

Grosvenor-Strathmore Metro Area Minor Master Plan

Attachment 4: Written Public Hearing Testimony from Montgomery County Department of Transportation and Staff Response

Issue/Property	Page	Testimony or comment	Commenter	Staff Response
Transportation Analysis		<p>Transportation Analyses: The draft plan does not include any transportation analyses, and as such we are unable to affirm the viability of the proposed lane diets. There is also a reference to a Transportation Section on p63 which we were unable to locate.</p> <p>Achieving transportation adequacy via the local-area (2016 LATR) and area-wide (2012 TPAR) methodologies can strongly bolster the case the changes to the street network. Not achieving adequacy, however, is indicative of a need for additional infrastructure, reduced automotive demand, and/or public awareness and acceptance of additional congestion.</p>	Conklin, Christopher, P.E. Deputy Director for Policy, Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) letter to Ossant, June 16, 2017.	Staff is in the process of preparing future travel forecasting procedures and data analysis for several on-going master plans. One of the key elements of this forthcoming analysis is the incorporation of growth recommended in the Grosvenor-Strathmore Minor Master Plan Amendment area with mitigation strategies to address the intersections that may exceed the subdivision staging policy intersection congestion standards.

Cross Sections		<p>Cross-Sections: Provide the nearest cross-sections for each non-SHA roadway segment in Table 6, as well as a list of any proposed changes to minimum rights of-way. Where there is not a precise cross-section, provide the nearest cross section and append the number with “mod”. Ideally, each modification should be accompanied by a note or footnote describing the intent of the modification.</p>	<p>Conklin, Christopher, P.E. Deputy Director for Policy, Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) letter to Ossant, June 16, 2017.</p>	<p>Cross sections standards as prescribed by the County's Context Sensitive Design Standards have been incorporated into some (but not all) master plans. Staff recommends that each roadway cross section that is proposed for change in a master plan is based on a current assessment of needs for sidewalks, bikeways, transit, parking, landscaping, and other features (bus stops, corner truncations etc.) that will change the currently available rights of way to a recommended minimum right of way. The Bethesda Downtown Master Plan is a current example of how staff recommends portraying street classifications and minimum recommended minimum rights-of-way in all master plans, unless guidance is provided by the Planning Board or Council. At this time, staff is recommending a change to Table 6, Street Classification, to include the following columns: Designation (B-1 etc.), Roadway, Limits, Minimum Right-of-Way and Lanes (number of lanes). In some cases, a graphic will also be provided to help with the Capital Improvements Program (CIP) recommendations that will be incorporated into the plan.</p>
Additional Modified Graphics		<p>Additional and Modified Graphics: We believe three new/modified figures would be extremely beneficial toward the drafting and implementation of this plan: (1) a map showing existing transit services, as well as areas where the plan feels additional service would be desirable; (2) a map of existing and proposed roadways; (3) a modified bikeways map (figure 24) that follows the design and palette in use with other recent and ongoing master plans.</p>	<p>Conklin, Christopher, P.E. Deputy Director for Policy, Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) letter to Ossant, June 16, 2017.</p>	<p>Staff recommends modified and additional graphics that are consistent with other recent master plans (such as the Bethesda Downtown Plan) for transit services (existing and proposed, streets and bikeways).</p>

Expanded CIP Listing		Expanded CIP Listing: Provision of a CIP listing around pages 82 or 83 (as has recently been done with the Bethesda and Rock Spring plans) is extremely helpful in quickly identifying projects created by the master plan, and is helpful in preparation of the Fiscal Impact Statement.	Conklin, Christopher, P.E. Deputy Director for Policy, Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) letter to Ossant, June 16, 2017.	Staff agrees and will provide a CIP listing in the back of the plan for the ultimate purpose of providing a Fiscal Impact Analysis of the plan's new and upgraded facilities. This Fiscal Impact Analysis will be provided by the County ___ Staff once the plan is transmitted to the Council.
Graphics	13	Several graphics (including Figure 1 on p13) do not clearly delineate major roads such as MD 355.	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	Graphics will be updated to more clearly delineate roadways.
Graphics	13	Several graphics (including Figure 1 on p13) do not clearly delineate the western boundary of the master plan area. Does it include or exclude MD 355?	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	Graphics will be updated to more clearly delineate the plan boundary.
Map or Graphics	9,50,60	There are references to the Champion tree on pages 9, 50, and 60, but no maps/figures appear to indicate the tree's location to the northeast side of the 355/Beach/Grosvenor intersection.	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	A graphic will be provided to more clearly delineate the Champion Tree's location.
Metro Parking Garage	9,34	The plan proposes to explore a recreation facility on top of Metro garage. The structural feasibility has not been determined as well as how a rec facility will impact the number of parking spaces in the garage.	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	Staff Agrees. The feasibility construction atop the Metro parking garage will need to be studied and coordinated with WMATA.
Strathmore Reference	13,16	The text says that Strathmore opened in 2001. Later in the report (p16) is correctly states the opening in 2005.	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	References to Strathmore will be corrected for consistency
MD 355 BRT	16	2nd Paragraph - This implies that BRT will remain on Rockville Pike. Note that our current plans assume that BRT would enter onto the Metro site.	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	The reference to BRT is part of a vision statement that does not detail the BRT concept.

