alternative parallel routes should be considered for higher priority.</p>	<p>This will be added to the prioritization discussion. Staff will present revised text at Worksession #2.</p>
135	<p>Good signage and pavement markings are paramount. The County is woefully behind in signing and marking bike routes. The City of Rockville has set a good example with signs that clearly label bike routes and direct bicyclists to destinations and alert drivers to presence of bicyclists. <b>Jack Cochrane, on behalf of Montgomery Bicycle Advocates (MOBIKE).</b></p>	<p>Not a master plan element.</p>	
136	<p>The Sierra Club recommends some funds be included in the FY05 CIP to begin implementing this plan. So much honest and hard work has gone into the development of this plan that it does not want to see it languish on MNCPPC's list of dream projects. <b>Jim Fary, on behalf of the Sierra Club, Montgomery County Group</b></p>	<p>Agree, but not a master plan element</p>	
137	<p>Consider quantitative performance measures for each objective, similar to the City of Rockville Bicycle Plan. <b>Jack Cochrane, on behalf of Montgomery Bicycle Advocates (MOBIKE).</b></p>	<p>The concept will be considered. However, since planning is done by MNCPPC and implementation by DPWT, SHA and others, performance measures really do not make sense. Further, DPWT does not want this plan to include timeframes. Without a timeframe for a prioritization system, measuring performance is not possible.</p>	
<b>GENERAL COMMENTS – Criticism and Suggestions</b>			
138	<p>Fill in the inadequate or missing links within the existing bikeway network. Increase the robustness of the network by completing and planning connectors to main routes, rebuilding time-worn</p>	<p>The plan places a high priority on bikeways that would complete an important link or fill in significant gaps.</p>	

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

#	Public or Agency Comment	Staff Response	Recommendation
139	<p>facilities and build new facilities where heavy increases in high-speed traffic have made former on-road routes impossible. <b>Helen Zitomer, on behalf of the Washington Area Bicyclist Association</b></p> <p>Planners must be allowed flexibility to adapt design standards for constrained situations inevitable in more urban areas. It may not be possible, or desirable to confirm to AASHTO standards in certain situations. <b>Helen Zitomer, on behalf of the Washington Area Bicyclist Association</b></p>	<p>The discussion on bikeway design will highlight the importance of meeting the AASHTO Guidewhenever possible.</p>	<p>Language will be added that provides implementing agencies with some flexibility. Further, bikeway design concepts will become an appendix rather than be included in the document body. Staff will present revised text for relevant sections at Worksession #2.</p>
140	<p>The selection of facility types outlined in the plan will require consideration on a case-by-case basis. The implementation of unmarked shoulders versus marked bike lanes is of particular concern. Bikeway continuity is critical, bikeways that unnecessarily terminate at non-intersections due to space constraints or other reasons should be avoided. <b>Helen Zitomer, on behalf of the Washington Area Bicyclist Association</b></p>	<p>The selection guidelines highlight simply the type of facility that would be most desirable for certain situations. The selection of bikeway type for specific road projects is often debated and determined during facility planning when issues such as site and environmental constraints are discussed. The discussion begins, however, with the master plan recommendation. Bikeway continuity is one of the plan's guiding principles; see page 6.</p>	
141	<p>It is important to distinguish between space intended for the exclusive use by bicycles versus shared space. Bicyclists and motorists need to understand the intended usage of a particular roadway. <b>Helen Zitomer, on behalf of the Washington Area Bicyclist Association</b></p>	<p>The plan adequate describes the intended use of bike lanes versus signed shared roadway. Staff will consider ways to better highlight and clarify these descriptions.</p>	<p>Staff will present revised text at Worksession #2.</p>
142	<p>The Master Plan presents a coherent network for the I-270 Corridor. But a coherent bikeway network for the eastern part of the County is lacking. Our greatest population centers are crisscrossed by major multilane highways, with more to come, in this part of the County. Simply following existing roads and paths may fall short. Consider a more bold or far-reaching solution, such as European-style bikeways governed by traffic lights at major intersections and crossings. <b>Helen Zitomer, on behalf of the</b></p>	<p>The few crossings of Northwest Branch somewhat disrupts the potential bikeway network in the eastern part of the County. This is a function of the roadway and highway network, as well as topography, not the bikeway network. All roadway and highway crossings of Northwest Branch feature a bikeway and</p>	

