

## ATTACHMENT 6



### DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES

Isiah Leggett  
*County Executive*

David Dise  
*Director*

June 26, 2017

Mr. Khalid Afzal, Acting Area 2 Division Chief  
Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission  
8787 Georgia Avenue  
Silver Spring, Maryland 20910

Re: Grosvenor-Strathmore Minor Metro Area Master Plan Public Hearing Draft

Dear Mr. Afzal:

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the Public Hearing Draft of the Grosvenor-Strathmore Metro Area Minor Master Plan.

Technical comments from the Departments of Transportation, Health and Human Services, and Fire and Rescue Services are attached for your review. We would also like to point out that while page 74 of the Plan correctly references the 2<sup>nd</sup> District Police Station being located on Wisconsin Avenue, the new 2nd District Station, located at 4823 Rugby Avenue, is currently under construction and is anticipated to open in late 2017.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Please contact me directly if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Greg Ossont  
Deputy Director

cc: Gwen Wright, M-NCPPC  
Maren Hill, M-NCPPC  
Ken Hartman, RSC

Office of the Director  
101 Monroe Street, 9th Floor • Rockville, Maryland 20850  
[www.montgomerycountymd.gov](http://www.montgomerycountymd.gov)

## MEMORANDUM

June 16, 2017

**TO:** Greg Ossont, Deputy Director  
Department of General Services

**FROM:** Christopher Conklin, P.E., Deputy Director for Policy  
Department of Transportation

**SUBJECT:** Grosvenor-Strathmore Metro Area Minor Master Plan – MCDOT Comments

Thank you for the opportunity to review the May 2017 Public Hearing Draft of the Grosvenor-Strathmore Metro Area Minor Master Plan. The enclosed comments are not intended give any sense of opposition to the plan, but rather to address potential issues and concerns that may limit the plan from fully realizing the vision of Montgomery County. To highlight our most pressing points from the detailed page-by-page comments attached:

- 1) **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.

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.

- 2) **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.
- 3) **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.

- 4) **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.

Should you have any questions regarding our comments on the plan, please feel free to contact me or Mr. Andrew Bossi, Senior Engineer, at 240-777-7200.

CC:AB:kcf

Attachments: detailed technical comments

cc: Al Roshdieh, MCDOT  
Gary Erenrich, MCDOT  
Andrew Bossi, MCDOT  
Amy Donin, DGS

0	Agency	Division	Team	Commenter	Page	Section	Comment
1	MCDOT	DO	Devel Rvw	GL	General	Graphics	A number of graphics (including Figure 1 on p13) do not clearly delineate major roads such as MD 355.
2	MCDOT	DO	Devel Rvw	GL	General	Graphics	A number of 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?
3	MCDOT	DO	Devel Rvw	GL	General		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.
4	MCDOT	DO	Policy	GE	9		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.
5	MCDOT	DO	Policy	GE	13		The text says that Strathmore opened in 2001. Later in the report (p16) is correctly states the opening in 2005.
6	MCDOT	DO	BRT	DB	16	Vision	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.
7	MCDOT	DO	Policy	AB	21	Figure 4	Identify what the bold green is by Cloister Dr.
8	MCDOT	DO	Devel Rvw	GL	30, 35, 36	Graphics	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]
9	MCDOT	DO	Policy	AB	30	Figure 10	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 acceptable) (as also referenced by p50, 2nd goal, 7th bullet).
10	MCDOT	DO	Policy	AB	31	Figure 11	Consider whether it might be prudent to show the ped/bike route through Avalon / Grosvenor Park between Grosvenor Lane and Metro.
11	MCDOT	DO	Devel Rvw	GL	32	Public Realm	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.
12	MCDOT	DO	Policy	GE	35	Figure 13	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.
13	MCDOT	DO	Policy	GE	35	Figure 13	Figure shows the garage entrance and exit ramp extended into the development site as a roadway. Traffic analysis will be required to insure that there is sufficient capacity to exit the garage after Strathmore events and during the PM peak period.
14	MCDOT	DO		AB, GL	36-43	Figures 14-23	Consider showing corner truncation (per Chapter 50) at applicable intersections shown in these illustrations, and consider including as a part of the fourth bullet under the second goal of p38.
15	MCDOT	DO	Devel Rvw	GL	38-39	Public Realm	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.

