

**Attachment B: Public Testimony Summary and Responses**

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony (commentor)	Response	Discussion / Recommendation
<b>General</b>						
1	Cost Estimates	MCDOT	General	For estimating costs as part of the Fiscal Impact Statement, please confirm whether it is possible to acquire the following info: 1) An enumerated listing of crossings identified for grade separation (and note whether these include ramp crossings, or if they're all assumed to be signalized, or somewhere in between) 2) Is it possible to generate a tally of how many green/yellow/blue line junctions there are, for purposes of estimating how many Protected Intersections may be anticipated? 3) Is it possible to generate a tally of how many total signals would be impacted? We have GIS layers of signals, if those are needed.	N/A	This information will be provided to MCDOT.
2	Cost Estimates	WABA	N/A	Want cost estimates and County Executive and County Council commitment to funding the plan.	N/A	The Montgomery County Department of Transportation will prepare cost estimates for the County Council's review of the plan.
3	Abandonments	MCDOT	N/A	Consider language stating that ROW being considered for abandonment should evaluate needs and intent in the Bicycle Master Plan.	Agree	We recommend adding a policy to pages 104-114:  "Abandonments:  Recommendations included in the Bicycle Master Plan should be considered as part of any right-of-way abandonment petition."

Attachment B: Public Testimony Summary and Responses

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony (commentor)	Response	Discussion / Recommendation
<b>Table of Contents</b>						
4	Table of Contents	MCDOT	6-7	Consider including additional reference points in the Table of Contents, particularly the Breezeway Network starting on p66.	Agree	<p>Add these subsections (shown in lower case letters):</p> <p>BIKEWAYS            Bicycle Facility Classifications            General Bikeway Application            Breezeway Network            Bikeway Recommendations</p> <p>BICYCLE PARKING            Short-Term Bicycle Parking            Long-Term Bicycle Parking            Bicycle Parking Stations</p> <p>PRIORITIZATION            Prioritization of Bikeways            Programmed Bikeways            Tier 1 Bikeway Projects            Tier 2 Bikeway Projects            Tier 3 Bikeway Projects            Tier 4 Bikeway Projects            Prioritization of Bicycle Parking Stations            Prioritization of Bicycle-Supportive Programs            Prioritization of Bicycle Supportive Laws, Regulations and Policies</p>
<b>Introduction</b>						
5	Reference to climate change	Climate Mobilization	9	Plan needs to reference Montgomery County's climate change goals.	Agree.	Add the following text to page 9: "Investing in bicycling is highly desirable for Montgomery County as it is a healthful, environmentally-friendly and cost-effective mode of transportation <u>that will help the county achieve its climate change goals...</u> "
6	Introduction	MoBike	9	<p>Add to the end of the second paragraph:</p> <p>"The network will be augmented by unseparated bikeways that allow particularly efficient travel by confident cyclists, for both transportation and recreation."</p>	Disagree, with changes.	<p>The vision of this plan is to create a low stress bicycling network and to provide some more limited accommodations for recreational bicyclists on roads in rural areas. In a few instances, it is recommending unseparated bikeways for use by moderate stress tolerating bicyclists, largely where bike lanes exist today.</p> <p>Add: "In rural areas of the County, a network of bikeable shoulders is recommended for recreational bicyclists who prefer to ride on the road."</p>
7	Introduction	Basken	10	This report perpetuates the fantasy that 3/4 of roads in the county are already low-stress.	Disagree.	Our analysis is based on extensive data collection and the most recent planning methods. While no model is 100% accurate, we believe that our analysis is a very good portrayal of bicycling conditions in the county.

**Attachment B: Public Testimony Summary and Responses**

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony (commentor)	Response	Discussion / Recommendation
<b>Defining the Vision</b>						
8	Goals & Objectives	Greater Colesville Citizens Assoc, Richardson	20-33	Objectives need to state what actions are going to be taken to achieve them.	Agree	Bikeways address Goal 2 and 3 (see page 37). Bicycle Parking addresses Goal 2 (see page 80). The Bicycle-Supportive Programs (see page 93) and Bicycle-Supportive Polices (see pages 104-105) identify the goals they support. All of the above help to increase bicycling rates in Montgomery County (Goal 1).
9	Goals & Objectives	Climate Mobilization	20-33	The goals, strategies and timetables in the plan are not sufficiently aggressive to address Montgomery County's climate change goals.	Disagree	As discussed with the Planning Board in July 2017, the plan specifically excludes environmental goals and objectives, as this is very difficult to measure in any meaningful way, and therefore is not a useful decision-making tool. While Appendix L indicates that the plan will reduce yearly emissions of carbon dioxide equivalent by between approximately 15,500 and 33,000 metric tons, which is equivalent to removing between approximately 3,300 and 7,000 cars from the roads each year, this is a very rough number that is not very sensitive to changes in the plan's recommendations.
10	Goals & Objectives	MoBike	20-33	The plan marginalizes existing cyclists who are comfortable bicycling on moderate stress roads (aka "enthused and confident" bicyclists). Recommends modifying the safety goal (Goal 4) to express that there is a benefit of reducing the stress level from high to moderate.	Disagree	The Planning Board decided against adding a "moderate-stress" metric in its September 8, 2016 work session on the Bicycle Master Plan Framework Report.  Staff continues to believe that the Bicycle Master Plan should focus on achieving a "low-stress" bicycling network and that the plan should not include a "moderate-stress" bicycling metric. Planning for "low-stress" bicycling is considered a best practice in North America.  Furthermore, data analysis is time-consuming and therefore expensive. In developing the Bicycle Master Plan, staff crafted the goals, objectives and metrics so that they provide decisionmakers with the most important information needed to develop the plan and to establish implementation priorities. Since the county is focused on constructing a "low-stress" bicycling network, there is little benefit to including a "moderate-stress" bicycling metric.
11	Increased bicycling metrics	MCDOT	21	Consider including a reference to a potential County-led data collection effort, to occur if it is found that the American Community Survey falls short on meeting data needs.	Agree	Add this note to Objective 1.1: " A county-led data collection effort may be needed if the American Community Survey fails to meet the data needs of this objective."
12	Increased bicycling metrics	PBTSAC, Tull	21-22	Define targets for Objectives 1.2, 1.3 and 1.4.	Agree	Baseline data is not yet available for these objectives. Targets will be defined once the data is available.
13	Connectivity metrics	MCDOT	25-26	Where distances are used (such as 2 miles from a rail station, or 2 miles from a school) consider including a footnote as to whether such distance is measured in a straight line (as the crow flies) or along a navigable path (as a user travels).	Agree	Add footnotes to Objective 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4. For transit stations (Objective 2.2) and libraries / recreation centers / parks (Objective 2.4) we used a network distance. For schools (Objective 2.3) we used a straight line distance, as that is how Montgomery County Public Schools determines their busing zones.