Map Color Display	21	Identify what the bold green is by Cloister Dr. (Figure 4)	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	The map will be updated to identify the green coloring or remove it.
Tuckerman Lane/Cloister Drive Intersection	30,35,36	Figures 10, 13, & 14 appear to propose a major pedestrian crossing on Tuckerman Lane opposite existing Cloister Dr. Originally, the Tuckerman Ln/Cloister Dr intersection was constructed to allow only right in, right out movements restricted by a physical median on Tuckerman Ln. Over time, a channelized southbound left turn median break was constructed. The community has requested to have a westbound left turn from Cloister Dr. but there are sight distance and traffic operations issues at this location. The ultimate decision on if this can be implemented will rest with further DOT analysis [see also: comment on p55 Roadway Recommendations]	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	Staff agrees that this decision will be made in the future.
Path through Holy Cross property and other connections to Beach Drive and Rock Creek Park	28, 30, 50	While p28 highlights the Metrorail line as a ped/bike barrier to the west, barriers appear to present themselves to the north (Holy Cross) and south (forest alongside Beach Dr / Rock Creek Trail). Consider whether it might be prudent for Figure 10 to show sidewalks/paths through Holy Cross (with a recognition that it is private land & may only be implementable as a part of redevelopment with easements), between Cloister & Weymouth (existing; should be shown), and toward Beach Dr / Rock Creek Trail (if park impacts are	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	The graphics indicates a possible path through the Holy Cross property, but it does not show a line through the private property as the property is outside of the plan area boundary. The path indicator was meant to show that if a potential opportunity arises that a pathway should be considered into and possibly through the property. Pedestrian friendly sidewalks and paths are proposed in the plan to connect to Beach Drive and Rock Creek Park on pages 30, 50, and 71. Existing pathways and trails outside of the plan area may ultimately be shown or enhanced in the plan's graphics. Duplicate graphics in the plan may be deleted or updated to reflect changes.

		acceptable) (as also referenced by p50, 2nd goal, 7th bullet).		
Ped/bike route through Avalon/Grosvenor Park between Grosvenor Lane and Metro	31	Consider whether it might be prudent to show the ped/bike route through Avalon / Grosvenor Park between Grosvenor Lane and Metro.	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	Staff will consider showing all ped/bike routes which are outside of the plan area but that lead into the plan area.
Gateway features on Rockville Pike/MD 355	32	2nd Major Bullet - MCDOT should be deleted from the recommendation for coordination to install gateway markers on Rockville Pike/MD355 for Strathmore Hall. Implementation of this recommendation is not within MCDOT's jurisdiction.	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	Recommend coordination for gateway features on the state highway be made with SHA (knowing that MCDOT might be interested in taking part in that discussion).
Access to recommended building at the corner of MD 355 and Tuckerman Lane (north)	35	This identifies a future building site with access from either Tuckerman or the Bus Kiss & Ride entrance from Tuckerman. It is not desirable for this 260 foot high building to have access from either point because of conflicts. This will require the developer to identify an alternative access and loading path.	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	The recommendation for access to this potential building site will be coordinated at the time of site plan.
Proposed shared street for WMATA garage and development site	35	Figure shows the garage entrance and exit ramp extended into the development site as a roadway. Traffic analysis will be required to ensure that there is sufficient capacity to exit the garage after Strathmore events and during the PM peak period.	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	Staff Agrees
Corner truncation on graphics	36-43	Consider showing corner truncation (per Chapter 50) at applicable intersections shown in these illustrations, and consider	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	Graphics are illustrative. Staff will review identified graphics.