16	MCDOT	DO	Policy	AB	38-39	Public Realm	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.
17	MCDOT	DO	Policy	AB	39	Figure 18	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.
18	MCDOT	DO	Devel Rvw	GL	42-43	Public Realm	The recommendation to provide covered walks, canopies, etc over building entrances and drop-off zones should be 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.
19	MCDOT	DO	Policy	AB	45	Placemaking	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.
20	<b>MCDOT</b>	<b>DO</b>		<b>AB, GE, GL</b>	<b>48-56</b>	<b>Mobility</b>	<b>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.</b>
21	MCDOT	DO	Policy	AB, DB	48	Mobility	2nd Paragraph - Appears to be a typo: "33 South BRT" should be "355 South BRT".
22	MCDOT	DO	Policy	AB	48	Mobility	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).
23	MCDOT	Transit	Ride-On	DA	48	Mobility	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 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.
24	MCDOT	DO	Policy	AB	49	TDM	2nd Bullet - Consider identifying transportation gaps.
25	MCDOT	DO	Policy	GE	49	TDM	Clarify whether the NADMS goal is referring to NADMS-Employees, or if there should be any consideration of NADMS targets for residents.
26	MCDOT	DO		AB, GL	49-51	TDM, Bike/Ped Connectivity	Include general commentary on providing Bikeshare throughout the plan area.
27	MCDOT	DO		AB, GL	50	Bike/Ped Connectivity	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).
28	MCDOT	DO	Devel Rvw	GL	50	Bike/Ped Connectivity	1st Goal (re: ped connections), Bullet 3 - We no longer allow installation of special pavement crosswalks in the County rights-of-way. This is primarily a result of a lack of maintenance funding.
29	MCDOT	DO	Policy	AB	50	Bike/Ped Connectivity	2nd Goal (re: low stress), Bullet 3 - There is a missing space between "along" and "Grosvenor"
30	MCDOT	DO	Policy	AB	50	Bike/Ped Connectivity	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.

31	MCDOT	DO	Devel Rvw	GL	50	Bike/Ped Connectivity	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.
32	MCDOT	DO	Policy	AB	50	Bike/Ped Connectivity	<b>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).</b>
33	MCDOT	DO	Policy	AB	51-54	Bike/Ped Connectivity	Confirm that Tuckerman is proposed to ultimately have both a sidepath and two-way separated bike lanes.
34	MCDOT	DO	Policy	AB	51, 55	Bike/Ped Connectivity	Consider locating Figure 24 and Table 5 on immediately subsequent pages.
35	MCDOT	DO	Policy	AB	51, 55	Bike/Ped Connectivity	Consider the need to explicitly label streets as Shared Roadways, which offers no functional need other than for wayfinding purposes.
36	MCDOT	DO	Devel Rvw	GL	51	Bike/Ped Connectivity	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."
37	MCDOT	DO	Policy	GE	51	Bike/Ped Connectivity	Consider recommending an ADA compliant access on the east side of the Metro tunnel beneath 355.
38	MCDOT	DO	Policy	AB	51	Figure 24	<b>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.</b>
39	MCDOT	DO		AB, RT, GL	51	Figure 24	<b>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, 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.</b>
40	MCDOT	DO	Policy	AB	51	Figure 24	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.
41	MCDOT	DO	Policy	AB	51	Figure 24	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.
42	MCDOT	DO	Policy	AB	51	Figure 24	Remove the "Proposed Bikeshare Station" or otherwise consider how this might be displayed / phrased to indicate that this may not be the <i>only</i> Bikeshare station.
43	MCDOT	DO	Policy	AB	51	Figure 24	There is a typo in the legend: the light-blue line reading "Separated Bike Lan"
44	MCDOT	DO	Policy	AB	51	Figure 24	Consider showing a connection (possibly as a sidepath?) through the Metro tunnel beneath 355.
45	MCDOT	DO	Policy	AB	51	Figure 24	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.
46	MCDOT	DO	Policy	AB	51	Figure 24	<b>This does not show a sidepath along Grosvenor La between 187 and 355, as called for on p50 and p55.</b>
47	MCDOT	DO	Policy	AB	51	Figure 24	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.