Attachment B: Public Testimony Summary and Responses

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony (commentor)	Response	Discussion / Recommendation
14	Metric 2.2	MCDOT	25	<p>As written, the extremes at each end -- high-density urban and low-density rural -- may throw off the intended information from this metric.</p> <p><u>High-Density Urban</u> While we recognize that bike facilities within a walkshed are important to those beyond it, in areas with a very high ratio of walkshed DUs versus bikeshed DUs: investments in pedestrian facilities may be the higher priority. This could result in an apparent lag in meeting this metric, even if implementation has been more optimally serving a larger amount of people.</p> <p>As an extreme example (as I'm not sure how to better phrase my explanation above): let's say super-dense neighborhood "Walkhaven" has 95% of people in its walkshed and 5% in the further bikeshed. Implementation would primarily focus on ped treatments, likely including bike treatments only as a component of ped projects. It may subsequently have a dismal percentage of DUs with access to low-stress bikeways, but could otherwise have an excellent pedestrian access.</p> <p><u>Low-Density Rural</u> Conversely, rural stations may have very few DUs within the either walk/bikeshed, and would subsequently have very little priority for facilities that would improve the metric for 2.2. Boyds, for example, is unlikely to achieve a high value for a long time given the expected difficulty in justifying widespread bicycle infrastructure: high costs of</p>	Disagree	For simplicity of presenting data results, the monitoring report on page 192 - 193 provides a single metric for each transit line. However, the detailed monitoring report in the appendix presents the targets / results by the transportation "policy area". For the time being we would prefer to stick with approach currently outlined, but we recognize that we may need to adjust the metrics over time.
15	Metric 2.2	MCDOT	25	Consider excluding rural stations.	Disagree	We understand that inclusion of rural stations such as Dickerson and Barnesville brings the connectivity metrics down, but that reflects reality. We plan to monitor how well the metrics are working with MCDOT and may need to modify them going forward.
16	Metric 2.3	MCDOT	26	Consider whether a reference to School Service Areas may be applicable, as the nearest schools are not always the schools that children are assigned to.	Agree	In the data requirement section, the "School Boundary" data was intended to reflect the School Service Area. We will change "School Boundary" to "School Service Area".
17	Metric 2.4	MCDOT	26	In the black section, 3rd bullet: Parks goes from 40% to 40%	Agree	The 2018 numbers for connectivity to parks are incorrect. They should be changed to 8% (libraries), 13% (recreation centers) and 13% (regional / recreational parks).
18	Metric 2.6	MCDOT	27	Generalize the referenced guideline: it won't always be 2nd Edition, nor even necessarily that title nor a publication from that same group. Consider simply referncing "styles that are accepable per established guidelines."	Agree	For Objectives 2.6, 2.8, Policy 2.13, and the correspondings sections of Appendix A, change:  "...the Association of Pedestrian and Bicycle Professionals Bicycle Parking Guidelines, 2nd Edition"  To:  "established guidelines, such as the Association of Pedestrian and Bicycle Professionals Bicycle Parking Guidelines."
19	Metric 2.7	MCDOT	28	What is the basis for the 40% goal (particularly: was there an intended reason for not making it higher?)	Disagree	Per discussion with MCDOT, we will monitor progress in implementing this metric and adjust it over time as needed.

**Attachment B: Public Testimony Summary and Responses**

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony (commentor)	Response	Discussion / Recommendation
20	Infographic	MCDOT	29	The information in this graphic could potentially give a false impression, as areas such as Bethesda or Silver Spring, in particular, are likely to have a very high number of dwelling units whereby bicycle access may not be as critical; rather pedestrian access would be predominant. [see comment on p25, item 2.2]	Agree	While we disagree with the comment, MCDOT feels strongly about it. This graphic is not critical to the plan, so it can be deleted.
21	Equity metrics	Helms	30-31	The plan needs a better focus on equity in the East County area and needs to measure the gaps in connectivity.	Disagree	We do not understand Mr Helms' concern and have emailed to follow up, but have not heard back. The results in Appendix A: Detailed Monitoring Report show that the plan recommends an equitable distribution of bikeways in the East County.
22	Equity metrics	American Heart Association	30-31	Plan needs to prioritize low and moderate-income residents.	Disagree	Equity is an essential part of the Bicycle Master Plan and is called out as Goal 3. Objective 3.1 is intended to address equity by measuring low-stress connectivity for very low-income areas, where the median income is less than 60 percent of the countywide median income, compared to the rest of the county . In the table in the staff report a value of 100 percent indicates that complete equity is achieved. The lower the value, the less equity is achieved. For example, the table shows that in 2018, very-low income areas have only 57 percent of the low-stress connectivity that other areas of the county have. If the Bicycle Master Plan's recommendations are implemented, this will grow to 95 percent in 2043 and then slightly drop to 90 percent with the full build out of the plan . If the equity threshold is increased to 80 percent or 100 percent of countywide median income, the table below shows that the results will be similar. Staff believes that the existing metric adequately measures equity, but the Planning Board is requested to provide direction to staff if they want to consider another threshold or another metric.
<b>Achieving the Vision</b>						
23	Four Types of Transportation Cyclists	MoBike	37	The percentages for the "Four Types of Cyclists" typology come from a particular study which, while scientifically valuable, relies on a poll of the 50 largest metropolitan areas in the U.S. – a sample that may not be representative of progressive Montgomery County. Another study by one of the authors polled only the Portland, OR metropolitan area. It came up with numbers showing 9% rather than 5% of the general population in the "enthused and confident" group. These numbers aren't the same everywhere, yet the plan cites the national numbers as definitive. Based on how data was organized, the "enthused and confident" group may be a lot larger.	Disagree	The study we reference is the most comprehensive to date on the four types of transportation cyclists. While we acknowledge that there are differences from community to community, the larger point is that most people only tolerate a low level of traffic stress. That said, it would be valuable for Montgomery County to count a survey to identify how its population is distributed among the four types of transportation cyclists.  We recommend adding this footnote to the bottom of page 37: "While these survey results represent the 50 largest metropolitan areas in the United States, they may not be representative of Montgomery County. However, multiple studies make clear that the "interested but concerned" group represents the largest group of bicyclists."
24	Four Types of Transportation Cyclists	PBTSAC	37	Check the values for the different types of bicyclists.	Okay	See response to Comment #23
25	Four Types of Transportation Cyclists	MCDOT	37	Has there been any further evaluation of how these percentages of transportation cyclists vary based on time of day, time of year, weather, purpose, cargo, access to necessary clothing or other gear/equipment, etc?	N/A	We are not aware of any research that addresses these questions.
26	Types of Trips	MCDOT	38	3rd Bullet - As noted on p25, item 2.2: trips within urban areas are likely to have a primary focus on pedestrian travel.	Agree	We agree.

Attachment B: Public Testimony Summary and Responses

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony (commentor)	Response	Discussion / Recommendation
27	Types of Trips	MCDOT	38	In regards to bullet #5: "bikeable shoulders of consistent width" - it may be particularly difficult to acquire funding for such projects.	Agree	The idea is to widen several rural roads. We recommend 17 miles in Tier 3 and 24 miles in Tier 4.
28	Types of Trips	MoBike	38	Add text in support of moderate stress bicyclists.	TBD	<p>If the Planning Board wants to address Mr. Cochrane's concerns without deprioritizing low-stress bikeways, they could consider including this statement on the bottom of page 38 (changes to Mr. Cochrane's proposed language are shown with underlining and strikethroughs):</p> <p>"Some confident cyclists prefer bike accommodations that support even faster, more efficient travel between destinations. They are willing to sacrifice some separation from traffic in order to maintain continuously higher speeds, avoid pedestrian conflicts, bypass obstacles, and maintain right-of-way at intersections. They may want to enter, exit, and re-enter the bikeway freely, and they can find separated bikeways cumbersome to navigate. Many separated bikeways may be inappropriate for the speeds they travel. Such riders often prefer accommodations that are moderate in stress but not high stress, including striped bike lanes, bikeable shoulders and non-residential shared roadways. In addition, many recreational riders prefer riding in such facilities, especially outside urban centers and in parks.</p> <p>Therefore, this plan provides the following guidance: Where space is available and does not substantially detract from the default bikeway, <u>conflict with another master plan recommendation or exceed the master plan right-of-way</u>, bike lanes or bikeable shoulders can be added in addition to the default bikeway, <u>in some cases overlapping with on-street parallel parking</u>. <del>This may include on-street parallel parking areas as well.</del></p> <p>Moreover, before taking away existing shoulders or parking lanes, road designers and future planners should be cognizant that cyclists often ride in these spaces, even if they are not specifically identified as bikeways in this plan.</p> <p>In addition, this plan specifically recommends several roads as having two bike facility types – both a separated bikeway such as a <u>sidepath</u>) and unseparated bikeway (such as conventional bike lanes and bikeable shoulders). These are typically roads that have existing shoulders or bike lanes frequently used by cyclists."</p>
29	Conventional Bike Lanes	MCDOT	53	Conventional Bike Lanes - Consider also including Muddy Branch Rd as an example.	N/A	MCDOT drops this comment.
30	Contraflow Bike Lanes	MCDOT	55	Contraflow Bike Lanes - Consider including Glenbrook Road from Bradley Blvd to Fairfax as an example	Agree with changes.	Add Glenbrook Road as an example on page 49 (separated bike lanes).
31	Advisory Bike Lane Image	MoBike	54	The photo of advisory bike lanes depicts cyclists riding in the door zone, where they could be struck by a suddenly opened car door. The document should use a photo of intelligently designed advisory bike lanes – ones that "advise" cyclists to stay out of the door zone.	Disagree	These bike lanes are 5 ft wide, which meets the minimum requirement for a bike lane adjacent to on-street parking on a residential street.
32	Bikeable Shoulders	MoBike	56	Remove the benefit that states "intended primarily for recreational bicyclists", which sounds more like a limitation than a benefit.	Agree with changes.	Revise the bullet to say: "Increase the comfort of recreational bicyclists."
33	Shared Street	MCDOT	60	Perhaps include Gibbs Street in the City of Rockville as an example of a shared street.	Disagree	We do not think Gibbs Street is a good example of a shared street, since the shared portion is so short.
34	General Bikeway Application	MCDOT	64	2nd Paragraph - Remove the words "facility planning"	Agree	Make this change.