		including as a part of the fourth bullet under the second goal of p38.		
Stormwater Management Facilities	38-39	Provision for stormwater management facilities - within the "Planting/Furnishing Zone" should be noted in the text and on Figure 18. The "Curb Zone" should extend a minimum of two (2) feet behind the curb (where on street parking is proposed) on business district and higher classification streets.	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	Staff agrees and will provide notation as to the need for stormwater management and curb zones.
Service Entries	38-39	p38 2nd Goal, 2nd Bullet // and the top-right graphic on p39 - Both reference providing minimal service entries into the public realm and view. Will new development be conditioned to provide for shared loading facilities? Or might dedicated on-street facilities be required along public or private streets for WB-50s, SU-30s, and other truck sizes, as applicable? Consider how such facilities might be managed if they are less than what are otherwise required by subdivision regulations.	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	Staff considers this a site plan issue. The illustrative drawings and images could be noted to indicate that adequate loading facilities for delivery vehicles will be required to be coordinated with MCDOT at the time of site plan.
Bike Lanes	39	The bottom graphic shows bike lanes between parking and the travel lane. Consider whether the graphic could instead show bicyclists between the curb and parking lane to provide additional buffer from traffic as well as reduce the threat of the door zone.	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	Graphics are illustrative. Staff will review identified graphics. However, the illustrative drawing was based on MCDOT's preliminary design for Tuckerman Lane shown on page 52 (Figure 25) that was discussed among MCDOT and Planning staff. The ultimate solution is shown on Figure 26 where a two-way separated bike lane is proposed.
Covered walks and canopies over building entrances	42-43	The recommendation to provide covered walks, canopies, etc over building entrances and drop-off zones should be	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	Staff agrees that DPS will need to approve covered walks and canopies over building entrances and loading zones.

		coordinated with DPS - there are limits on how far these canopies can extend into the public right-of-way. Proposed drop-off zones are subject to review and approval.		
Bicycle Parking	45	5th Sub-Bullet - Consider rephrasing along the lines of "Custom and functional bike racks" to emphasize that usability should not be disregarded in favor of aesthetic design.	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	Staff agrees with this change.
Recommendations for areas outside of the plan's boundary	48-56	The master plan makes a number of recommendations located outside of the planning area, particularly around Grosvenor / Beach. Consider whether the Scope should be modified.	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	Staff considers these recommendations to be of particular concern to the Planning Board and the District Council as they affect the overall success of connectivity and access to transit and the plan area in general.
Typo	48	2nd Paragraph - Appears to be a typo: "33 South BRT" should be "355 South BRT".	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	Staff will revise this reference.
North Bethesda Transitway	48	2nd Paragraph - Consider mentioning the North Bethesda Transitway, which per the functional master plan may terminate at either Grosvenor or White Flint. The draft Rock Spring explicitly stipulates that it will terminate at Grosvenor (though we have disagreed with this specificity).	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	Staff agrees that the terminus (Grosvenor or White Flint) for the North Bethesda transitway is yet to be decided and will reflect this fact in the plan.
Mention of the pending high frequency Ride On	48	2nd Paragraph - Also include mention of the pending high frequency Ride On extRa service that will span the 355 corridor between Lakeforest Mall and Medical Center, serving 12 designed stops. Service will operate as an overlay to routes 46 & 55 and will operate during the peak periods only. This will include stops at Grosvenor on-street along each direction of MD 355, using the	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	Staff agrees that other transit services, such as the high frequency Ride On service can be mentioned in the plan to enhance the Mobility Section. Transit options change, and this may be an item that is best described in the forthcoming transportation appendices.