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

#	Public or Agency Comment	Staff Response	Recommendation
	Washington Area Bicyclist Association	most major roads in the eastern County feature a bikeway. The plan proposes a separate bikeway along US29 from MD 198 to Stewart Lane.	
143	Recognize the many opportunities to connect neighborhoods, schools, parks and other facilities via routes other than established streets and arterial roads (i.e., connecting cul-de-sacs with a short path). <b>Helen Zitomer, on behalf of the Washington Area Bicyclist Association</b>	This is important, but not part of the scope of this plan. The focus is on major bikeways and connections to major, countywide destinations and activity centers.	
144	Ensure that bicycling considerations are included in every capital project, zoning decision and private development project. <b>Helen Zitomer, on behalf of the Washington Area Bicyclist Association</b>	Montgomery County current policy is that all capital projects and land development must consider all master plan recommendations, including bikeways. In fact, the CIP is largely based on master plan recommendations. The various ways in which bikeways are implemented are discussed in the Implementation Chapter.	
145	Add a statement to page 7 to reflect that on-road bicycling is in fact frequently safer than riding on a side path. <b>Alan Migdall, on behalf of the Gaithersburg Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee</b>	On-road bicycling often can be safer than riding on a sidepath.	A statement will be added to the plan. Staff will present revised text at Worksession #2.
146	Avoid marking a sharp division between recreational and transportation bicycling. Recreational trails are key to providing a source of new users for our transportation trails. <b>Alan Migdall, on behalf of the Gaithersburg Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee</b>	Page 1 describes how bicycle transportation and recreational riding overlap. The plan recognizes the blurred distinction.  The plan highlights the importance of the park trail system to the countywide bikeway network and bicycle transportation connectivity. However, the plan makes no recommendations to change the park trail system or the 1998 Countywide Park Trails Plan.	
147	The 1999 AASHTO Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities should be included as an appendix, in addition to the SHA guidelines. <b>Alan Migdall, on behalf of the Gaithersburg</b>	The AASHTO Guide is a separate document with copyright restrictions. It is referenced throughout the document. It	

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

#	Public or Agency Comment	Staff Response	Recommendation
148	<p><b>Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee</b></p> <p>The Bicycle Facility Selection Guidelines should clearly state that connectivity is paramount so that a specific recommendation on type of facility is just a preference and does not preclude a different type of facility if it turns out that the preferred alternative is not feasible. <b>Alan Migdall, on behalf of the Gaithersburg Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee</b></p>	<p>is not necessary to add it as an appendix.</p> <p>The Bicycle Facility Selection Guidelines only state the desirability of a certain type of bikeway under certain circumstances.</p>	
149	<p>Emphasize cross-county connections like the ICC bike path and the Corridor Cities Transitway bike path. <b>Lynne Rosenbusch</b></p>	<p>Agree</p>	<p>Staff will present revised text at Worksession #2.</p>
150	<p>Emphasize each bike trail, bike lane and shoulder for each particular geographic area of the County. <b>Lynne Rosenbusch</b></p>	<p>This plan emphasizes countywide and regional bikeway connectivity. The plan will direct readers to community master plans and sector plans to learn more about proposed local bikeway systems.</p>	
151	<p>Add language to the plan that allows for the bike map to be expanded for future bikeways when a master plan is updated to include more trails and bike lanes. <b>Lynne Rosenbusch</b></p>	<p>Agree</p>	<p>Staff will present proposed revised text at Worksession #2.</p>
152	<p>The plan should include language that it be implemented in a timely manner. The implementation plan should include costs, a timeline and potential sources of funding for each bikeway. <b>Lynne Rosenbusch</b></p>	<p>These issues are highlighted in the plan. The plan includes general costs of bikeways, identifies funding issues and places all bikeways in a high (within 10 years) or moderate (10 years or longer) category.</p>	
153	<p>Bikeways identified in community master plans and sector plans, but not highlighted by this plan, should be at least recognized by this plan. <b>Lynne Rosenbusch</b></p>	<p>Chapter 2 highlights the relationship between countywide bikeways and local bikeways. The role of local bikeways could be better emphasized.</p>	<p>Staff will present revised text at Worksession #2</p>
154	<p>Transportation planners should work closely with community planners to develop local bikeway networks as part of community master plans and sector plans. <b>Lynne Rosenbusch</b></p>	<p>See Appendix C, Local Bikeway Plan Guidance starting on page 76.</p>	
155	<p>Require transportation planners to ride their bicycles in traffic to better understand traffic conditions and codified bikeway design standards. <b>Lynne Rosenbusch</b></p>	<p>The manner in which bikeways are identified and evaluated is determined by transportation planning staff and recommendations directing staff to act in a specific manner is not appropriate for a</p>	