**Attachment B: Public Testimony Summary and Responses**

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony (commentor)	Response	Discussion / Recommendation
35	General Bikeway Application	MCDOT	65	Consider clarifying that the bottom rows for each roadway class are examples.	Agree	Make this change.
36	Breezeway Network	MoBike	66	Where it says "prioritize higher speed bicycle travel between major activity centers", change "higher speed" to "more rapid".	Disagree	We do not recommend this change.
37	Breezeway Network	MoBike	66	The text says "As a suburban jurisdiction with densifying but still widely spaced activity centers, Montgomery County is the perfect candidate for this network, <u>which supports efficient travel over long distances.</u> <del>because it can enable people to travel quickly and efficiently between distant activity centers.</del> "	Agree	Make this change.
38	Breezeway Network	MCDOT	69	To confirm: are the minimum widths called out for in the first set of bullets specific to breezeways?	N/A	Yes. They are also the <u>preferred</u> widths we would need for very high demand routes. Is any clarification needed in the text?
39	Breezeway Network	MCDOT	68	We believe Breezeways should not include any on-street segments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sep bike lanes should be off-street. Consider clarifying the three bullets on this page on whether they refer to on-street or off-street facilities. Perhaps a different name for each?</li> <li>- We suggest that Breezeways also not include Neighborhood Greenways, particularly among streets such as Woodland Drive.</li> </ul>	Agree	Add section to page 71: "Neighborhood Greenways: In the Breezeway Network, traffic volumes should be far less than 3,000 vehicles per day on neighborhood greenways. Where traffic volumes are around 3,000 vehicles per day separated bike lanes may be necessary."  On page 61, add to the "Typical Application" section that "Traffic volumes should be less than 3,000 per day and preferably closer to 1,000 vehicles per day."
40	Breezeway Network	MoBike	70	Make "grade separation" the top bullet, since it represents the best treatment.	Agree	We support this change. While grade separation might not always be the best treatment for a given situation, it is the highest quality treatment.
41	Breezeway Network	MCDOT	70	1st Bullet - Confirm issue relating to road noise. Is road noise from bicyclists an issue?	Agree	This is an error and should be removed.

Attachment B: Public Testimony Summary and Responses

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony (commentor)	Response	Discussion / Recommendation
42	Breezeway Network	MCDOT	70-71	May need to differentiate between on-street facilities and off-street facilities, which may have differing demands on construction techniques, materials, etc.	Agree	<p>We recommend these changes:</p> <p>Pavement Surface: Breezeways will be constructed to meet the requirements of public road design. They will feature high-quality construction, surface materials and maintenance practices that maximize surface smoothness and pavement life, minimizing potential for pavement cracking and buckling.</p> <p>Specific construction requirements should be adapted to each location in a manner appropriate to local conditions and anticipated wear-and-tear. If maintenance, service or emergency vehicles will need to access the Breezeway, construction methods and materials should take that into account. During Breezeway design, pavement technologies to be investigated include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fine grained asphalt and porous asphalt surface courses to reduce road noise.</li> <li>• Thickened pavement courses to accommodate vehicular loading where necessary and lengthen pavement life.</li> <li>• Appropriate slope for drainage.</li> <li>• Special treatments for tree roots.</li> <li>• Thickened aggregate base courses to accommodate vehicular loading where necessary and lengthen pavement life.</li> <li>• High modulus pavements to reduce pavement thickness.</li> <li>• Higher asphalt content in asphalt base courses to increase durability and fatigue resistance.</li> <li>• Structural enhancements for poor pavement subgrades to accommodate vehicular loading and lengthen pavement life.</li> <li>• Perpetual pavement technologies to lengthen pavement life.</li> <li>• Porous pavement to reduce ice buildup and water spray from tires.</li> </ul> <p>Breezeways will feature construction practices designed to result in high quality pavement installation. These practices include improved subgrade preparation and testing, installation of pavements with appropriate lift thicknesses, rigorous asphalt temperature monitoring and thorough compaction for uniform density and smoothness.</p> <p>Within the bikeway network, Breezeways are prioritized for maintenance in a manner similar to priority arterials</p>
43	Breezeway Network	MCDOT	71	1st Paragraph, after Bullets - Consider whether this paragraph's level of detail is necessary for this master plan.	Agree	See response to Comment #42.
44	Breezeway Network	MCDOT	71	Last Bullet - Amend the sentence "...as these bikeways will need to be treated by Montgomery County <u>or the State Highway Administration.</u> "	Agree	Make this change.
45	Breezeway Network	MoBike	72-75	The Breezeway Network is an excellent target but the network is too small and many of the corridors will not be able to meet the proposed standards, since there is insufficient space to separated walking from bicycling and because many have a large number of driveways. The Breezeway Network will not be a full substitute for moderate stress bikeways.	Agree	<p>MCDOT and MoBike request a few additions to the Breezeway Network. We recommend these additions to the Breezeway Network:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extend Montrose Parkway from MD 355 to Falls Road.</li> <li>• Add Old Georgetown Road between Montrose Parkway and Democracy Boulevard.</li> <li>• Add Democracy Boulevard between Old Georgetown Road and Seven Locks Road.</li> <li>• Add Germantown Road between Aircraft Drive and Observation Drive.</li> <li>• Add Shady Grove Road between Shady Grove Access Road and Key West Avenue.</li> </ul> <p>These corridors have some of the highest potential bicycling demand in the network that are not currently designated as part of the Breezeway Network.</p>



