

ATTACHMENT D: Numbered Redline Edits

1) Table of Contents, Add these subsections:

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

Bicycle-Supportive Programs

Summary of Bicycle-Supportive Programs

Existing Bicycle-Supportive Programs

Recommended Expanded Bicycle-Supportive Programs

Recommended New of Bicycle-Supportive Programs

Bicycle-Supportive Legal and Policy Framework

Summary of Bicycle-Supportive Legal and Policy Framework

Existing Legal and Policy Framework

Recommended Laws, Regulations and Policies

ATTACHMENT D: Numbered Redline Edits

2) Page 9, 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.

3) Page 21, Objective 1.1, Add this note:

A county-led data collection effort may be needed if the American Community Survey fails to meet the data needs of this objective.

4) Page 25, Objective 2.2 (transit stations), Add this note:

Analysis evaluates connectivity based on a "network" distance of two-miles from the transit station.

5) Page 26, Objective 2.3 (schools), Add this note:

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.

6) Page 26, Objective 2.4 (libraries / recreation centers / parks), Add this note:

Analysis evaluates connectivity based on a "network" distance of two-miles from the public facility.

7) Page 37, Add footnote #4:

⁴ 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.

8) Page 38, Add text after the bulleted section:

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.

Therefore, this plan provides the following guidance: Where space is available and does not substantially detract from the default bikeway, conflict with another master plan recommendation or exceed the master plan right-of-way, bike lanes or bikeable shoulders can be added in addition to the default bikeway, in some cases overlapping with on-street parallel parking.

ATTACHMENT D: Numbered Redline Edits

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.

In addition, this plan specifically recommends several roads as having two bike facility types – both a separated bikeway (such as a sidepath) 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.

9) Page 61, Add fourth bullet to “Typical Application” section:

Traffic volumes should be less than 3,000 vehicles per day and preferably closer to 1,000 vehicles per day.

10) Page 64, Replace first paragraph with:

A countywide master plan cannot anticipate all opportunities to implement bikeways that might arise. A bikeway segment not identified in the plan may be implemented if it advances the goals of the plan. The following table provides default bikeway recommendations for streets where the Bicycle Master Plan does not recommend a bikeway. Additionally, while the bikeway recommendations in this plan reflect the state-of-the practice, they can be upgraded as the state-of-the-practice changes.

11) Page 65, add note:

** Where it is impractical or infeasible to implement a master-planned bikeway on a primary residential street, traffic calming should be implemented to improve the comfort of both walking and bicycling in the street, including speed limit reductions, raise crosswalks, curb extensions, traffic diversions, etc, consistent with other county policies.

12) Page 71, add after the “Transitions” section:

Neighborhood Greenways: For neighborhood greenways that are designated as part of the Breezeway Network, traffic volumes should be less than 2,000 vehicles per day. Where traffic volumes are around 3,000 vehicles per day, a designated bikeway may need to be implemented in lieu of a neighborhood greenway.

13) Replace “Breezeway Corridors” table:

CORRIDOR	FROM	TO	TYPOLOGY
<u>US-29Burtonsville to Silver Spring</u>	Howard County	Fenton Street	Freeway
Capital Crescent Trail	District of Columbia	Silver Spring Transit Center	Rail Corridor
<u>MD-355-SouthCity of Rockville to Friendship Heights</u>	City of Rockville	District of Columbia	Older Major Highway
<u>Veirs Mill RoadCity of Rockville to Wheaton</u>	City of Rockville	Georgia Avenue	Older Major Highway
<u>MD-355-NorthClarksburg to City of Gaithersburg</u>	Stringtown Road	City of Gaithersburg	Modern Major Highway