		northbound pull-off area and an existing southbound far-side stop beyond the Tuckerman (north) intersection. That southbound stop will be reconstructed to provide ADA-compliant access between the stop and the sidewalk immediately west, providing access to the Metro tunnel.		
Transportation Gaps	49	2nd Bullet - Consider identifying transportation gaps.	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	Coordination with MCDOT is recommended to identify potential gaps in transportation services. This information may ultimately be incorporated into the plan or the appendices.
NADMS Goal Clarification	49	Clarify whether the NADMS goal is referring to NADMS-Employees, or if there should be any consideration of NADMS targets for residents.	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	The discussion of transportation forecasting, including NADMS, will be a topic of the transportation appendices. Clarification in the plan should be made as to whether NADMS refers to employees only or also residents.
Bikeshare	49-51	Include general commentary on providing Bikeshare throughout the plan area.	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	Page 51 recommends bikeshare be provided at the Metro site. Bikeshare systems can also be deployed in smaller more nimble stations with fewer bikes. This recommendation can be expanded to include the entire plan area, not just at the Metro site. MCDOT currently spreads these facilities among areas other than Metro sites. In places like Baltimore, MD, some bikeshare stations contain only a few bicycles at specific employer or residential locations based on negotiations with land owners and discussion of need.
Raised Intersection Crosswalks	50	1st Goal (re: ped connections), Bullet 3 - Vertical deflection (as in the case of tabletop intersections) is not currently permitted along arterial roadway (as is the case of Tuckerman La).	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	Staff recommends keeping this language in the plan as a recommendation to consider for future improvements that calm traffic and provide safe pedestrian crossings.
Crosswalk Pavement	50	1st Goal (re: ped connections), Bullet 3 - We no longer allow installation of special pavement crosswalks in the County	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	Staff recommends keeping this language in the plan as a recommendation to consider for future improvements that calm traffic and provide safe pedestrian crossings.

		rights-of-way. This is primarily a result of a lack of maintenance funding.		
Punctuation	50	2nd Goal (re: low stress), Bullet 3 - There is a missing space between "along" and "Grosvenor"	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	Noted and a revision is recommended.
Grosvenor Lane Sidepath	50	2nd Goal (re: low stress), Bullet 3 - We support this recommendation and its reference despite being outside of the master plan area, and suggest that the Rock Spring plan do the same.	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	MCDOT support is noted.
Crosswalks at all Intersection	50	1st Goal (re: low stress), Bullet 5 - The statement to provide crosswalks at all intersections in the plan area should be deleted. This comment is an operational comment not appropriate for a Master Plan document and gives the public an unreasonable expectancy.	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	Staff recommends keeping this language in the plan as a recommendation to consider for future improvements that calm traffic and provide safe pedestrian crossings.
Connection to Rock Creek Trail	50	2nd Goal (re: low stress), Bullet 6 - This proposes a connection to Rock Creek Trail via sidepath along 355, but Rock Creek Trail and 355 do not intersect. Clarify whether this should be sidepath only to Beach Dr (in which case how does this differ from Bullet 2), or if sidepath is being suggested along Beach Dr to Rock Creek Trail (in which case Figure 24 needs to be updated).	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	Noted: Staff recommends clarifying this language and perhaps making it on complete recommendation to connect Edson Lane to Beach Drive with a sidepath.
Tuckerman Lane Bikeway Treatment	51-54	Confirm that Tuckerman is proposed to ultimately have both a sidepath and two-way separated bike lanes.	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	The long-term option is described in Figure 26 on page 53. This option supports removal of the existing sidepath and installation of a 2-way separated bikeway on one side of Tuckerman Lane. Perhaps a separate graphic showing existing facilities is required with a stand-alone future graphic.
Graphic and Table Placement in Plan	51,55	Consider locating Figure 24 and Table 5 on immediately subsequent pages.	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	Consideration will be given to placing the graphic and table together when the plan is revised.

Shared Roadways	51,55	Consider the need to explicitly label streets as Shared Roadways, which offers no functional need other than for wayfinding purposes.	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	Shared Roadways are currently in the Council approved functional transportation plan, and as such will remain in the plan unless staff is directed to change this display.
Bikeshare Stations	51	1st Bullet - It is likely that we will pursue more than one Bikeshare station on the Metro site as part of any plan to redevelop that property. We suggest revising the statement to read: "Provide bikeshare station(s) on the Metro site as determined as part of the review of any plan to redevelop that property."	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	Staff agrees with this change to the recommendation but may modify it.
Metro Tunnel & ADA	51	Consider recommending an ADA compliant access on the east side of the Metro tunnel beneath 355.	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	Staff agrees with this change to the recommendation but may modify it after coordination with WMATA
Map Coloring Consistency with other Plans	51	Consider using design and color palette for this map that is in use with the Bikeways Master Plan, and has been in use with most other recent master plans. This could use a common color palette, background palette, and label each bikeway.	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	Staff is currently discussing the consistency between master plans and the display of bikeways and roadways. Figure 24 is recommended to be updated to show this consistency.
Public and Private Streets Designations	51	Clarify whether the two internal streets will be public, private, and/or maintained by WMATA. Based on the lack of detail in Table 6 (p56) it appears these may be intended to be private/WMATA, in which case consider stipulating under what conditions these might be private streets (as has been stipulated with private streets in some other master plans). If these are proposed to be public or WMATA streets, note that while a street of this nature could be a pilot location,	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	A separate street diagram is recommended, and this should clarify where public and private streets will be located. Color consistency with other master plans will likely be provided. Staff assumes that public and private streets that allow public access on the Joint Development site will be constructed by the chosen developer.