**Attachment B: Public Testimony Summary and Responses**

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony (commentor)	Response	Discussion / Recommendation
46	Breezeway Network	MCDOT	72-75	MD 355 N and S - Conflicts with BRT? Consider parallel corridors?	Disagree with changes.	We agree with MCDOT that a follow-up work item is needed to confirm the locations of the Breezeway Network corridors. If there is unlikely to be sufficient right-of-way to construct a Breezeway corridor on a specific route, it may be necessary to shift the corridor to a parallel road.  Therefore, we recommend adding a statement at bottom of page 73 that says: "Upon approval of the master plan, the Montgomery County Department of Transportation and the Montgomery County Planning Department will seek funding to confirm the locations of the Breezeway Network corridors."
47	Breezeway Network	Smith, WABA	72-75	Need a Breezeway corridor that connects Germantown East and Germantown West.	Agree	See response to Comment #45.
48	Breezeway Network	Smith, WABA	72-75	Need a Breezeway corridor in R&D Village on Shady Grove Road.	Agree	See response to Comment #45.
49	Breezeway Network	MCDOT	72-75	Montrose Pkwy - Consider extending to the Germantown/Grosvenor Exelon Transmission Corridor.	Agree	See response to Comment #45.
50	Breezeway Network	MCDOT	73	US 29 - Consider maximum use of the Old Columbia Pike corridor.	Disagree with changes.	As previously recommended, add a statement at bottom of page 73 that says: "Upon approval of the master plan, the Montgomery County Department of Transportation and the Montgomery County Planning Department will seek funding to confirm the locations of the Breezeway corridor."
51	Breezeway Network	MCDOT	72-75	We like when corridors use dual-destination naming, particularly for cases where corridors use a road's name despite often not necessarily being on that roadway.	Agree	Change the names of these corridors becomes:  Georgia Ave North becomes: Olney to Glenmont Georgia Ave South becomes: Glenmont to Silver Spring MD 355 North becomes: Clarksburg to City of Gaithersburg MD 355 South becomes: City of Rockville to Friendship Heights Montrose Pkwy becomes: White Flint to Veirs Mill Rd Randolph Rd becomes: Veirs Mill Rd to White Oak University Blvd becomes: Wheaton to Takoma / Langley US 29 Corridor becomes: Burtonsville to Silver Spring Veirs Mill Rd becomes: City of Rockville to Wheaton
52	Breezeway Network	MCDOT	72-75	Consider extending the MD 355 North Breezeway's northern limit to Little Bennett Park instead of Stringtown Road.	Disagree	We believe that a standard sidepath is sufficient to accommodate the demand on this segment of road.
53	Breezeway Network	MoBike	74	The Germantown-Grosvenor breezeway should not count on Tuckerman Lane as a connection.	Disagree	Tuckerman La is currently under study by MCDOT, so there is an opportunity to implement it.
54	Breezeway Network	MoBike	74	The PEPCO corridor from Cabin John Park to Germantown may not qualify as a breezeway, given its undulating grade and surrounding low density – though it will be an immensely popular recreation trail.	Disagree	We have not defined Breezeways based on their grade and surrounding density.
55	Breezeway Network	Keltz	75	ICC Trail should follow the highway, not deviate onto local roads.	Disagree	This is not feasible everywhere.
56	Breezeway Network	MoBike	75	I've been involved extensively in analyzing ICC Trail options, and I can say that a dedicated grade-separated trail crossing of Rt. 29 at the ICC is absolutely not feasible. The master-planned alignment – which I believe still goes through Upper Paint Branch Park – would have to cross Rt. 29 via Fairland Rd or Briggs Chaney Rd. (Nees Lane to Briggs Chaney is by far the better option, assuming the trail runs through the park).	Disagree	While the master-planned alignment crosses US 29 at the ICC, we do not have sufficient information to determine whether the master-planned alignment is or is not feasible.

**Attachment B: Public Testimony Summary and Responses**

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony (commentor)	Response	Discussion / Recommendation
57	Breezeway Network	MoBike	75	Add Midcounty Highway to the ICC Breezeway, creating a connection all the way to Clarksburg.	Agree	If the County decides to construct MidCounty Highway, the proposed sidepath should be upgraded to a Breezeway.
58	Breezeway Network	MoBike	75	Extend the Montrose Parkway Breezeway to include the Matthew Henson Trail.	Disagree	The Matthew Henson Trail was not built to the standard required of the Breezeway Network.
59	Breezeway Network	Cullen	75	Where major roads cross trails (ex Tuckerman La at the Bethesda Trolley Trail), traffic control is needed.	Disagree	While we agree that traffic control is needed at this location, traffic control is typically not included in master plans. Policy 2.15 on page 112 recommends developing standards for trail crossings of major roads.
60	Bikeway Recommendations	MCDOT	77	Can these mileages be broken out by roadway owner between SHA and non-SHA?	Agree	We can split the mileage by roadway owner and provide that directly to MCDOT and SHA.
61	Bikeway Recommendations	MCDOT	77	We have 4 existing separated bikeways now: Woodglen, Nebel, Spring, and Glenbrook.	Disagree	This table shows existing miles, not existing bikeways.
62	Bikeway Recommendations	MCDOT	77	We have 2 contraflow bike lanes: Glenbrook and Cedar.	Agree	Round up contra-flow to 1 mile.
63	Bicycle Parking	MCDOT	81	Typo of "Recreattion" under Short-Term / Entertainment.	Agree	Make this change.
64	Bicycle Parking	MCDOT	83	1st Paragraph - Consider rephrasing "Up to 10 bicycles can <u>securely</u> fit..."	Agree	Make this change.
65	Bicycle Parking	MCDOT	88	Consider calling for covered bike parking at the MARC stations Barnesville and Dickerson.	Agree	Make this change.
66	Bicycle Parking	MCDOT	90	We feel this may be too many bike stations, and suggest a more rigorous assessment, greater use of tiered prioritization (the prioritization on p184-185 doesn't appear to include all of these stations), or a larger variation in the scale of facilities (in lieu of full stations, perhaps instead simply covered bike racks).	Agree	Per a follow-up conversation, MCDOT is specifically concerned about the number of bike stations along the Corridor Cities Transitway Phase 2 alignment. We agree and propose to remove these stations: Gateway Center and Manekin Station.
67	Bicycle Parking	MCDOT	90	How many long-term spaces are estimated to be necessary for the bike stations at Cloverleaf, Comsat, Dorsey Mill, Gateway Center, Germantown CCT, and Manekin?	N/A	The recommendations in the plan provide long-term bike parking spaces for 5% of 2040 boardings during the AM peak period. Since we do not yet have a forecast of boardings on Phase 2 of the Corridor Cities Transitway, we are unable to provide a goal-based estimates. Therefore, our recommendation is to provide 20 long-term and 6 short-term bicycle parking spaces until we have better ridership estimates.
68	Programs	MCDOT	93	Implementation is also achieved through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- CIP Roadway Projects</li> <li>- CIP Traffic Improvement Projects</li> <li>- Sidewalk &amp; Curb Replacement Projects</li> <li>- Residential Resurfacing</li> <li>- Mass Transit Projects</li> <li>- Bridge CIP Projects</li> <li>- ADA Compliance</li> <li>- Developer Participation</li> <li>- MDOT Projects</li> <li>- NPS Projects</li> <li>- MNCPPC Parks Projects</li> </ul>	Agree	Add two programs:  1) Additional MCDOT programs: including CIP Roadway Projects, CIP Traffic Improvement Projects, Bridge CIP Projects, Mass Transit Projects 2) Non-MCDOT programs: including MDOT projects, NPS projects, MNCPPC projects.
69	Programs	MCDOT	94	Program 1.2 - Remove the text "Phase II" from the first sentence.	Agree	Make this change.
70	Programs	MCDOT	94	Program 1.2 - Consider amending the first sentence to read "facility planning or other concept study"	Agree	Make this change.

**Attachment B: Public Testimony Summary and Responses**

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony (commentor)	Response	Discussion / Recommendation
71	Programs	MCDOT	94	Program 1.3 - There are now more than 70 bikeshare stations.	Agree	Make this change.
72	Programs	MCDOT	95	Program 1.4 - Consider referencing the Pedestrian Bike Traffic Safety Advisory Committee (PBTSAC)	Agree	Add a section on the PBTSAC using this language from the website:  The Pedestrian, Bicycle, and Traffic Safety Advisory Committee (PBTSAC) is a group of citizens, elected officials, and government representatives focused on pedestrian and bicycle safety issues in Montgomery County.  Lead Agency: Montgomery County Department of Transportation
73	Programs	MCDOT	97	Program 2.1 - Update to the FY17-22 or the FY19-24 (depending on time of master plan adoption) 6-yr program. Change to design & construction of shared use paths, on-street bikeways, wayfinding, and bike parking. Add Marinelli Rd, change Emory La to Emory La / Muncaster Mill Rd (MD 115). Add "and others"	Agree	Make this change.
74	Policies	Allen	103	Policies are needed to consider walking and bicycling in the school site selection process. Furthermore, when a new school is constructed the County should improve walking and bicycling connectivity to it. School zone boundaries should consider accessibility for bicycling and walking.	Agree	Add a new policy:  "School Site Selection: Montgomery County Public Schools should update their school site selection criteria to consider the appropriateness of existing walking and bicycling infrastructure for children. Where good walking and bicycling does not already exist, MCPS should work with MCDOT to construct child-appropriate walking and bicycling infrastructure in the immediate vicinity of the school."
75	Policies	MCDOT	105	Policy 1.1 - Change the Lead Agency to CountyStat.	Agree	Make this change.
76	Policies	MCDOT	107	Policy 2.1 - Be mindful that with speed limits of 10 MPH or 15 MPH it is likely that many bicyclists will legally be speeding. While we are unaware of any enforcement of bicycle speeding, such speed limits could make it possible and potentially slow bicycle travel times.	Agree	The intent for shared streets is that all road users need to go 10 mph or less, including bicyclists. For neighborhood greenways, 20 MPH is more in line with industry practice. Therefore, increase the speed to 20 MPH.
77	Policies	MCDOT	107	Policy 2.2 - The phrasing can be taken to imply that the law causes poor design, and is also awkwardly negative for the context of this plan. Consider phrasing along the lines of "bike facilities may not be considered adequate/safe to all users, and bicyclists should have the right to decide where it is safe to bicycle"	Agree	Replace the "Justification" section with MCDOT's proposed language.
78	Policies	MCDOT	108	Policy 2.4 - Consider rephrasing this section to emphasize working with SHA to improve upon their policy (perhaps identifying key goals of improvement), as replacing the policy or focusing on only the negatives of conventional bike lanes runs a risk of SHA throwing out the policy completely.	Agree	Replace the first sentence in 2.4 with: "Work with the Maryland State Highway Administration to update their policies to achieve a low-stress bicycling environment instead of prescribing that conventional bike lanes are to be installed when road projects involve widening or new construction."