ATTACHMENT D: Numbered Redline Edits

<u>Germantown Road</u>	<u>Aircraft Drive</u>	<u>Observation Drive</u>	<u>Modern Major Highway</u>
Germantown to Burtonsville	Utility Corridor	Prince George's County	Utility Corridor
Germantown to Grosvenor	Schaeffer Road	MD 355	Utility Corridor
Germantown to Life Sciences Center	Middlebrook Road	City of Rockville	Modern Major Highway
<u>Georgia Avenue South</u> <u>Glenmont to Silver Spring</u>	Glenmont Metrorail Station	Ellsworth Drive	Older Major Highway
Intercounty Connector Trail	MD 355	Prince George's County	Freeway
<u>Life Sciences Center to Shady Grove Metro</u>	<u>Key West Avenue</u>	<u>Shady Grove Access Road</u>	<u>Older Major Highway</u>
<u>Georgia Avenue North</u> <u>Olney to Glenmont</u>	Olney-Laytonsville Rd	Glenmont Metrorail Station	Older Major Highway
<u>Potomac to Rock Spring</u>	<u>Seven Locks Rd</u>	<u>Old Georgetown Rd</u>	<u>Modern Major Highway</u>
<u>Montrose Parkway</u> <u>Potomac to Veirs Mill Road</u>	<u>Rockville Pike</u> <u>Falls Road</u>	Veirs Mill Road	Modern Major Highway
<u>Randolph Road</u> <u>Veirs Mill Road to White Oak</u>	Veirs Mill Road	Columbia Pike	Older Major Highway
<u>University Boulevard</u> <u>Wheaton to Takoma / Langley</u>	Veirs Mill Road	Prince George's County	Older Major Highway
<u>White Flint to Rock Spring</u>	<u>Montrose Parkway</u>	<u>Democracy Boulevard</u>	<u>Older Major Highway</u>

* Upon approval of the master plan, the Montgomery County Planning Department and the Montgomery County Department of Transportation will seek funding to confirm the locations of the Breezeway Network corridors.

14) Page 74 – 75, Insert these Breezeways in alphabetical order:

Old Georgetown Road

The Old Georgetown Road Breezeway connects White Flint to Rock Spring and consists of separated bike lanes and sidepaths.

Democracy Boulevard

The Democracy Boulevard Breezeway connects Rock Spring to Potomac and consist of sidepaths.

Germantown Road

The Germantown Road Breezeway connects Germantown Town Center to Montgomery College and consists of sidepaths.

Shady Grove Road

The Shady Grove Road Breezeway connects the Life Sciences Center to the Shady Grove Metrorail station area and consists of a sidepath.

15) Page 78, Replace first paragraph with this:

ATTACHMENT D: Numbered Redline Edits

Park trails are the backbone of the existing bicycling network in many areas of Montgomery County. While trails such as the Matthew Henson Trail and Capital Crescent Trail are built to modern standards, older trails such as the Rock Creek Trail and the Sligo Creek Trail are substandard in design in some locations. It is challenging if not impossible to upgrade these trails in many locations due to steep slopes, proximity to streams and other environmental constraints. Four park trails are identified in this plan due to their high level of transportation use: Rock Creek Trail, Sligo Creek Trail, Capital Crescent Trail and Matthew Henson Trail. Other hard surface park trails, while not identified in this plan, also provide transportation utility. Where possible, the Montgomery County Department of Parks should upgrade park trails over time to standards set by the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) and American with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards.

16) Page 78, Add this section beneath the “Park Trails” section:

Utility Corridors

A condition of the PEPCO-Exelon merger was that the utility company would pilot the use of utility right-of-way for trails between the Germantown Soccerplex and Westlake Drive. Construction of a natural surface trail is underway in the Germantown area and a hard surface trail is under design for the entire length of the corridor. The Bicycle Master Plan explicitly recommends trails on four utility corridors, including:

Utility Corridor #1: Dickerson Road to Tuckerman Lane

Utility Corridor #2: Germantown to Burtonsville

Utility Corridor #3: Bowie Mill Road to Cherry Valley Drive

Utility Corridor #4: Muncaster Mill Road to Morningwood Drive

There are many other utility corridors in Montgomery County that might be appropriate for trails and this plan does not exclude them from future consideration.

17) Page 78, add:

Floating Transit Islands

In this design, the transit vehicle stops at a raised concrete island, while the bike lane 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 transit stop. Appendix B provides an example of a floating transit island."

18) Page 93, Add three existing programs to table:

<u>1.10 Additional MCDOT Programs</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>		<u>X</u>
<u>1.11 Non-MCDOT Programs</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>		<u>X</u>
<u>1.12 Pedestrian Bicycle Traffic Safety Advisory Committee</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>

ATTACHMENT D: Numbered Redline Edits

19) Page 96, Add three programs:

1.10 Additional MCDOT Programs

[show icons for Goals 1, 2 and 4]

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.

1.11 Non-MCDOT Programs

[show icons for Goals 1, 2 and 4]

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.