		there remain significant hurdles with shared streets regarding the effects of PM surge traffic, design, maintenance, and liability which may not guarantee implementation by either MCDOT or WMATA.		
Bike and Pedestrian Friendly Intersection Terminology	51	If the term "Bike and Pedestrian Friendly Intersection" is to be used: define this term and how this is distinct from other signalized and/or unsignalized intersections, as applicable.	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	Staff recommends keeping this language in Figure 24 in the plan as a recommendation to consider for future improvements that calm traffic and provide safe pedestrian crossings. New treatments may be available to MCDOT in the future, especially for bicycle improvements but that also consider pedestrians and vehicles in terms of safety.
ADA Accommodation	51	Consider whether the "Recommended Bike Friendly Stairs" will also require ADA accommodation, or if the master plan deems alternate level routes to be acceptable with regard to ADA.	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	The bicycle-friendly stairs recommendation in Figure 24 is a stand-alone recommendation to provide bicycle improvements to a specific location that will likely contain stairs that connect Tuckerman Lane to the WMATA site.
Bikeshare Stations Locations other than Metro Garage Location	51	Remove the "Proposed Bikeshare Station" or otherwise consider how this might be displayed / phrased to indicate that this may not be the only Bikeshare station.	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	<p>The proposed bikeshare station in Figure 24 is only meant to recommend that there must be a bikeshare station at the Metro site. Whether or not MCDOT will request other bikeshare locations in the area at the time of site plan or other opportunity was not considered. See above comment on bikeshare locations.</p> <p>As stated above, the goal on Page 51 recommends that bikeshare be provided at the Metro site. Bikeshare systems can also be deployed in smaller more nimble stations with fewer bikes. This recommendation can be expanded to include the entire plan area, not just at the Metro site. MCDOT currently spreads these facilities among areas other than Metro sites. In places like Baltimore, MD, some bikeshare stations contain only a few bicycles at specific employer or residential locations based on negotiations with land owners</p>

				and discussion of need when opportunities arise such as site plan review.
Typo	51	There is a typo in the legend: the light-blue line reading "Separated Bike Lan"	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	Noted, and a revision recommended.
Tuckerman Lane Bikeway Location Clarification	51	The map would appear to imply that the Tuckerman separated bikeway would be constructed on the west/inner side of Tuckerman. Is this correct? If so, text elsewhere in the document should reaffirm this more clearly, particularly among the subsequent pages 52-54.	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	Staff will provide clarification with a north arrow in Figures 25 & 26 with text clarifications.
Map Error	51	This does not show a sidepath along Grosvenor La(ne) between 187 and 355, as called for on p50 and p55.	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	Figure 24 is incorrect and will be updated to reflect the proposed sidepath on Grosvenor lane and also indicate the side of the road that is recommended for a sidepath.
Direct Ped/Bikeway Connections from Plan area to Rock Creek Park	51	Per the comment on Figure 10 and supported by text on p50: consider showing potential connections between the plan area, through Rock Creek Park, and directly onto Beach Dr.	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	At this time the plan recommends that the pedestrian and bike connection be made via a sidepath along MD 355 connecting the plan area to Rock Creek Park via Grosvenor Lane and Beach Drive.
Plan Consistency with Bikeway Master Plan	51	As the Bikeway Master plan is also currently under review: ensure that all bikeway proposals match between the two plans. We identified several conflicts.	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	Plan consistency is noted and staff is coordinating. The Bikeway Master Plan currently generalizes some recommendations (such as using the term "Separated Bikeways" to indicate where separated bike lanes or option sidepaths will be planned.
Graphics and Facilities Display	51	Figure 10 (p30) and 11 (p31) both show additional facilities, such as the Fitness Loop. Consider whether Figure 24 should show additional facilities to guarantee that these items either remain or are implemented.	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	Figure 10 is meant to be more of a framework for both potential public and private improvements outside of the plan area, rather than functional recommendations for public facilities that will require cost estimates for the plan.
Illustrative Graphics	52-53	The proposed interim and ultimate longterm #1 typical sections to implement bike lanes ignore existing auxiliary turn lanes and medians.	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	Noted. The graphics are meant to be illustrative in nature, and future design and engineering by MCDOT may ultimately change these recommendations.

