

Attachment B: Public Testimony Summary and Responses

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony (commentor)	Response	Discussion / Recommendation
<b>General</b>						
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.  Lead Agency: Montgomery County Department of Transportation"
<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	Add these subsections (shown in lower case letters):  BIKEWAYS Bicycle Facility Classifications General Bikeway Application Breezeway Network Bikeway Recommendations  BICYCLE PARKING Short-Term Bicycle Parking Long-Term Bicycle Parking Bicycle Parking Stations  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

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

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony (commentor)	Response	Discussion / Recommendation
<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	Add to the end of the second paragraph:  "The network will be augmented by unseparated bikeways that allow particularly efficient travel by confident cyclists, for both transportation and recreation."	Disagree, with changes.	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.  Add to the end of the second paragraph: "In rural areas of the County, a network of bikeable shoulders is recommended for recreational bicyclists who prefer to ride on the road."
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.
<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	The plan already states what actions are going to be taken to achieve the objectives of the plan. 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 Policies (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 2016, 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.
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.

Attachment B: Public Testimony Summary and Responses

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony (commentor)	Response	Discussion / Recommendation
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 clarification to the "Data Requirements" section of Objective 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4.  Objective 2.2 (transit stations): "Analysis evaluates connectivity based on a "network" distance of two-miles from the transit station.  Objective 2.3 (schools): "Analysis evaluates connectivity based on an "as the crow flies" distance of from each school, as that is how Montgomery County Public Schools determines their busing zones."  Objective 2.4 (libraries / recreation centers / parks): "Analysis evaluates connectivity based on a "network" distance of two-miles from the public facility.
14	Metric 2.2	MCDOT	25	As written, the extremes at each end -- high-density urban and low-density rural -- may throw off the intended information from this metric.  <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.  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 pedestrian treatments, likely including bike treatments only as a component of pedestrian projects. It may subsequently have a dismal percentage of DUs with access to low-stress bikeways, but could otherwise have an excellent pedestrian access.  <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	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 slightly down, but that reflects reality. But since each station's contribution to the metric is based on the number of dwelling units within two miles of the station, rural stations have very little impact on the metrics. Regardless, 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".

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

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony (commentor)	Response	Discussion / Recommendation
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	Currently, about 15% of blocks in the 19 Bicycle Pedestrian Priority Areas have sufficient bicycle parking. The 40% target is a best guess based what can be acheived by development projects and a County bike parking program. We believe that the 40% target is ambitious, but per discussion with MCDOT, we will monitor progress in implementing this metric and adjust it over time as needed.
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.
<b>Achieving the Vision</b>						
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.
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.
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."

Attachment B: Public Testimony Summary and Responses

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony (commentor)	Response	Discussion / Recommendation
34	General Bikeway Application	MCDOT	64	2nd Paragraph - Remove the words "facility planning"	Agree	Make this change.
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?
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.
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.
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.

Attachment B: Public Testimony Summary and Responses

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony (commentor)	Response	Discussion / Recommendation
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.
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 "Recreation" 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.
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 at the end of pages 93 - 96:  <b>"Additional MCDOT Programs</b>  The Montgomery County Department of Transportation has a number of programs in the capital budget that include bicycle-supportive elements, including road, traffic improvement, bridge and mass transit projects.  <b>Non-MCDOT Programs</b>  There are a number of non-Montgomery County Department of Transportation programs that include bicycle-supportive elements, including Maryland Department of Transportation projects, National Park Service projects and Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission projects."
69	Programs	MCDOT	94	Program 1.2 - Remove the text "Phase II" from the first sentence.	Agree	Make this change.

Attachment B: Public Testimony Summary and Responses

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony (commentor)	Response	Discussion / Recommendation
70	Programs	MCDOT	94	Program 1.2 - Consider amending the first sentence to read "facility planning or other concept study"	Agree	Make this change.
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.
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 travel 10 mph or less, including bicyclists. For neighborhood greenways, 20 mph is more in line with industry practice. Therefore, we recommend increasing the desired posted speed limit on neighborhood greenways 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.  "Justification: Bicycle facilities may not be considered adequate/safe to all users, and bicyclists should have the right to decide where it is safe to bicycle."
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."
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	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:  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, including one mile of elementary schools, 1.5 miles of middle schools and 2 miles of high schools libraries, parks and recreation centers on all roads where it is legal to ride a bicycle.
81	Policies	MCDOT	108	Policy 2.6 - Swap the lead agencies: MNCPPC first; DOT 2nd	Agree	Make this change.

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

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony (commentor)	Response	Discussion / Recommendation
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.
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.
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.