Attachment B: Public Testimony Summary and Responses

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony (commentor)	Response	Discussion / Recommendation
79	Policies	MCDOT	108, 109	<p>Policy 2.4 and 2.7- Consider preserving conventional bike lanes, as they may continue to play a role despite the plan's efforts to go beyond them. This may be applicable if SHA sticks with their current policy, or also if we consider that SHA may be unlikely to construct off-street facilities (particularly those that involve narrowing streets).</p> <p>In areas where may also be a preference with sidepaths there may remain a preference from bicyclists for conventional bike lanes, and the plan should continue to make room for such dual-bikeways.</p>	Agree with changes.	<p>We do not believe that conventional bike lanes are an appropriate long-term bikeway for most bicyclists on higher speed and higher traffic volume roads and we believe that SHA will continue to adjust its policies to be more supportive of low-stress bicycling. We also agree with MCDOT that there will continue to be a benefit to conventional bike lanes as an interim bikeway type. Where there is sufficient right-of-way to provide conventional bike lanes in addition to separated bikeways, we do not object to the conventional bike lanes (see note on page 65). The plan also supports conventional bike lanes if for whatever reason the separated bikeway cannot be implemented but the conventional bike lane can be implemented as an interim bikeway (page 134).</p> <p>Per our discussion with MCDOT, we recommend adding the following language on page 109, Policy 2.7, at the bottom of the first paragraph:</p> <p>"However, conventional bike lanes can be considered as an interim way of providing bicycle facilities or as a supplement to recommended facilities, particularly in locations where provision of conventional bike lanes does not increase the road cross section. However, conventional bike lanes are not a substitute for low-stress facilities, particularly on higher volume / higher speed roads."</p>
80	Policies	MCDOT	108	Policy 2.6 - Consider defining what it means to be in the vicinity of schools, libraries, etc. Presumably this is within 2 miles? [noting my very first comment about how mileage is measured]	Agree	<p>The intent in the objectives on page 26 was to set a very low level of traffic stress just for schools, so modify Policy 2.6 to say:</p> <p>Establish Level of Traffic Stress targets, including a "low" level of traffic stress countywide and a "very low" level of traffic stress for access to public schools, <u>including one mile of elementary schools, 1.5 miles of middle schools and 2 miles of high schools</u><del>libraries, parks and recreation centers on all roads where it is legal to ride a bicycle.</del></p>
81	Policies	MCDOT	108	Policy 2.6 - Swap the lead agencies: MNCPPC first; DOT 2nd	Agree	Make this change.
82	Policies	MCDOT	109	Policy 2.8 - Cost should also be a consideration in this process. We agree that Best Practices are important, but we must be mindful that many well-intentioned changes to projects can render them so expensive such that they are never built.	N/A	MCDOT drops this comment.
83	Policies	MCDOT	110	Policy 2.10 - We are hesitant at this point to make Protected Intersections the preferred type, as we currently have no experience with them and have concerns with pedestrian safety/operations. Suggest performance characteristics in lieu of explicitly requiring protected intersections as the preferred type.		Staff is working on language to satisfy MCDOT's concern.
84	Policies	MCDOT	110	Policy 2.11 - Consider property rights implications of this in the absence of redevelopment. Consider MNCPPC as the Lead Agency, for action as part of redevelopment.	N/A	MCDOT drops this comment.
85	Policies	MCDOT	111	Policy 2.12 - Include MDOT SHA as an additional Lead Agency.	Agree	Make this change.
86	Policies	MCDOT	112	Policy 2.15 - Include MDOT SHA as an additional Lead Agency.	Agree	Make this change.
87	Policies	MCDOT	113	Policy 2.17 - Suggest eliminating this, as it is not specific to the Bike Master Plan. It is redundant, as it is already included in the Vision Zero Plan.	Agree	Make this change.

**Attachment B: Public Testimony Summary and Responses**

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony (commentor)	Response	Discussion / Recommendation
88	Policies	MCDOT	113	Policy 2.18 - Suggest eliminating this, as it is not specific to the Bike Master Plan. It is redundant, as it is already included in the Vision Zero Plan.	Agree	Make this change.
<b>Implementing the Vision</b>						
89	Strong Bicycling Community	MCDOT	118	2nd Paragraph - Delete "government" in the first sentence.	Agree	Make this change.
90	Task Force	MCDOT	120	Task Force - We suggest that this be led by MNCPPC, as per other master plans.	Agree	Indicate that the Planning Board, not the County Executive, establishes this task force. Indicate that it will be chaired by the Planning Department only.
91	Task Force	MCDOT	120	Task Force - Consider including WMATA &/or MTA as representatives to the task force.	Agree	Add WMATA and MTA.
92	Small Area Plans	MCDOT	120	Small Area Infra Plans - Need to identify the level of effort involved in identified projects.	N/A	Per discussion with MCDOT, staff will request funding for these plans in the off-year CIP.
93	Design Standards	MCDOT	121-122	Avoid prescribing pavement design requirements.	Agree	Remove all but the first two sentences as shown below:  Surface Quality: Sidepaths in Montgomery County are plagued by degrading pavement, including pavement cracking and buckling due to the growth of tree roots. Sidepaths will be designed to withstand such root growth and vehicle loading since maintenance trucks will use them on occasion. <del>These requirements may result in different designs for subgrade and pavement thicknesses based on soil conditions. According to the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities, shared-use paths, at a minimum, should have a total pavement depth of 6 inches, including the surface course and the base course (typically an aggregate rock base) placed over a compacted subgrade. There may be other ways to reduce pavement cracking and evolving best practices should always be considered.</del>
94	Design Standards	MCDOT	123	Considerations - Delete "wide"	N/A	MCDOT drops this comment.
95	Design Standards	MCDOT	129	Rigid bollards are not recommended due to collision (and potential projectile) risks.	Agree	Remove this section.
96	Design Standards	Greater Colesville Citizens Assoc, Richardson		The plan violates Montgomery County's road design standards.		Montgomery County's road design standards were last comprehensively updated in 2007 / 2008. Since that time, many new types of bikeways have emerged. The Montgomery County Department of Transportation understands that the road design standards need to be updated, and is currently scoping out a project to begin updating the standards.
97	Implementation Mechanism	MCDOT	134	Implementation is also achieved through: - CIP Roadway Projects - CIP Traffic Improvement Projects - Sidewalk & Curb Replacement Projects - Residential Resurfacing - Mass Transit Projects - Bridge CIP Projects - ADA Compliance - Developer Participation - MDOT Projects - NPS Projects - MNCPPC Parks Projects	N/A	See response to Comment #68.
98	Implementation Mechanism	MCDOT	134	In the short paragraph before the numbered list, remove the two uses of the word "facility".	Agree	Make this change.