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

#	Public or Agency Comment	Staff Response	Recommendation
156	Update this master plan every five years to reflect new development and potential for new and expanded bike routes. <b>Lynne Rosenbusch</b>	The plan will be continually amended by subsequent community master plans, sector plans and functional master plans. It is up to a future Planning Board and County Council to determine when this plan will be comprehensively revised and amended, likely in 15-20 years.	
157	Include a policy statement about not eliminating shoulders on a road designated for a bikeway. <b>Lynne Rosenbusch</b>	This is important. A statement will be added to the Implementation Chapter that will ensure that signed shared roadways (shoulder bikeways) retain and/or maintain adequate shoulder space as part of any future roadway improvement.	Staff will present modified text at Worksession #2.
158	Consider long-distance bike corridors, both north-south and east-west. <b>Lynne Rosenbusch</b>	Themed bikeway corridors are not included in this plan. The County, in cooperation with SHA and other agencies, can create bicycle corridors through its signage program.	
159	Encourage more participation by the bicycling community in master plan processes, including this one. <b>Lynne Rosenbusch</b>	Participating by the bicycling community has been a high priority in the development of this plan. Park and Planning staff are aware of notifying the bicycling community about current, on-going master plan processes that may affect bicycling.	
160	Enforce grid pattern of roadway design/layout for all new development. <b>Lynne Rosenbusch</b>	This is beyond the scope of this plan. Land use policies are established as part of community master plans and sector plans. Street layout and design are determined as part of site plan review and approved by the Planning Board.	
161	Place more emphasis on on-road bicycling rather than trails along roads. <b>Lynne Rosenbusch</b>	The plan attempts to strike a balance between on-road and off-road bicycling.	

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

#	Public or Agency Comment	Staff Response	Recommendation
		<p>A major goal of the plan is to meet the needs of the largest number of bicyclists as quickly as possible. Shared use paths serve the largest number of potential bicyclists and shared use paths encourage more people to begin using a bicycle for transportation.</p> <p>The plan recommends more than 100 miles of signed shared roadways. In addition, all future roadway improvement projects, along roads identified for a countywide bikeway or not, must consider and address bicycle access and accommodation.</p>	
162	<p>A network of bike lanes should be built from Germantown to Clarksburg. <b>Lynne Rosenbusch</b></p>	<p>The plan will not identify any additional bike lanes. However, the plan will include language that all future County and State roadway improvement projects consider on-road bicycle accommodation, including bike lanes. Further, transportation planning staff will coordinate with development review staff to ensure developer-built roads as part of a newly constructed subdivision provides space for on-road bicycling.</p>	
163	<p>Standard width of shared use paths should be 10 feet. There is more room for bikes to pass each other taking into account handlebar width. <b>Lynne Rosenbusch</b></p>	<p>10 feet is preferred and desirable for more urban areas of the County. However, 8 feet is often acceptable for areas in which use is expected to be only moderate. In addition, 10 feet often may not be achievable due to right of way and environmental constraints. The minimum acceptable width is therefore 8 feet.</p>	
164	<p>Stop the practice of planting trees next to trails. Tree roots crack the path and branches drop off and become a hazard. <b>Lynne</b></p>	<p>Shared use paths are often recommended along roads for which street trees are</p>	



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

#	Public or Agency Comment	Staff Response	Recommendation
	<b>Rosenbusch</b>		
165	Bikeway maintenance should be done as often as possible. The bikeway maintenance program should also address emergencies like removing a downed tree or limb. <b>Lynne Rosenbusch</b>	required by the County's road code. This is a long-term maintenance issue. Bikeway maintenance should become a function of standard roadway maintenance in the future. Per requests by the County Executive, details on how the County will maintain bikeways will not be included in this plan. The plan will mention only that a bikeway maintenance program is needed.	
166	Certain roads (like Great Seneca Highway) should have a trail on both sides. <b>Lynne Rosenbusch</b>	A shared use path on both sides of a road is not efficient in terms of limited space and cost in most instances, but may be appropriate in more urban areas or suburban crossroad communities.	
167	Make trail crossings at intersections safer, including adding refuge islands where possible and considering traffic calming measures to reduce speeding and increase bicycle/pedestrian visibility. <b>Lynne Rosenbusch</b>	A discussion of shared use path crossings at intersections should be added to the new appendix on bikeway design.	Staff will present text for this new appendix at Worksession #2.
168	Ensure a quality control mechanism is in-place for all developer provided bikeways. Be sure shared use paths are built to County standards. <b>Lynne Rosenbusch</b>	Developers are required to coordinate with DPWT for County roads and with SHA for State highways. Site planners at M-NCPPC are responsible for ensuring the facilities are built to standards or conform to recommendations by the Planning Board. Text explaining this issue should be added to the Implementation Chapter.	Staff will present revised text at Worksession #2.
169	The plan needs to specify how planned bikeway facilities are communicated to DPWT or the developers who will implement those plans. This is needed to educate citizens on how this process happens and to ensure that it does happen. <b>John Fauerby</b>	The various ways in which bikeways are implemented are described throughout Chapter 4, Implementation.	
170	Bicycles are not required to use shared use paths when they are present. The County must ensure adequate on-road bicycle accommodation along roads that feature, or are planned to	The plan clearly states that bicycles are legal vehicles of the road. Both the County and the State address bicycle	

