

Attachment E: Final Responses to Public Testimony

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony	Planning Board Decision
General					
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.	No change.
2	Cost Estimates	WABA	N/A	Want cost estimates and County Executive and County Council commitment to funding the plan.	No change.
3	Abandonments	MCDOT	N/A	Consider language stating that ROW being considered for abandonment should evaluate needs and intent in the Bicycle Master Plan.	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"

Attachment E: Final Responses to Public Testimony

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony	Planning Board Decision
Table of Contents					
4	Table of Contents	MCDOT	6-7	Consider including additional reference points in the Table of Contents, particularly the Breezeway Network starting on p66.	<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>
Introduction					
5	Reference to climate change	Climate Mobilization	9	Plan needs to reference Montgomery County's climate change goals.	Page 9, add: "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 pagagraph:</p> <p>"The network will be augmented by unseparated bikeways that allow particularly efficient travel by confident cyclists, for both transportation and recreation."</p>	<p>Page 9, Add to the end of the second paragraph:</p> <p>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 alread low-stress.	No change.

Attachment E: Final Responses to Public Testimony

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony	Planning Board Decision
Defining the Vision					
8	Goals & Objectives	Greater Colesville Citizens Assoc, Richardson	20-33	Objectives need to state what actions are going to be taken to achieve them.	No change.
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.	No change.
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.	No change.
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.	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.	No change.
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).	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 files" 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.

Attachment E: Final Responses to Public Testimony

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony	Planning Board Decision
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>	No change.
15	Metric 2.2	MCDOT	25	Consider excluding rural stations.	No change.
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.	Page 26, Data requirement, 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%	Update metrics
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 acceptable per established guidelines."	<p>For Objectives 2.6, 2.8, Policy 2.13, and the correspondings sections of Appendix A, change:</p> <p>"...the Association of Pedestrian and Bicycle Professionals Bicycle Parking Guidelines, 2nd Edition"</p> <p>To:</p> <p>"established guidelines, such as the Association of Pedestrian and Bicycle Professionals Bicycle Parking Guidelines."</p>

Attachment E: Final Responses to Public Testimony

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony	Planning Board Decision
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?)	No change.
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]	Page 29: Remove Red Line infographic
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.	No change.
22	Equity metrics	American Heart Association	30-31	Plan needs to prioritize low and moderate-income residents.	No change.
Achieving the Vision					
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.	Add footnote to page 37.
24	Four Types of Transportation Cyclists	PBTSAC	37	Check the values for the different types of bicyclists.	No change.
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?	No change.

Attachment E: Final Responses to Public Testimony

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony	Planning Board Decision
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.	No change.
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.	No change.
28	Types of Trips	MoBike	38	Add text in support of moderate stress bicyclists.	<p>Page 38, Make these changes:</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>. This may include on-street parallel parking areas as well.</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.	No change.
30	Contraflow Bike Lanes	MCDOT	55	Contraflow Bike Lanes - Consider including Glenbrook Road from Bradley Blvd to Fairfax as an example	Page 49: Add Glenbrook Road as an example of a separated bike lane.
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.	No change.
32	Bikeable Shoulders	MoBike	56	Remove the benefit that states "intended primarily for recreational bicyclists", which sounds more like a limitation than a benefit.	Page 56: revise the bullet to say: "Increase the comfort of recreational bicycling."

Attachment E: Final Responses to Public Testimony

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony	Planning Board Decision
33	Shared Street	MCDOT	60	Perhaps include Gibbs Street in the City of Rockville as an example of a shared street.	We will show an image of the DC Wharf as a local example of a shared street.
34	General Bikeway Application	MCDOT	64	2nd Paragraph - Remove the words "facility planning"	Page 64, second paragraph: remove "facility planning".
35	General Bikeway Application	MCDOT	65	Consider clarifying that the bottom rows for each roadway class are examples.	Page 65: Add "Example:" before each street.
36	Breezeway Network	MoBike	66	Where it says "prioritize higher speed bicycle travel between major activity centers", change "higher speed" to "more rapid".	No 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> because it can enable people to travel quickly and efficiently between distant activity centers. "	Page 66, Change: "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> because it can enable people to travel quickly and efficiently between distant activity centers. "
38	Breezeway Network	MCDOT	69	To confirm: are the minimum widths called out for in the first set of bullets specific to breezeways?	No change.
39	Breezeway Network	MCDOT	68	We believe Breezeways should not include any on-street segments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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? - We suggest that Breezeways also not include Neighborhood Greenways, particularly among streets such as Woodland Drive. 	Page 61, add the following text to the "Typical Application" section: <p>"Traffic volumes should be less than 3,000 per day and preferably closer to 1,000 vehicles per day."</p> <p>Page 71, add after the "Transitions" section: <p>"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."</p> </p>
40	Breezeway Network	MoBike	70	Make "grade separation" the top bullet, since it represents the best treatment.	Page 70, make "grade separation" the top bullet, since it represents the best treatment.
41	Breezeway Network	MCDOT	70	1st Bullet - Confirm issue relating to road noise. Is road noise from bicyclists an issue?	Page 70: delete first bullet in the "Pavement Surface" section about road noise.