		Longterm #2 seems more practical from a traffic operations standpoint, but it will require additional right-of-way or public improvements easements to implement that design.		
Punctuation and Clarification	52	1st Sentence - Remove the comma in "two, one-way" or consider rephrasing to something like "a pair of one way".	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	Staff agrees and will consider how to update this language for clarity and reading.
Punctuation	52	2nd Sentence - Remove the comma in "permanent, two-way"	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	Staff agrees and will consider how to update this language for clarity and reading.
State Roads' Numbers Designations	55	Rockville Pike is noted as also being MD 355. Consider also noting that Old Georgetown Road is MD 187.	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	Staff agrees and will consider how to update this language for clarity and reading.
Endpoints of SP-43 Bikeway	55	Amend the endpoints of SP-43 to clarify "Rockville Pike at Tuckerman Lane" as the North Intersection and South Intersection.	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	Staff agrees and will consider how to update Table 5 language for clarity and reading.
2012 TPAR Transit Test	55	Provide information on the 2012 TPAR Transit test. While each metric is operational, these provide a good snapshot of Existing conditions & the needs as the plan area develops.	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	This information will be provided in the transportation appendices.
Metrorail Turnbacks	55	Be mindful that when Metrorail turnbacks are eliminated at Grosvenor (that is: all trains continue to Shady Grove), Grosvenor will likely see a significant reduction in usage. The plan should highlight that turnbacks will be eliminated.	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	Staff agrees and will consider how to update the plan to reflect potential METRO changes to turnbacks at Grosvenor.
Additional information on MD 355 South, the North Bethesda	55	Provide additional information on MD 355 South, the North Bethesda Transitway (noting our comment on p48 regarding its potential eastern termini), the pending Ride On extRa service (noting	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	Staff recommends providing a transit map to show future transitways. Bus lines and potential changes to bus routes and services can be incorporated and described into the transportation appendices and possibly in the plan text.

Transitway, and Ride On Extra		our comment on p48 regarding the Tuckerman stop), and bus lines currently serving the area. A map is highly recommended.		
Additional Shuttles	55	Consider including recommendations from p49 regarding additional support shuttles.	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	Bus shuttles and services can be incorporated and described into the transportation appendices and possibly in the plan text on page 55.
BRT Access to Metrorail Station	55	Note that our current plans for BRT assume that it would enter onto the Metro site.	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	Noted.
2016 LATR & 2012 TPAR Analysis	55-56	Provide 2016 LATR and 2012 TPAR Roadway analyses and findings. If both tests pass, this strengthens the case for the proposed transportation network and can make implementation proceed more smoothly through their respective public processes. If either of the tests fail, it is an indication that more evaluation, mode shift, and/or infrastructure may be necessary to achieve the vision of the plan, or the results act to raise awareness if elected officials should choose to approve the plan with acknowledgment of potential impacts to congestion.	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	The discussion of transportation forecasting, including 2016 LATR and 2012 TPAR Roadway analyses and findings including NADMS, will be a topic of the transportation appendices. This analysis should support land use density recommendations of the plan.
Site Distance at Tuckerman and Cloister Lane (proposed full movement intersection)	55	Limited sight distance (among other issues) have rendered a full movement intersection at Tuckerman / Cloister an unfavorable consideration. Consider whether connections between Cloister and either Montrose Ave or Kenilworth Ave may provide the Stoneybrook community with alternative means of access. [see also: comment on p30,35,36]	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	Connections between Cloister and either Montrose Ave or Kenilworth were not considered due to land use and environmental impacts. The ultimate decision on the intersection recommendation may potentially be implemented with further MCDOT analysis.