48	MCDOT	DO	Devel Rvw	RT	51	Figure 24	As the Bikeway Master plan is also currently under review: ensure that all bikeway proposals match between the two plans. We identified several conflicts.
49	MCDOT	DO	Devel Rvw	RT	51	Figure 24	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.
50	MCDOT	DO		GL, AB	52-53	Graphics	The proposed interim and ultimate longterm #1 typical sections to implement bikelanes ignore existing auxiliary turn lanes and medians. 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.
51	MCDOT	DO	Policy	AB	52	Bike/Ped Connectivity	1st Sentence - Remove the comma in "two, one-way" or consider rephrasing to something like "a pair of one-way".
52	MCDOT	DO	Policy	AB	52	Bike/Ped Connectivity	2nd Sentence - Remove the comma in "permanent, two-way"
53	MCDOT	DO	Policy	AB	55	Table 5	Rockville Pike is noted as also being MD 355. Consider also noting that Old Georgetown Road is MD 187.
54	MCDOT	DO	Policy	AB	55	Table 5	Amend the endpoints of SP-43 to clarify "Rockville Pike at Tuckerman Lane" as the North Intersection and South Intersection.
<b>55</b>	<b>MCDOT</b>	<b>DO</b>	<b>Policy</b>	<b>GE</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>Transit Recommendations</b>	<b>Provide information on the 2012 TPAR Transit test. While each metric is operational, these provide a good snapshot of Existing condtions &amp; the needs as the plan area develops.</b>
56	MCDOT	DO	Policy	AB	55	Transit Recommendations	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.
<b>57</b>	<b>MCDOT</b>	<b>DO</b>	<b>Policy</b>	<b>AB</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>Transit Recommendations</b>	<b>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 our comment on p48 regarding the Tuckerman stop), and bus lines currently serving the area. A map is highly recommended.</b>
58	MCDOT	DO	Policy	AB	55	Transit Recommendations	Consider including recommendations from p49 regarding additional support shuttles.
59	MCDOT	DO	BRT	DB	55	Transit Recommendations	Note that our current plans for BRT assume that it would enter onto the Metro site.
<b>60</b>	<b>MCDOT</b>	<b>DO</b>	<b>Policy</b>	<b>AB</b>	<b>55-56</b>	<b>Roadway Recommendations</b>	<b>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.</b>
61	MCDOT	DO		AB, GL	55	Roadway Recommendations	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]
62	MCDOT	DO	Policy	AB	55	Roadway Recommendations	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.

63	MCDOT	DO	Policy	AB	55	Roadway Recommendations	2nd Bullet - While we are not averse to keeping this recommendation to <b>Study</b> , 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.
64	MCDOT	DO	Devel Rvw	RT, AB	55	Roadway Recommendations	3rd Bullet - Replace "traffic light" with "traffic signal".
65	MCDOT	DO	Policy	AB	56	Roadway Recommendations	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.
66	MCDOT	DO	Devel Rvw	RT	56	Roadway Recommendations	2nd Bullet - Consider rephrasing this item; the phrasing feels rather odd and not immediately understandable.
67	MCDOT	DO	Policy	AB	56	Roadway Recommendations	3rd Bullet - It is assumed this comment refers to shared <b>private</b> parking facilities, as there is no Parking Lot District covering the Grosvenor area. Clarify this text, as needed.
68	MCDOT	DO	BRT	DB	56	Roadway Recommendations	Add an additional bullet including "Consideration of Future BRT"
69	MCDOT	DO	Policy	AB	56	Roadway Recommendations	<b>Provide a map of the roadway network.</b>
70	MCDOT	DO	Policy	AB	56	Table 6	<p><b>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).</b></p> <p><b>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.</b></p> <p><b>Alternately, providing cross-sections either in the main document or in the appendix will help establish intention &amp;/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.</b></p> <p><b>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).</b></p>
71	MCDOT	DO	Policy	AB	56	Table 6	A-71 (Tuckerman La) is most like CSRDS 2004.07, modified to provide a sidepath.
72	MCDOT	DO	Policy	AB	56	Table 6	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.