Attachment B: Public Testimony Summary and Responses

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony (commentor)	Response	Discussion / Recommendation
99	Implementation Mechanism	MCDOT	134	Numbered List, #1 - Remove the word "facility".	Agree	Make this change.
100	Implementation Mechanism	MCDOT	135	Blue Box - Facility Planning is not implementation. Need to expand this CIP section to include references to available funding, final design, right-of-way, utilities, and construction.	Agree	Staff is working on language to satisfy MCDOT's concern.
101	Implementation Mechanism	Dalrymple	136	Separated bicycle facilities and protected intersections are an allowable credit under the County Code.	Agree	Staff agrees with this statement, but MCDOT does not agree.
102	Implementation Mechanism	MCDOT	136	1st Paragraph, 1st Sentence - Safety may not be the only reason not to construct such facilities. They could be environmental, operational, etc.	Agree	Change to: "For smaller development projects, constructing incremental bicycling improvements at the time of development is desirable as long as it does not result in unsafe conditions <u>or severe environment impacts.</u> "
103	Implementation Mechanism	MCDOT	136	1st Paragraph - Remove the last sentence " <i>The applicant's financial contribution to the future construction of the bikeway or protected intersections can be credited toward the applicable development impact taxes, pursuant to the Montgomery County Code.</i> " Such contributions may not be directly adding capacity, therefore they may not be eligible for impact tax credits. There may be some room for exceptions is the project being contributed to is advancing toward construction in the very near-term, and also UMPs / LATIP fees may be eligible for credits.	Disagree	Planning staff disagrees with MCDOT on this comment. The Code says an improvement "that adds highway or intersection capacity or improves transit service or bicycle commuting..." is eligible. In other words, if realigning or rebuilding existing lanes improves bicycle commuting, seems that the work should qualify as eligible for a transportation impact tax credit, even if it doesn't technically add capacity. However, we propose the following language:  "In certain cases, as determined by the Montgomery County Department of Transportation, the applicant's financial contribution to the future construction of the bikeway or protected intersections may be credited toward the applicable development impact taxes, pursuant to the Montgomery County Code."
104	Implementation Mechanism	MCDOT	136	2nd Paragraph - Clarify "For on-road striped bikeways, the developer must also pave shoulders that will be delineated with pavement markings" as all of our shoulders are paved; we do not use grass shoulders.	Agree	Change to: "For on-road striped bikeways, the developer must also <del>pave</del> <u>construct</u> shoulders that will be delineated with pavement markings."
105	Implementation Mechanism	MCDOT	136	Last Bullet - Delete the final sentence. We cannot guarantee that the contribution will be used in the immediate vicinity of the ROW frontage.	Disagree	Planning staff disagrees with MCDOT on this comment.
106	Implementing Separated Bike Lanes	MCDOT	141	Narrowing Travel Lanes - Consider specifying whether the separated bike lane being referred to is on-street. If off-street, this needs to highlight the costs of relocating curbs, drainage, utilities, etc.	Disagree with changes.	Add this language: "This guidance is flexible, as specific roadway conditions may result in a reordering of these priorities."
107	Implementing Separated Bike Lanes	MCDOT	141	Narrowing Travel Lanes - This treatment perhaps shouldn't always be first go-to, especially if facility is outside the road or for facilities with higher speeds (particularly greater than 45 MPH) or a high percentage of larger vehicles (BRT routes may fall into this category).	Disagree with changes.	See response to Comment #106.
108	Implementing Separated Bike Lanes	MCDOT	142	Table - The type of bikeway may affect the priority of treatments used.	Disagree	See response to Comment #106.
109	Prioritization	MCDOT	144	Consider including Breezeways in these priorities.	Disagree	Additional priority is not recommended for Breezeway Networks beyond the prioritization they are assigned in the Prioritization section of the plan.
110	Prioritization	MCDOT	145	Consider highlighting breezeways in this graphic.	Disagree	See response to Comment #109.

Attachment B: Public Testimony Summary and Responses

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony (commentor)	Response	Discussion / Recommendation
111	Prioritization	Washington Grove, Shady Grove Advisory Committee, Everhart, Allen	145-182	Increase the prioritization of this trail from Tier 3 to Tier 1.	Agree	Increase the priority of the Piedmont Crossing LP Trail between Town of Washington Grove and Shady Grove Metrorail station from Tier 3 to Tier 1.  Increase the priority of the sidepath on Crabbs Branch Way between its northern terminus and Shady Grove Rd to Tier 1.
112	Prioritization	Johnson	145-182	Increase priority of bikeways leading to White Oak (New Hampshire Ave crossing of I-495, US29 crossing at Northwest Branch).	Disagree	Both projects will be very impactful and costly. It is better to wait until redevelopment along these corridors implements the network, though this could take a long time.
113	Prioritization	Allen	145-182	Small gaps that need higher priority between Rockville and Gaithersburg, especially over I-370.	Agree	Increase the priority of the bikeways on Industrial Dr and Gaither Rd, between I-370 and Shady Grove Road, to Tier 2 to better link Rockville and Gaithersburg.
114	Prioritization	City of Takoma Park		Designate Flower-Piney Branch and Takoma/Langley Crossroads bikeways as Tier 1 instead of Tier 2.	Agree with changes.	Agree that these projects should be designated Tier 1:  Domer Ave / Gilbert St Neighborhood Greenway Greenwood Ave Neighborhood Greenway Anne St Neighborhood Greenway Wildwood Dr Neighborhood Greenway Glenside Dr Neighborhood Greenway
115	Prioritization	MCDOT	145	Consider whether any Programmed Bikeways should be reassigned into Tier 1 (or elsewhere) if they have not yet advanced into final design or construction. (example: Goshen Rd)	Agree	The intent was to include projects that are fully or partially funded for construction in the 6-year capital budget in the "Programmed Bikeways" section because by being included in the 6-year capital budget for construction they have been identified as a priority.  Change the first sentence on page 146 to "Programmed bikeways include those that are completely or partially funded <u>for construction</u> in the county's <u>six-year</u> capital improvements budget..."
116	Prioritization	MCDOT	146	Add Needwood Rd, Seven Locks Rd, LSC Loop, Falls Rd, Bikeways - Minor (all i.e. Washington Grove Connector, Emory Lane, Sandy Spring Bikeway, etc.), Facility Plan (all i.e. Tuckerman La, Goldsboro Rd, Bowie Mill Rd)	Agree with changes.	Per the previous comment and our response, we would only include bikeways in the "Programmed Bikeways" section if they are funded for construction in the six-year capital budget.  Add these projects in the Programmed Bikeways section: Needwood Road (the unbuilt section), Washington Grove Connector and Emory Lane.
117	Prioritization	MCDOT	148	Confirm mileage & limits of the Woodmont Ave bikeway; something here isn't correct.	N/A	The Woodmont Ave bikeway is broken into segments that are part of the MD 355 Breezeway and a segment that is not. The segment between Stathmore Ave and Wisconsin Ave is 0.1 miles and is not part of the breezeway.
118	Prioritization	MCDOT	155	Confirm mileage & limits of the Woodmont Ave bikeway; something here isn't correct.	N/A	The Woodmont Ave bikeway is broken into segments that are part of the MD 355 Breezeway and a segment that is not. The segment between Stathmore Ave and Wisconsin Ave is 0.1 miles and is not part of the breezeway.