1.12 Pedestrian Bicycle Traffic Safety Advisory Committee

[show icons for Goals 1, 2, 3 and 4]

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

20) Page 97, Replace first paragraph in Policy 21 with:

Under the annual bikeways program, bikeways, trails and wayfinding signs that cost less than \$1 million are planned, designed and constructed. The program’s current implementation schedule includes construction of shared use paths, on-street bikeways, wayfinding and bicycle parking on Rockville Pike at Strathmore ~~(FY18-20)~~, Washington Grove Connector ~~(FY21-22)~~ and, Emory Lane / Muncaster Mill Road (MD 115), Marinelli Road and others ~~(FY21-22)~~. The program employs a bikeways coordinator.

21) Page 104 – 105, Make modifications to table:

2.10 Make Protected Intersections the Preferred Intersection Type <u>Extending Separated Bike Lanes Through Intersections</u>	X	X		X
2.17 Establish Vision Zero Collision Review Team <u>School Site Selection</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>		X
2.18 Provide Open Access to Crash Data <u>Enable Traffic Calming and Access Restrictions on Neighborhood Greenways</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>		X

ATTACHMENT D: Numbered Redline Edits

<u>2.21 Abandonments</u>	<u>X</u>	<u>X</u>		
<u>2.22 Loading Zones</u>		<u>X</u>		<u>X</u>

22) Page 107, Policy 2.2, Change the "justification" to:

Justification: There is a legacy of poor bicycle lane design in Montgomery County (and much of the country), including narrow bicycle lanes, bicycle lanes that end short of intersections and bicycle lanes that are placed to the right of right-turning traffic. Until safe bicycle facilities are ubiquitous in Montgomery County, bicyclists should have the right to decide where it is safe to bicycle. 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.

23) Page 108, Policy 2.4: Replace first sentence with:

Pursue replacement of the Maryland State Highway Administration's marked bike lane policy with one that is consistent with achieving a low-stress bicycling network. 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.

24) Page 109, Policy 2.7, add this language to the bottom of the first paragraph:

However, conventional bike lanes can be considered an interim bicycle facility 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.

25) Page 110, Replace Policy 2.10 title with:

2.10: Make Protected Intersections the Preferred Intersection Type Extending Separated Bike Lanes through Intersections

26) Page 110, Replace Policy 2.10 text with:

Revise Montgomery County's context-sensitive road design standards to make protected intersections the preferred type of intersection treatment at all intersections where at least one street is recommended to have a sidepath, separated bike lane, buffered bike lane or conventional bike lane. Where motorists to cross paths with bicyclists, intersection designs should be chosen for their ability to minimize the following at the point of conflict:

- Bicyclist and pedestrian exposure to the conflict
- Speed differential between bicyclists, pedestrians, and motorists
- Bicyclist and pedestrian crossing distances and associated traffic signal timing requirements

At the time of adoption of this plan, protected intersections are the state of the practice for extending separated bike lanes through the intersection and should be implemented where separated bike lanes cross major highways, arterial roads, business district streets or other high-

ATTACHMENT D: Numbered Redline Edits

volume streets. Should best—practices change, the most recent guidance for these designs should be applied.

27) Page 113, Replace Policy 2.17 with:

2.17 School Site Selection

[show icons for Goals 1, 2 and 4]

When Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS) selects a new school site, their criteria should strongly consider the appropriateness of existing walking and bicycling infrastructure for children. Where safe and comfortable walking and bicycling infrastructure does not already exist, MCPS should work with MCDOT to construct child-appropriate walking and bicycling infrastructure in the immediate vicinity of the school.

Justification: Providing a safe and comfortable walking environment to public schools is a core objective for Montgomery County.

Lead Agency: Montgomery County Public Schools

Supporting Agency: Montgomery County Department of Transportation, Planning Department

28) Page 113, Replace Policy 2.18 with:

2.18 Enable Traffic Calming and Access Restrictions on Neighborhood Greenways

[show icons for Goals 1, 2 and 4]

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.

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.

Lead Agency: Montgomery County Department of Transportation

29) Page 114, Add two new policies:

2.21 Abandonments

ATTACHMENT D: Numbered Redline Edits

[show icons for Goals 1 and 2]

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

2.22 Loading Zones

[show icons for Goals 1, 2 and 4]

Develop a policy on loading zones that encourages loading zones to be located on-site and that consolidates loading zones and driveways immediately adjacent to one another.

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.

Lead Agency: Planning Department

30) Page 135, Change the “Facility Planning Process” description this:

Montgomery County Department of Transportation’s (MCDOT) Transportation Project Development Process

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). As of 2018, 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:

- Capital Funding Process: 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.
- Planning & Analysis (Facility Planning Phase I): 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.
- Preliminary Design and Engineering (Facility Planning Phase II & Final Design): 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

ATTACHMENT D: Numbered Redline Edits

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.