73	MCDOT	DO	Policy	AB	56	Table 6	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.
74	MCDOT	DO	Policy	AB	56	Table 6	P-5 (Grosvenor La) fits CSRDS 2003.12
75	MCDOT	DO	Policy	AB	56	Table 6	<b>Given the traffic volumes, focus on ped/bike connectivity, and potential as a 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.</b>
76	MCDOT	DO	Devel Rvw	GL	56	Table 6	Consider adding the shared street and the Metro access road into this table.
77	MCDOT	DO	Policy	AB	63	Carbon Emissions Policy Guidance	<b>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.</b>
78	MCDOT	DO	Policy	AB	82	CIP	<p><b>We noted the following projects which should be accounted for in this list, noting that this may not be an exhaustive listing:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- (p49) Support shuttles such as the Rock Spring Express to fill transportation gaps (need to ID these gaps).</li> <li>- (p49) Employ TDM strategies for the Metro site through the N.Bethesda TMD.</li> <li>- (p50) Construct ADA access w/ crosswalks at Grosvenor/Beach</li> <li>- (p50) Construct sidewalk from Grosvenor La to Pooks Hill Rd along east side of 355.</li> <li>- (p50) Consider full movement tabletop intersection w/ special paving on Tuckerman at the signal near the WMATA garage entrance.</li> <li>- (p50) Enhance the at-grade mid-block crossing from the Metro Station to the Strathmore ramp.</li> <li>- (p50) Provide adequate crosswalks at all intersections in the Plan area.</li> <li>- (p50) Improve the existing stairway connecting Metro to Tuckerman.</li> <li>- (p50) Enhance the Metro tunnel under 355 with lighting, signing, and public art.</li> <li>- (p50) Create a 2way separated bike lane along Tuckerman.</li> <li>- (p50) Construct a sidepath along 355 between Edson and Beach.</li> <li>- (p50) Construct a sidepath along Grosvenor La between 187 and 355.</li> <li>- (p50) Construct a sidepath along 547 between 355 and Beach.</li> <li>- (p50) Connect existing and planned bikeways to the Metro station entrance (need to ID any gaps).</li> <li>- (p50) Connect the Plan area to Rock Creek Trail via a ped/bike path along 355.</li> <li>- (p50) Study additional connections from the Plan area to Rock Creek Trail.</li> <li>- (p50) Implement a signed-shared roadway on Grosvenor La between the Bethesda Trolley Trail and the plan area.</li> <li>- (p50) Funding for general BiPPA bike/ped treatments.</li> <li>- (p50) Wayfinding signs for the Bethesda Trolley Trail and Rock Creek Trail.</li> </ul>

79	MCDOT	DO	Policy	AB	82	CIP	<p>[continued from previous comment]:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- (p55) MD 355 South BRT</li><li>- (p55) North Bethesda Transitway</li><li>- (p55) Reconstruction of Tuckerman/Cloister to a full-movement intersection.</li><li>- (p55) Construction of a traffic signal at Tuckerman / Cloister.</li><li>- (p55) Provide for eastbound movements from Grosvenor La onto Beach Dr.</li><li>- (p56) Construct a new shared street within the WMATA site.</li><li>- ADA compliant access between the bus stop along SB 355 between the Tuckerman intersections &amp; the Metro tunnel under MD 355.</li></ul>
----	-------	----	--------	----	----	-----	--

**From:** [De La Rosa, Nicki L](#)  
**To:** [Ossont, Greg](#)  
**Cc:** [Donin, Amy](#); [Ahluwalia, Uma](#); [Nice, Matthew L](#)  
**Subject:** Grosvenor Strathmore Metro Area Minor Master Plan, Public Hearing Draft, May 2017  
**Date:** Monday, June 19, 2017 8:05:16 AM  
**Attachments:** [image003.png](#)

---

Greetings,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the Grosvenor Strathmore Metro Area Minor Master Plan, Public Hearing Draft, May 2017.

The Department of Health and Human Services has no concerns to raise about the plan. We do wish to strongly endorse the following aspects of the plan that we believe promote our mission and County residents' health and safety.