Ordering of Bulleted Recommendations	55	2nd & 3rd Bullets - Consider swapping the order of these two bullets so that issues relating to Tuckerman/Cloister are side-by-side as the first and second bullets.	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	Noted. Staff will consider this revision.
Grosvenor Lane to Beach Drive Improvement	55	2nd Bullet - While we are not averse to keeping this recommendation to Study, be mindful that providing for eastbound movements from Grosvenor to Beach would attract significant traffic to Grosvenor La, and would likely put into conflict competing goals of improving clarity, preserving parkland (particularly the Linden Oak), and cost. This may be a difficult item to provide a cost estimate for as a part of the Fiscal Impact Statement.	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	Noted. No change recommended. However, this issue may be explored in the transportation appendices of the plan.
Traffic Signal Language	55	3rd Bullet - Replace "traffic light" with "traffic signal".	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	Noted. Staff will consider this revision.
Shared Street Definition	56	1st Bullet - Consider providing greater definition as to what a shared street is. In its current form, a common reader may look at Figure 24 (p51) and get confused about the distinctions between a Planned Shared Roadway, a Recommended Shared Roadway, and a Recommended Shared Street.	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	Staff will consider this revision to provide greater definition. However, a shared street naturally allows bicycle use as a shared roadway. The two are distinct, yet they do overlap. Clarity may need to be provided.
Off-Street Parking Language	56	2nd Bullet - Consider rephrasing this item; the phrasing feels rather odd and not immediately understandable.	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	Noted. Staff will consider rephrasing this item to provide clarity.
Shared Public/Private Parking Facilities	56	3rd Bullet - It is assumed this comment refers to shared private parking facilities, as there is no Parking Lot District covering the Grosvenor area. Clarify this text, as needed.	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	Noted. Staff will consider rephrasing this item to provide clarity.

BRT	56	Add an additional bullet including "Consideration of Future BRT"	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	Noted. Staff will consider adding this item.
Roadway Map	56	Provide a map of the roadway network.	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	Staff recommends adding a new roadway map to the plan and coordinating the display colors to be consistent with other recent master plans.
Non-SHA Road Cross Sections	56	Provide the nearest cross-sections for each non-SHA roadway segment and denote the number of travel lanes intended. For SHA roadways, we are comfortable listing the standard only as "SHA", as the State is not bound to our Context Sensitive Road Design Standards (CSRDS). As separated bike lanes and shared use paths are not included in any of the approved CSRDS, it is anticipated that there will not be an exact standard for each roadway. Where there is not a precise standard, provide the nearest standard and append it with "mod". Ideally, each modification should be accompanied by a note or footnote describing the intent of the modification. Alternately, providing cross-sections either in the main document or in the appendix will help establish intention &/or act as proof of concept. In general, it is our preference that dimensioned cross-sections be located in the Appendix, as providing dimensioned cross-sections in the plan itself can be interpreted as rigidly fixing those dimensions as requirements, limiting flexibility should standards change.	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	For Table 6, staff is considering the value of providing the nearest standard and append it with "mod". This is not how the Bethesda Downtown Plan was produced, and staff thinks that this plan is a good model for other plans' development. The most important number in the plans is the total minimum right of way needed. Each roadway, in the end, becomes a custom design that considers available rights-of-way, landscaping, stormwater, bikeways, etc. See the tables and maps on pages 38-46 in the Bethesda Downtown Plan Planning Board draft, July 2016. Consistency with this plan is recommended. The details of the roadway recommendations graphics are coordinated with the county standards so that they are not in conflict (as much as possible). Referring to a modified cross section may not be the preferred method for master plans, and the staff seeks planning board guidance on this issue.