**Attachment B: Public Testimony Summary and Responses**

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony (commentor)	Response	Discussion / Recommendation
<b>Monitoring the Vision</b>						
119	Monitoring Report	WABA, Dennis	26	The plan falls short on connectivity to schools, libraries and recreation centers.	Discussion Needed	<p>The low connectivity results for many schools (especially elementary and some middle schools) is largely a result of these schools being surrounded by one or more Primary Residential streets. Most of the recommendations on these streets were not prioritized for implementation because they will be difficult to implement due to their location in residential communities (they will be impactful) and their low use outside of school arrival/dismissal. The Planning Board should consider whether sidewalks on residential streets should be considered bikeable by children. If the answer is "yes," the Planning Board should consider whether to remove sidepaths from Primary Residential streets. If the answer is "no," the Planning Board should consider whether they want to prioritize more sidepaths on residential streets. About 120 miles (or 10%) of the 1,200-mile proposed bicycling network are bikeways on Primary Residential streets.</p> <p>Additionally, some of the lack of connectivity to schools is due to crossings that have excessive posted speed limits or lack of a pedestrian median refuges. To address this concern, the Planning Board could consider recommending a Safe Routes to School policy: "Safe Routes to School: Develop a Safe Routes to School policy that permanently (not just during school hours) reduces posted speed limits in front of schools and provides traffic calming features and / or traffic control, such as pedestrian median refuges, adjacent to schools to facilitate safe crossings." Master plans do not typically recommend crossing treatments at specific locations.</p> <p>Objective 2.4 on page 193 shows that low-stress connectivity to public libraries is good (60 percent by 2043), but connectivity to recreation centers is low (40 percent by 2043). While the reasons for low connectivity to recreation centers vary, one of the major reasons is that while the roadways are considered low-stress, many of the intersections adjacent to these facilities are moderate stress. An example is the Whetstone Community Center is Montgomery Village. The Montgomery Village Master Plan recommends a sidepath on the north side of Centerway Road, but since this is a four-lane road with a posted speed limit of 35 mph and limited to no traffic controls (i.e., stop signs or signals), many of the crossings (such as at Thomas Farm Road) are not deemed bikeable for most people.</p>
120	Monitoring Report	MCDOT	193	Monitoring should consider how to track and relate to capital expenditures.	Agree	Add a bullet at the bottom of the page that says "Expenditures on bikeway improvements."
<b>Bikeway Recommendations</b>						
121	Bikeway Recommendations	MCDOT	226-366	Note that any facilities proposed along Rustic Roads (or any like variant) cannot be implemented as long as the streets retain the Rustic classifications. Identify any such streets, note that they are advisory only should Rustic status be removed, and exclude the facility's mileage from the total tally (for ease of estimating costs for the Fiscal Impact Statement). I only spotted 2 such cases (noted in a subsequent comment), but there could be more that I'd missed.	Make change	We will add the proposed note to each bikeway on a rustic road: "This bikeway recommendation is advisory only until such time as the Rustic Road designation is removed."



**Attachment B: Public Testimony Summary and Responses**

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony (commentor)	Response	Discussion / Recommendation
122	Bikeway Recommendations	SHA		The MDOT SHA recommends the plan not include recommendations to construct two-way separated bicycle lane facilities on both sides of a roadway. The MDOT SHA has questions over the level of demand to support such an investment and the potential feasibility due to the amount of right-of-way that may need to be acquired and other competing roadway and development uses for the same right-of-way		<p>As discussed in Appendix C, pages 60-63, two-way separated bike lanes or shared use paths on both sides of the street are warranted in some situations. The general application for this facility type is along wide, high-volume streets with limited crossing opportunities where destinations exist on both sides of the street. Two-way bikeways on both sides of the street minimize the need to cross wide roadways, travel excessive distances to cross at a safe location and improve access and network connectivity to both sides of the street.</p> <p>Conversely, two-way bikeways on one side of the street and one-way separated bike lanes on both sides of the street can limit access for bicyclists</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A single two-way bikeway on one side of the street, while potentially beneficial to connect to some destinations along one side of the corridor, can require bicyclists to cross the roadway twice to reach their destinations and limit access to the other side of the street. This may deter some people from bicycling, lead to bicycling on the sidewalk or cause excessive delay to cross the street.</li> <li>• Similarly, a pair of one-way bikeways on each side a street may present a problem if a bicyclist's destination is on the opposite side of the street from the direction of travel. This configuration requires the rider to either cross the street twice to access the destination, or it may lead a cyclist to ride against traffic on the side of the street where the destination is located.</li> </ul> <p>By providing a two-way facility on each side of the street, Montgomery County will enable bicyclists to complete trips to their destinations with minimal conflicts and delay and encourage more "Interested but Concerned" riders to consider bicycling.</p> <p>The Bicycle Master Plan recognizes that constructing two-way bikeways on both sides of the street is expensive and will require substantial right-of-way. Therefore, the plan prioritizes constructing two-way bikeways on both sides of the road in only a few locations where the demand is expected to be high. In most locations, a two-way bikeway is prioritized for one side of the road only.</p>
123	Bikeway Recommendations	Goodill		In urban areas bikeways should be one-way on both sides of street. Two-way bikeways on both sides of street is excessive and is inconsistent with urban character. Specifically in White Oak Policy Area.		See response to Comment #122
124	Bikeway Recommendations	WABA, Smith		This is needed whenever a road has more than two lanes in each direction OR speed limit is over 35 mph.		See response to Comment #122
125	Bikeway Recommendations	Genn		Instead of being overly prescriptive, plan implementation should use Public Benefits points systems to determine how to achieve the multiple policy objectives on a case-by-case basis for development projects. The point system would determine how aspirational to proposed bikeways would be.		We believe bicycling infrastructure represents critical public infrastructure and is therefore a mandatory element of any development project.
<b>Appendix A: Detailed Monitoring Report</b>						
126	Objectives	MCDOT	A-2 to A-30	Consider discussing the level of investment needed for each objective to be met.	Agree	We will add columns for the connectivity metrics that show how connectivity improves for each prioritization tier.
127	Tables	City of Takoma Park	A-33	The connectivity to Takoma Park ES should increase by more than 3% by 2033.	Discussion Needed	

**Attachment B: Public Testimony Summary and Responses**

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony (commentor)	Response	Discussion / Recommendation
<b>Appendix B: Bicycle Facility Design Toolkit</b>						
128	Interstate Ramps	Dennis	N/A	The plan needs to articulate ways for bicyclists and pedestrians to safely cross interstate ramps.	Agree	<p>We recommend changes to the following language on page 79:</p> <p>"Interstate Ramps: Due to the high speed of traffic on most freeway on- and off-ramps, crossing freeway ramps is a major safety concern and impediment to both walking and bicycling. Potential approaches to improving crossings at interstates includes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Traffic control at the crossing, including full signalized intersections.</li> <li>2) Grade-separated crossings.</li> <li>3) <u>Geometric changes.</u>"</li> </ol> <p>We have asked Toole Design Group (consulting firm providing assistance on the Bicycle Master Plan) to cost out a section in the toolkit that identifies general approaches to safely convey bicyclists and pedestrians across interstate ramps.</p>
129	Separated Bike Lanes	MoBike	B-11	<p>Add these considerations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Likelihood of pedestrian encroachment, in particular when the barrier is parked cars or the facility is at sidewalk level adjacent to the sidewalk.</li> <li>o Ability to get around obstacles like leaf piles, strollers, pedestrians, etc. when the barrier is impervious to cyclists and the bikeway is not at the same level as the sidewalk. Bollards are better.</li> </ul>	Disagree	We don't believe these add a lot of value. Pedestrian encroachment isn't particular to separated bike lanes. When there is pedestrian encroachment (or leaf piles), it shouldn't be too difficult for bicyclist to navigate around them.
130	Separated Bike Lanes	MCDOT	B.11	"Less likely ned for signal modifications" -- Only for one-way separated bike lanes	N/A	Per discussion with MCDOT, this comment is dropped.
131	Conventional Bike Lanes	MCDOT	B.14	Conventional bike lanes might be used in addition to sidepaths (see comment on p108-109)	Agree	Addressed with proposed change to Policy 2.7 on page 109.
132	Bikeable Shoulders	MCDOT	B.17	Last Bullet - rephrase as "must comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act or seek a wavier"	Agree	We will make this change.
133	Protected Intersections	MCDOT	B.26	Confirm that the NTOR sign is correctly placed, as it is not clear how this would apply. It is facing a thru/left movement, which is the intersection is signalized would be prohibited from turning left on red even without a sign.	Agree	The arrow is in the wrong place. The image will be revised. We will also indicate that two-stage turn queue boxes now have interim approval from FHWA. Also change "wit" to "with"
134	Protected Intersections	MCDOT	B.28	Guidance #6 - This is a standard action; why is this being called out on this page?	Disagree	This was added at the request of MCDOT.
135	Separated Bike Lanes	MCDOT	B.36	Guidance #3 - Reads like a requirement rather than a guideline. Use of "may only" is synonymous with "shall"; consider using "should".	Agree	We will change "may" to "should". Also change "with" to "width"
136	Neighborhood Greenways	MCDOT	B.45	Consider referencing the Executive Regulations related to traffic restrictions: when and where they can be used.	Agree	Make change.