1. The inclusion of 15 percent Moderately Priced Dwelling Units (MPDUs) as a high priority public amenity. The availability of safe and affordable housing continues to be a challenge for many County residents;
2. The inclusion of green space, flexible recreation area, and safe connections to existing park amenities including the Rock Creek Park Trail and Bethesda Trolley Trail.

Additionally, the Department wishes to urge planners to carefully consider the following as part of any new development or redevelopment efforts.

1. While the population of the plan area is mainly young professional age (20 to 34 year-olds) residents at this time, planners should consider developing infrastructure to support aging in place to encourage residents to remain in their communities as needs change. The Department urges use of the World Health Organization's "Age Friendly Cities Checklist" in planning for any development efforts to maximize accessibility of services for all community residents;
2. Inclusion of not only green space and flexible recreation areas, but also family friendly play areas with restrooms, water fountains and adequate seating options. Providing a variety of interconnected active and passive recreation areas encourages a sense of community and aligns with the CDC Healthy Community Design Initiative;
3. Inclusion of separate and designated pedestrian, bike and vehicle lanes. Wherever possible, bike lanes should be separated from pedestrian traffic and the flow of vehicular traffic and parking lanes via curbs or planting zones to minimize the potential for accidents and injuries.

Please contact me with any questions or concerns.

Best Regards,

*Nicki*

Nicki De La Rosa  
Program Manager II  
Planning, Accountability and Customer Service  
Montgomery County Department of Health & Human Services  
401 Hungerford Drive, 7th floor - Rockville, MD 20850  
Phone: 240-777-1388 - Fax: 240-777-3099

Please note that I work a compressed schedule and am off every Friday. I will respond to all email sent

on Friday upon my return to the office the following week.



*CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email message, including any attachments, is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). The information contained in this message may be confidential. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message. Thank you!*



MONTGOMERY COUNTY FIRE AND RESCUE SERVICE


Isiah Leggett  
County Executive

Scott E. Goldstein  
Fire Chief

**MEMORANDUM**

June 15, 2017

TO: Deputy Director Gregory Ossont  
Department of General Services (DGS)

FROM: Fire Chief Scott E. Goldstein   
Montgomery County Fire and Rescue Service (MCFRS)

SUBJECT: Public Hearing Draft Grosvenor-Strathmore Metro Area Minor Master Plan

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above-referenced document. With the input of both my staff and fire code compliance personnel in the Department of Permitting Services (DPS), I offer the following comments:

- The road cross-sections on pages 53-54 show 7-ft wide parking lanes. Per Executive Regulation 8-16 and the County Road Code, on-street parking is specified as 8-ft wide. If parking lanes were only 7-ft wide, this reduction in width would have an adverse impact on operational width for fire-rescue apparatus.
- The statement on page 74 regarding provision of fire-rescue service to the plan area requires modification so that it is accurate and complete. As written, the paragraph indicates that Kensington Volunteer Fire Department – Fire Station 5 serves the plan area. This is partially correct. I recommend the amended narrative as per below.

“The plan area is served primarily by Bethesda Fire Department – Fire Station 20 and Kensington Volunteer Fire Department – Fire Station 5. Fire-rescue resources from other stations respond into the plan area as needed. These include Rockville Volunteer Fire Department – Fire Station 23, Bethesda Fire Department – Fire Station 26, Bethesda-Chevy Chase Rescue Squad – Fire/Rescue Station 41, and occasionally others depending upon the incident type and availability of resources within the North Bethesda area.”

**Office of the Fire Chief**

---

100 Edison Park Drive, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor • Gaithersburg, Maryland 20878-3204  
240-777-2486 • 240-777-0725 TTY • 240-777-2443 FAX

[www.montgomerycountymd.gov](http://www.montgomerycountymd.gov)

I hope you find this information useful. Should you require any further assistance regarding this matter, please feel free to contact Mr. Scott Gutschick, my Planning and Accreditation Section Manager, 240-777-2417.

cc: Mr. Scott Gutschick, Section Manager – MCFRS Planning and Accreditation  
Ms. Amy Donin, Planning Specialist – Department of General Services (DGS)