		Referencing road design standards can be a useful method of quickly identifying a plan's intent with the ROW, be it for car lanes, parking, bike lanes, sidewalks, landscaping, etc. (especially helpful where stipulated ROW is greater than what is called for in a standard). They also establish a number of other items (such as pavement depth).		
Tuckerman Lane Cross Section	56	A-71 (Tuckerman La) is most like CSRDS 2004.07, modified to provide a sidepath.	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	Noted, see above.
Tuckerman Lane Cross Section	56	B-1 (Tuckerman La) is most like CSRDS 2005.02, modified to have +10 ft. of ROW than the standard to provide for the cross-sections as detailed on p52-54.	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	Noted, see above.
Montrose Avenue Cross Section	56	P-1 (Montrose Ave) is most like CSRDS 2003.12, modified to be 10 ft less ROW than the standard requires. This ROW must either be revised to 70 ft, or it must be clarified how 10 ft is to be attained through a reduced cross section. As the existing pavement width (37 ft) is near enough to the cross-section pavement width (38 ft) it is unlikely that the curbline would be impacted for 1 ft of lateral shift. Reducing the landscaping to 4 ft may be most ideal, noting that such widths can only accommodate small plants and are of limited stormwater management efficacy.	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	Noted, see above.
Grosvenor Lane Cross Section	56	P-5 (Grosvenor La) fits CSRDS 2003.12	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	Noted, see above.
Grosvenor Lane Designation	56	Given the traffic volumes, focus on ped/bike connectivity, and potential as a	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	Staff agrees and recommends classifying Grosvenor Lane P-5 in Table 6 and as a Minor Arterial Roadway with 2 travel

		BRT route: consider whether P-5 (Grosvenor La) should be classed as a Minor Arterial. Unless otherwise stipulated, this would match standard 2004.25, would narrow the pavement width by eliminating parking, and would increase the pavement depth with an additional 4" Graded Aggregate Base.		lanes. This option can further be discussed with other roadway discussions in the transportation appendices.
	56	Consider adding the shared street and the Metro access road into this table.	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	Table 6 is meant to establish functional road classifications for publicly-owned roadways. No change is recommended.
Naming of Mobility Section	63	2nd Paragraph, Last Sentence - Where is the Transportation Section? This main document includes a chapter on Mobility , but no such sections on Transportation. Consider changing "Section" to "Appendix" if that is what is intended, assuming a Transportation Appendix will be provided.	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	Noted. TBD.
Capital Improvements List	82	We noted the following projects which should be accounted for in this list, noting that this may not be an exhaustive listing: - (p49) Support shuttles such as the Rock Spring Express to fill transportation gaps (need to ID these gaps). - (p49) Employ TDM strategies for the Metro site through the N.Bethesda TMD. - (p50) Construct ADA access w/ crosswalks at Grosvenor/Beach - (p50) Construct sidewalk from Grosvenor La to Pooks Hill Rd along east side of 355. - (p50) Consider full movement tabletop intersection w/ special paving on Tuckerman at the signal near the	MCDOT via Ossant, June 26, 2017	A draft table of potential public CIP projects is recommended. However, the recommendation to construct a new shared street within the WMATA site is not meant to be a publicly owned facility. Distinctions between public and private facilities may be made to be made for clarity.

	<p>WMATA garage entrance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - (p50) Enhance the at-grade mid-block crossing from the Metro Station to the Strathmore ramp. - (p50) Provide adequate crosswalks at all intersections in the Plan area. - (p50) Improve the existing stairway connecting Metro to Tuckerman. - (p50) Enhance the Metro tunnel under 355 with lighting, signing, and public art. - (p50) Create a 2way separated bike lane along Tuckerman. - (p50) Construct a sidepath along 355 between Edson and Beach. - (p50) Construct a sidepath along Grosvenor La between 187 and 355. - (p50) Construct a sidepath along 547 between 355 and Beach. - (p50) Connect existing and planned bikeways to the Metro station entrance (need to ID any gaps). - (p50) Connect the Plan area to Rock Creek Trail via a ped/bike path along 355. - (p50) Study additional connections from the Plan area to Rock Creek Trail. - (p50) Implement a signed-shared roadway on Grosvenor La between the Bethesda Trolley Trail and the plan area. - (p50) Funding for general BiPPA bike/ped treatments. - (p50) Wayfinding signs for the Bethesda Trolley Trail and Rock Creek Trail. - (p55) MD 355 South BRT 		
--	--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- (p55) North Bethesda Transitway- (p55) Reconstruction of Tuckerman/Cloister to a full-movement intersection.- (p55) Construction of a traffic signal at Tuckerman / Cloister.- (p55) Provide for eastbound movements from Grosvenor La onto Beach Dr.- (p56) Construct a new shared street within the WMATA site.- ADA compliant access between the bus stop along SB 355 between the Tuckerman intersections & the Metro tunnel under MD 355.		
--	---	--	--