Attachment E: Final Responses to Public Testimony

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony	Planning Board Decision
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.	<p>Page 71: Make 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"> • Fine grained asphalt and porous asphalt surface courses to reduce road noise. • Thickened pavement courses to accommodate vehicular loading where necessary and lengthen pavement life. • Appropriate slope for drainage. • Special treatments for tree roots. • Thickened aggregate base courses to accommodate vehicular loading where necessary and lengthen pavement life. • High modulus pavements to reduce pavement thickness. • Higher asphalt content in asphalt base courses to increase durability and fatigue resistance. • Structural enhancements for poor pavement subgrades to accommodate vehicular loading and lengthen pavement life. • Perpetual pavement technologies to lengthen pavement life. • Porous pavement to reduce ice buildup and water spray from tires. <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 within the roadway network. This priority applies to snow removal, resurfacing, sweeping and other general maintenance activities.</p>
43	Breezeway Network	MCDOT	71	1st Paragraph, after Bullets - Consider whether this paragraph's level of detail is necessary for this master plan.	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 or the State Highway Administration."	Page 71, Last Bullet: Modify: "...as these bikeways will need to be treated by Montgomery County <u>or the State Highway Administration.</u> "

Attachment E: Final Responses to Public Testimony

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony	Planning Board Decision
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.	<p>Page 73, Add:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Montrose Parkway from MD 355 to Falls Road. • Old Georgetown Road between Montrose Parkway and Democracy Boulevard. • Democracy Boulevard between Old Georgetown Road and Seven Locks Road. • Germantown Road between Aircraft Drive and Observation Drive. • Shady Grove Road between Shady Grove Access Road and Key West Avenue. <p>Page 74 - 75, add descriptions of Breezeways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • White Flint to Rock Spring: The Old Georgetown Road Breezeway connects White Flint to Rock Spring and consists of separated bike lanes and sidepaths. • Potomac to Rock Spring: 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. • Life Sciences Center to Shady Grove Metro: The Shady Grove Road Breezeway connects the Life Sciences Center to the Shady Grove Metrorail station area and consists of a sidepath.
46	Breezeway Network	MCDOT	72-75	MD 355 N and S - Conflicts with BRT? Consider parallel corridors?	Page 73, Add note: "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.	See response to Comment #45.
48	Breezeway Network	Smith, WABA	72-75	Need a Breezeway corridor in R&D Village on Shady Grove Road.	See response to Comment #45.
49	Breezeway Network	MCDOT	72-75	Montrose Pkwy - Consider extending to the Germantown/Grosvenor Exelon Transmission Corridor.	See response to Comment #45.
50	Breezeway Network	MCDOT	73	US 29 - Consider maximum use of the Old Columbia Pike corridor.	See response to #46.

Attachment E: Final Responses to Public Testimony

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony	Planning Board Decision
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.	Page 73 to 75, change the names of corridors to: 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: Potomac to Veirs Mill Road Randolph Rd becomes: Veirs Mill Road 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.	No change.
53	Breezeway Network	MoBike	74	The Germantown-Grosvenor breezeway should not count on Tuckerman Lane as a connection.	No change.
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.	No change.
55	Breezeway Network	Keltz	75	ICC Trail should follow the highway, not deviate onto local roads.	No change.
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).	No change.
57	Breezeway Network	MoBike	75	Add Midcounty Highway to the ICC Breezeway, creating a connection all the way to Clarksburg.	No change.
58	Breezeway Network	MoBike	75	Extend the Montrose Parkway Breezeway to include the Matthew Henson Trail.	No change.
59	Breezeway Network	Cullen	75	Where major roads cross trails (ex Tuckerman La at the Bethesda Trolley Trail), traffic control is needed.	No change.
60	Bikeway Recommendations	MCDOT	77	Can these mileages be broken out by roadway owner between SHA and non-SHA?	No change.
61	Bikeway Recommendations	MCDOT	77	We have 4 existing separated bikeways now: Woodglen, Nebel, Spring, and Glenbrook.	No change.
62	Bikeway Recommendations	MCDOT	77	We have 2 contraflow bike lanes: Glenbrook and Cedar.	Page 77, Round up existing contra-flow bike lanes to 1 mile.
63	Bicycle Parking	MCDOT	81	Typo of "Recreattion" under Short-Term / Entertainment.	Page 81: Correct the spelling of "Recreattion"
64	Bicycle Parking	MCDOT	83	1st Paragraph - Consider rephrasing "Up to 10 bicycles can <u>securely</u> fit..."	Page 83, 1st paragraph, change to: "Up to 10 bicycles can <u>securely</u> fit..."