Attachment B: Public Testimony Summary and Responses

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony (commentor)	Response	Discussion / Recommendation
96	Design Standards	Greater Colesville Citizens Assoc, Richardson		The plan violates Montgomery County's road design standards.	N/A	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.
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	<p>Change the "Facility Planning Process" description to more broadly describe the "Transportation Project Development Process" as follows:</p> <p><b>"Montgomery County Department of Transportation's (MCDOT) Transportation Project Development Process</b></p> <p>Facility planning for transportation projects, including bikeways, serves as the transition between the master plan and a stand-alone project within the county's Capital Improvements Program (CIP). The Montgomery County Department of Transportation's (MCDOT) Transportation Project Development Process includes several phases to evaluate and preliminarily design a proposed project, provide information for elected officials to determine if the project should be funded, and move forward to final design and construction. All phases include public involvement. These phases include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Capital Funding Process:</b> Every year, MCDOT submits a capital budget request for the design and construction of current approved capital projects and new capital project expenses. After a project has successfully made it through the Transportation Facility Planning Process, it is ready to be submitted as a "stand alone" capital improvement project.</li> <li>• <b>Planning &amp; Analysis (Facility Planning Phase I):</b> This phase is a rigorous planning level investigation of the proposed improvements leading to a preferred alternative, concept development and a benefit / impacts assessment for the following critical elements: public participation, background data, purpose and need, travel demand forecasting, conceptual alignments and typical sections, preliminary impacts and a project summary report.</li> </ul>

Attachment B: Public Testimony Summary and Responses

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony (commentor)	Response	Discussion / Recommendation
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Preliminary Design and Engineering (Facility Planning Phase II &amp; Final Design)</u>: This phase begins the 35 percent preliminary engineering design work for the project while Final Design takes a project to full 100 percent design. Upon completion of 35 percent design and when the project is funded in the Capital Improvements Program (CIP), the Division of Transportation Engineering can proceed with final design of the project. The length of time necessary to perform design varies depending on the size and complexity of the project. Major tasks of Phase II include ongoing public participation, topographic survey, horizontal and vertical alignments, right-of-way / easements needed, environmental impacts, construction sequence and construction costs. At the completion of Phase II, the County Executive and County Council review the project to determine if the project merits consideration in the CIP as a funded stand-alone project.</li> <li>• <u>Right-of-Way, Utilities and Permitting</u>: The County must apply for and obtain permits from several agencies before construction can begin. As the design work is completed and the alignments and profile of the project are finalized, all necessary Right of Way is acquired for the project.</li> <li>• <u>Procurement and Construction</u>: When the plans and design for a project are completed, it is ready to be bid out for construction. During construction, the Transportation Construction Section supervises and inspects the Contractor's work to ensure the project is being constructed to Montgomery County's standards for design and quality, while minimizing the inconvenience to the public/community."</li> </ul>
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> ."
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."
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.
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	<p>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.</p> <p>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..."</p>

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

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony (commentor)	Response	Discussion / Recommendation
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.
<b>Monitoring the Vision</b>						
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."
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.	Disagree	Staff believes that the bikeway recommendations in this master plan represent critical public infrastructure. As with any other conformance requirement of a master plan recommendation, whether the required improvement meets the nexus and rough proportionality tests will be considered as part of regulatory review. Furthermore, for optional method applications, any public benefit points awarded will be reviewed and decided by the Planning Board based on the specifics of each application and the priorities established in the master plan.
<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 recommend changing "may" to "should". Also change "with" to "width"

Attachment B: Public Testimony Summary and Responses

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony (commentor)	Response	Discussion / Recommendation
136	Neighborhood Greenways	MCDOT	B.45	Consider referencing the Executive Regulations related to traffic restrictions: when and where they can be used.	Agree	<p>MCDOT will need to consider changes to their access restriction and traffic calming policies to effectively implement neighborhood greenways. Therefore, staff recommends adding the proposed policy on pages 104 to 114 of the plan:</p> <p><b>Enable Traffic Calming and Access Restrictions on Neighborhood Greenways</b></p> <p>To fully and effectively implement neighborhood greenways on residential streets, MCDOT should consider changes to the executive regulations to allow traffic calming features and access restrictions along neighborhood greenways that may not meet the criteria for similar treatments under Executive Regulations governing Speed Humps (ER 32-08), Access Restrictions (ER 17-94), and any other regulations or policies that limit implementation of traffic calming and access restrictions.</p> <p>Justification: Executive regulations specify when traffic calming and traffic access restrictions may be used. While neighborhood greenway treatments may result in features and treatments typical of traffic calming and access restrictions, the goal of neighborhood greenways is to provide low-stress bicycling corridors, and implementation of corridor-wide improvements may warrant these treatments in areas that might not otherwise meet the requirements set forth in the executive regulations governing access management or traffic calming. Limiting the applicability of this policy to areas designated by the Bicycle Master Plan as a neighborhood greenway should prevent overuse of these treatments in areas where they are unwarranted and will not circumvent existing executive regulations relating to these treatments.</p> <p>Lead Agency: Montgomery County Department of Transportation</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 recommend adding 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.

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

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony (commentor)	Response	Discussion / Recommendation
<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	N/A	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	N/A	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.
145		Basken	N/A	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	N/A	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		PBTSAC	N/A	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.
150		Greater Colesville Citizens Assoc, Richardson	N/A	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.