**Attachment B: Public Testimony Summary and Responses**

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony (commentor)	Response	Discussion / Recommendation
137	Loading Zones	WABA		Add guidance related to loading zones.	Agree	<p>We recommend adding a policy to pages 104-114:</p> <p>Loading Zones:</p> <p>Develop a policy on loading zones that encourages loadings zones to be located on-site and that consolidates loading zones and driveways immediately adjacent to one another.</p> <p>Justification: Loading zones present potential conflicts between motorists and non-motorists. On-site loading zones are desirable especially in urban areas, because they provide a designated space for trucks outside the bikeway and sidewalk. Consolidating loading zones and driveways for the same building limits exposure for pedestrians and bicyclists along a roadway.</p> <p>Lead Agency: Planning</p>
<b>Appendix C: Issue Papers</b>						
138	Floating Bus Stops	MCDOT	C.15	<p><u>Repeating a comment from the Working Draft:</u>                      We strongly urge that information relating to transit (e.g. floating bus stops) be included. We appreciate MNCPPC's concurrence with the importance of this issue, and believe that the suggested Bicycle Facility Design Toolkit (also including bikeways across interstates &amp; transitions between 2-way and 1-way bikeways, and we would also include light rail interactions) could be useful.</p> <p>However, we feel that at least some recognition of floating bus stops (and/or other treatments) should be included in this plan, and that doing so would very much fit with the plan's approach to sharing a number of Best Practices.</p>	Agree	<p>We will add this text to the bottom of page 78 with a photo from Spring Street.</p> <p>Floating Bus Stops</p> <p>In this design, the bus stops at a raised concrete island, while the bike lane veers travels behind the island. This configuration allows transit vehicles to stay in their own lane without jumping in front of cyclists, and gives cyclists added protection from vehicular traffic at the bus stop.</p>
139	Conventional Bike Lanes	MCDOT	C.47	Conventional bike lanes (and dual-bikeways) might still have a need alongside sidepaths (see comment on p108-109)	Agree	Addressed with proposed change to Policy 2.7 on page 109.
140	Dual Bikeways	MoBike	C-48	Portions of River Road are retained as a dual bikeways in the plan, so remove this example.	Disagree	The specific section of River Road is in Westbard, where separated bike lanes are recommended to replace the dual bikeway.
<b>Appendix I: Breezeway Network</b>						
141	Breezeway Network maps	MCDOT	Gen	It may be helpful to provide maps (similar to the maps shown for each geographic area in the main plan document) for each individual Breezeway.	N/A	Per discussion with MCDOT, this comment is dropped.
<b>Other</b>						
142		Helms		The plan needs better integration with Montgomery County's Vision Zero plan.	Disagree	We are not clear why Mr. Helm's thinks that the plan is not integrated with the Vision Zero plan. A follow-up email was sent to Mr. Helms.
143		Everhart		This Level of Traffic Stress on Crabbs Branch Way should be reduced. It is currently rated "high" stress.	Disagree	Our analysis is based on extensive data collection and the most recent planning methods. While no model is 100% accurate, we believe that our analysis is largely an accurate portrayal of bicycling conditions in the county. There are a lot of heavy vehicles on Crabbs Branch Way, which contributes to a high stress level.

**Attachment B: Public Testimony Summary and Responses**

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony (commentor)	Response	Discussion / Recommendation
144		Hoffer		Montgomery County needs a balanced transportation system that addresses the needs of most people, not a small percent of the population. Bike lanes, mistiming traffic lights and No Turn On Red signs are deliberately created gridlock in Downtown Silver Spring that spills over into residential communities.	Disagree	A balanced transportation system prioritizes safety for all users. Improvements that increase safety and comfort for cyclists and pedestrians benefit all users, as slower traffic speeds have been shown to reduce crashes and the severity of crashes. Given the Council's Vision Zero Initiative to eliminate traffic related deaths and severe injuries by 2030, and the Council-mandated non-auto driver mode share goals in the most recently approved master plans, the transportation network is in need a of a rebalancing to incentivize walking, biking and transit.
145		Basken		This plan should be a fundamental demand for all transportation modes, but this report reads like a plea for "table scraps".	Disagree	
<b>Non-Master Plan Issues</b>						
146		Nuttycombe		County should insist that bikeshare providers maintain a higher standard of care in monitoring where their product winds up.	Agree	This is not a master plan issue.
147		PBTSA		The Two-Year Vision Zero Plan calls for the development of a Pedestrian Master Plan. We look forward to a similarly careful, thorough and dedicated effort to develop a Pedestrian Master Plan that similarly focuses on improved pedestrian access, connectivity, and safety.	Agree	The Planning Department's budget request includes funds to develop a detailed evaluation of the pedestrian network, along the same lines of what we did before we kicked off the Bicycle Master Plan. This study will be critical to development of a Pedestrian Master Plan.
148		Greater Colesville Citizens Assoc, Richardson		The draft plan gives priority to bicycles over all other modes and actually degrades roads and transit, the two modes that provide mobility for most people.	Disagree	A balanced transportation system prioritizes safety for all users. Improvements that increase safety and comfort for cyclists and pedestrians benefit all users, as slower traffic speeds have been shown to reduce crashes and the severity of crashes. Given the Council's Vision Zero Initiative to eliminate traffic related deaths and severe injuries by 2030, and the Council-mandated non-auto driver mode share goals in the most recently approved master plans, the transportation network is in need a of a rebalancing to incentivize walking, biking and transit.
149		Greater Colesville Citizens Assoc, Richardson		The proposed bike plan destroys the character of many communities, substantially increases safety issues related to vehicles, and is very costly for the benefit only a few bikers.	Agree / Disagree	The cost to implement this plan will be high, but it is also intended to substantially increase the amount of bicycling.
150		Greater Colesville Citizens Assoc, Richardson		Would substantially increase the amount of stormwater runoff.	TBD	Bikeways projects must consider reducing stormwater runoff, so its unclear to what extent they will increase stormwater runoff.
151		Greater Colesville Citizens Assoc, Richardson		Proposal to build 15-21 feet wide bike lanes by taking existing travel lanes from vehicles and taking people's properties will result in gridlock and reduce quality of life.	Agree / Disagree	This plan does not propose to eliminate any existing travel lanes, though MCDOT / SHA may decide that is the best course of action after completing a traffic study. There is likely to be property acquisition to implement the plan.
152		Greater Colesville Citizens Assoc, Richardson		The cost of the bike plan is excessive and the budget is insufficient to implement it.	TBD	The Montgomery County Department of Transportation will prepare a cost estimate for the County Council's review of the plan. The prioritization section of the plan will allow the Planning Board and County Council to adjust the recommendations in the plan that are viewed as public commitments by identifying those recommendations that should be constructed within the life of the plan and those that should be considered beyond the life of the plan.

**Attachment B: Public Testimony Summary and Responses**

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony (commentor)	Response	Discussion / Recommendation
153		Greater Colesville Citizens Assoc, Richardson		No space without removing lanes or taking land/properties. Identifies five examples in the White Oak and Fairland / Colesville areas where additional space is needed to implement bikeway recommendations.	TBD	Many of the bikeways in the plan will not be implemented without redevelopment and larger capital projects. It is difficult to predict which capital projects will be funded and which areas will redevelop. The plan therefore recommends a bikeway in the event that bridge replacement and redevelopment occur. From experience we know that if a bikeway is not recommended in a plan, it becomes much harder to require its construction as part of a development approval and is less likely to be constructed in a state or county project.
154		Greater Colesville Citizens Assoc, Richardson		The bikeways should be placed in urban areas along arterial and business streets. Bikes should use BRT vehicles along major roads; BRT vehicles are being designed to carry bikes.	Disagree	We strongly disagree with this statement. BRT will not be located on every road and BRT station locations are not conducive to many bike trips.