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

#	Public or Agency Comment	Staff Response	Recommendation
	include, a shared use path. <b>John Fauerby</b>	accommodation as part of all roadway and intersection improvement projects, including shared use path projects.	
171	Those roads not deemed safe for bicycling should be identified. Include a policy for correcting the lack of safety on these roads. <b>John Fauerby</b>	The County features more than 3,000 miles of road. Staff had to limit the scope of this plan in order to make it manageable. Therefore, it was decided to focus on major roadways and bicycling corridors and ensuring that these routes provide for a safe bicycling experience. It is beyond the scope of the plan to evaluate every mile of road in the County. Further, correcting unsafe road conditions are the responsibility of DPWT or SHA, the operating agencies, which have the safety of all users as a key objective.	
172	Itemize the benefits and dangers of each bikeway type in order to educate planners on which type of bikeway is "better" for a particular situation. <b>John Fauerby</b>	Advantages and disadvantages of bikeway types are adequately covered in the Bicycle Facility Selection Guidelines on pages 24-26. Per a request from the County Executive, a table will be added to this section to clarify advantages and disadvantages of various bikeway types.	
173	Park and Planning is biased against bike lanes to the extreme. For instance the Clarksburg Master Plan has an extensive network of bike paths and one example of a shared roadway with no extra space for bicycling. Bikes lanes (or bikeable shoulders) should be on every State highway and County arterial. Generally consider more bike lanes in this Plan. Bike lanes have better associated standards, like width and where they can terminate. Bike lanes also are less likely to be removed/eliminated to accommodate future roadway improvements. Bike lanes also can offer traffic calming benefits.  I would be satisfied if a binding statement was made in the master	This plan strives to meet the needs of all potential users, and thus recommends a variety of bikeway types throughout the County. In general, bike lanes are more desirable in more urban locations, along roads connecting to major destinations, where clearly delineated space for bicyclists is needed.  Due to right of way constraints, bike lanes are simply not possible on every road or highway. In addition, bike lanes	Staff will present proposed revised text for the implementation chapter at Worksession #2.

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

#	Public or Agency Comment	Staff Response	Recommendation
	<p>plan that all State highways and County arterials and through roads must have either an associated bike lane or bikeable shoulder in each direction of travel.</p> <p><b>John Fauerby</b></p>	<p>are not desirable on every road since bike lanes legally require bicyclists to use them (and not travel in the motor vehicle travel lanes). Recommending bike lanes on every major road would dilute the effectiveness of this plan. Currently, County and State policies require bicycle accommodation to be considered as part of any roadway or intersection project.</p> <p>The Plan should include language recommending that all future roadway improvement projects along State highways or County arterials consider on-road bicycle accommodation, including investigating whether bike lanes or bikeable shoulders make sense.</p>	
174	<p>Describe the characteristics of bicycles that will be using particular planned bikeways. Acknowledge the different types of bicycles (single and tandem standard, single and tandem recumbent, sign and tandem tricycles). <b>John Fauerby</b></p>	<p>Bicycle types and bicyclists' experience levels will not be assigned to certain types of bikeways. However, the plan acknowledges that certain types of bicyclists typically use certain types of bikeways more often. See page 7.</p>	
175	<p>Area master planners may not be educated that this plan serves as the backbone on which to build a bikeway network for smaller areas of the County. The Plan should include a section about adequate bicycling planning staff and bicycling planning support within M-NCPPC. <b>John Fauerby</b></p>	<p>See Appendix C, Local Bikeway Plan Guidance.</p>	
176	<p>The approved and adopted plan needs to be posted on the internet with each area enlargement available for download at letter size. <b>John Fauerby</b></p>	<p>All approved and adopted community master plans, sector plans and functional plans are posted on the M-NCPPC website. In addition, staff drafts or public hearing drafts of plans are always posted as part of ongoing planning efforts.</p>	