- Right-of-Way, Utilities and Permitting: 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.
- Procurement and Construction: 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.

31) Page 136, Change to:

Lay the groundwork for future implementation (see sidebar below) of separated bike lanes along the project's right-of-way frontage where there are not logical end points for the bikeway, as determined by the Montgomery County Planning Board. In this case, the developer must also contribute ~~make a financial contribution to make up for~~ the difference in cost between laying the groundwork ~~for future implementation of the bikeway~~ and full implementation of the bikeway to. ~~This financial contribution will be used by~~ the Montgomery County Department of Transportation for improvements to the local bikeway network to implement bikeway projects within the vicinity of the right-of-way frontage of the development project.

32) Page 137, add before the blue box:

Payments In Lieu of Constructing Bikeway Implementation

While the Bicycle Master Plan strongly recommends using the development approval approach discussed in the "Implementation through Development Approvals" section of the plan when determining what bikeways developers are required to construct as part of their projects, there will be instances, as described in blue box below, where the Planning Board determines that a development project, on a case-by-case basis, may not be required to follow this process. In those instances, the developer is required to make a financial contribution in lieu of constructing the sidewalk and / or bikeway to support the Planning Board's finding of safe, adequate and efficient site access and circulation.

33) Page 144, Add as third paragraph:

The bikeway and bicycle parking station prioritization in this plan are guidelines based on the best available information at the time the plan was approved by the Montgomery County Council. This prioritization should be reassessed every few years based on available resources, lessons learned and to ensure consistency with the goals of the plan and to ensure continuity of

ATTACHMENT D: Numbered Redline Edits

the bicycling network. In addition, the implementation of bikeways and bicycle parking stations that are identified as lower priorities in this plan can be accelerated as opportunities to implement them arise, such as redevelopment projects and state and local capital projects.

34) Page 275, add to Germantown East map:

GERMANTOWN TOWN CENTER TO MONTGOMERY COLLEGE BREEZEWAY				
Germantown Rd	Seneca Meadows Pkwy	Observation Dr	Separated Bikeway	Sidepath (North Side)

35) Page 279, add to Germantown Town Center map:

GERMANTOWN TOWN CENTER TO MONTGOMERY COLLEGE BREEZEWAY				
Germantown Rd	Aircraft Dr	Seneca Meadows Pkwy	Separated Bikeway	Sidepath (North Side)

36) Page 283, add to Germantown West map:

GERMANTOWN TOWN CENTER TO MONTGOMERY COLLEGE BREEZEWAY				
Germantown Rd	Aircraft Dr	I-270	Separated Bikeway	Sidepath (North Side)

37) Add to North Bethesda map:

POTOMAC TO ROCK SPRING BREEZEWAY				
Democracy Blvd	I-270 Spur	Old Georgetown Rd	Separated Bikeway	Sidepath (North Side)

POTOMAC TO VEIRS MILL RD BREEZEWAY				
Montrose Rd	I-270	Hitching Post La	Separated Bikeway	Sidepath (South Side)
Hitching Post La	Montrose Rd	Swim Club Way	Separated Bikeway	Sidepath (South Side)
Swim Club Way	Hitching Post La	Trail	Separated Bikeway	Sidepath (South Side)
Trail	Swim Club Way	Montrose Pkwy	Trail	Off-Street Trail
Montrose Pkwy (MD 927)	Tildenwood La	Towne Rd	Separated Bikeway	Sidepath (North Side)

ATTACHMENT D: Numbered Redline Edits

WHITE FLINT TO ROCK SPRING BREEZEWAY				
Old Georgetown Rd	Towne Rd	I-270	Separated Bikeway	Sidepath (East Side)
Old Georgetown Rd	I-270	Democracy Blvd	Separated Bikeway	Separated Bike Lanes (Two-Way, East Side)

38) Page 321, add to Potomac map:

POTOMAC TO VEIRS MILL ROAD BREEZEWAY				
Montrose Rd	Falls Rd	I-270	Separated Bikeway	Sidepath (South Side)

39) Page 339, add to Shady Grove Metro Station map:

LIFE SCIENCES CENTER TO SHADY GROVE METRO BREEZEWAY				
City of Rockville	City of Rockville	MD 200 Ramp	Separated Bikeway	Sidepath (South Side)

40) Page 81, replace “Summary of Bikeway Recommendations (Miles) table with:

CATEGORY	BIKEWAY TYPES	EXISTING	PLANNED	TOTAL
Trails	Off-Street Trails	99	73	172
	Stream Valley Park Trails	28	0	28
	Neighborhood Connectors	11	3	14
Separated Bikeways	Shared Use Paths	117	456	573
	Separated Bike Lanes	2	97	99
Striped Bikeways	Buffered Bike Lanes		7	7
	Conventional Bike Lanes	10	15	25
	Advisory Bike Lanes			0
	Contra-Flow Bike Lanes	1	5	6
Bikeable Shoulders	Bikeable Shoulders		128	128
Shared Roads	Neighborhood Greenways		48	48
	Shared Streets		1	1
	Priority Shared Lane Markings		5	5
Total		266	839	1105

ATTACHMENT D: Numbered Redline Edits

41) Replace “Monitoring Report” table with:

Objective	Metric	Existing (2018)	Funded	Immediate	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3	Tier 4	Build Out	
Goal 1: Increase bicycling rates in Montgomery County										
1.1	Percentage of residents who commute by bicycle.	0.5% (2016)	0.5% (2016)	1%	3%	4%	6%	8%	12%	
1.2	Bicycling Rates to Transportation Management Districts	Bethesda	Data Not Yet Surveyed							
		Friendship Heights								
		North Bethesda								
		Shady Grove								
		Silver Spring								
		White Oak								
1.3	Bicycle Rates to Transit	Red Line	1.6% (2016)	1.6% (2016)	2%	4%	6%	8%	10%	15%
		Brunswick Line	TBD							
		Purple Line (planned)	TBD							
		Corridor Cities Transitway (planned)	TBD							
1.4	Bicycle Rates to Schools	Elementary Schools	Data Not Yet Surveyed							
		Middle Schools								
		High Schools								
Goal 2: Create a highly-connected, convenient and low-stress bicycling network										
2.1	Countywide Connectivity	15%	N/A	20%	25%	35%	50%	55%	85%	
2.2	Connectivity to Transit Stations	Red Line	10%	10%	20%	35%	55%	60%	65%	80%

ATTACHMENT D: Numbered Redline Edits

Objective	Metric	Existing (2018)	Funded	Immediate	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3	Tier 4	Build Out	
		Brunswick Line	10%	15%	20%	30%	50%	55%	55%	75%
		Purple Line	5%	10%	20%	30%	60%	65%	70%	75%
		Corridor Cities Transitway	0%	0%	0%	30%	35%	40%	40%	75%
2.3	Connectivity to Public Schools	Elementary Schools	40%	40%	40%	40%	40%	45%	45%	60%
		Middle Schools	25%	25%	25%	30%	30%	35%	35%	55%
		High Schools	15%	15%	15%	15%	20%	20%	25%	35%
2.4	Connectivity to Public Facilities	Public Libraries	10%	10%	15%	20%	35%	45%	50%	85%
		Recreation Centers	15%	15%	15%	20%	25%	30%	35%	70%
		Recreational and Regional Parks	25%	25%	25%	30%	30%	45%	50%	75%
2.5	Rails Stations with Bicycle Parking Stations	Red Line	0	0	0	4	8	11	11	11
		MARC Brunswick Line	0	0	0	2	4	5	5	5
		Purple Line	0	0	0	2	5	7	7	7
		Corridor Cities Transitway	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	3
2.6	Sufficient Bicycle Parking at Public Schools	Elementary Schools	0%	N/A	N/A	N/A	100%	100%	100%	100%
		Middle Schools	0%	N/A	N/A	N/A	100%	100%	100%	100%
		High Schools	0%	N/A	N/A	N/A	100%	100%	100%	100%
2.7	Sufficient Bicycle Parking in Bicycle-Pedestrian Priority Areas		15%	15%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	80%
2.8		Public Libraries	11%	11%	50%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

ATTACHMENT D: Numbered Redline Edits

Objective	Metric	Existing (2018)	Funded	Immediate	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3	Tier 4	Build Out	
	Sufficient Bicycle Parking at Public Facilities	Recreation Centers	15%	15%	50%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Goal 3: Provide equal access to low-stress bicycling for all members of the community										
3.1	Connectivity to Low Income Areas		15%	N/A	20%	25%	35%	45%	50%	80%
Goal 4: Improve the safety of bicycling										
4.1	The number of bicycling fatalities and serious injuries per year.		20 (2016)	0 by 2030 (per Vision Zero Action Plan)						