Attachment E: Final Responses to Public Testimony

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony	Planning Board Decision
65	Bicycle Parking	MCDOT	88	Consider calling for covered bike parking at the MARC stations Barnesville and Dickerson.	Page 89, add note: "3. Short-term bicycle parking should be covered."
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).	Page 90: Remove Gateway Center and Manekin Station bike stations.
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?	No change.
68	Programs	MCDOT	93	Implementation is also achieved through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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 	Page 96, Add two programs at the end: 1.10 Additional MCDOT Programs 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 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.	Page 94, Program 1.2: Remove the text "Phase II" from the first sentence.
70	Programs	MCDOT	94	Program 1.2 - Consider amending the first sentence to read "facility planning or other concept study"	Page 94, Program 1.2: Consider amending the first sentence to read "facility planning or other concept study"
71	Programs	MCDOT	94	Program 1.3 - There are now more than 70 bikeshare stations.	Page 94, Program 1.3: Change '50' to '70'
72	Programs	MCDOT	95	Program 1.4 - Consider referencing the Pedestrian Bike Traffic Safety Advisory Committee (PBTSAC)	Page 96, Add this program: 1.12 Pedestrian Bicycle Traffic Safety Advisory Committee 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

Attachment E: Final Responses to Public Testimony

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony	Planning Board Decision
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"	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"
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.	Add a new policy to pages 104 - 114: "School Site Selection 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"
75	Policies	MCDOT	105	Policy 1.1 - Change the Lead Agency to CountyStat.	Page 105, Policy 1.1 - Change the Lead Agency to CountyStat.
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.	Page 107, Policy 2.1, Change: '15 mph' 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"	Page 107, Policy 2.2, Change the "justification" to: "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.	Page 108, Policy 2.4: Replace first sentence 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 E: Final Responses to Public Testimony

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony	Planning Board Decision
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 there 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>	<p>Page 109, Policy 2.7, add this language to the bottom of the first paragraph:</p> <p>"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."</p>
80	Policies	MCDOT	108	<p>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]</p>	<p>Page 108, Policy 2.6, Change as follows:</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>libraries, parks and recreation centers on all roads where it is legal to ride a bicycle.</p>
81	Policies	MCDOT	108	<p>Policy 2.6 - Swap the lead agencies: MNCPPC first; DOT 2nd</p>	<p>Page 108, Policy 2.6: Swap the lead agencies: MNCPPC first; DOT 2nd</p>
82	Policies	MCDOT	109	<p>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.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Attachment E: Final Responses to Public Testimony

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony	Planning Board Decision
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.	<p>Page 110, Replace Policy 2.10 with:</p> <p>Policy 2.10: Extending Separated Bike Lanes through Intersections</p> <p>Where motorists to cross paths with bicyclists, intersection designs should be chosen for their ability to minimize the following at the point of conflict:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <p>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-volume streets. Should best—practices change, the most recent guidance for these designs should be applied.</p>
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.	No change.
85	Policies	MCDOT	111	Policy 2.12 - Include MDOT SHA as an additional Lead Agency.	Page 111, Policy 2.12: Include MDOT SHA as an additional Lead Agency.
86	Policies	MCDOT	112	Policy 2.15 - Include MDOT SHA as an additional Lead Agency.	Page 112, Policy 2.15: Include MDOT SHA as an additional Lead Agency.
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.	Page 113, Policy 2.17: Delete policy.
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.	Page 113, Policy 2.18: Delete policy.
Implementing the Vision					
89	Strong Bicycling Community	MCDOT	118	2nd Paragraph - Delete "government" in the first sentence.	Page 118, 2nd Paragraph: Delete "government" in the first sentence.
90	Task Force	MCDOT	120	Task Force - We suggest that this be led by MNCPPC, as per other master plans.	Page 120, 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.	Page 120, Add WMATA and MTA as members of task force

Attachment E: Final Responses to Public Testimony

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony	Planning Board Decision
92	Small Area Plans	MCDOT	120	Small Area Infra Plans - Need to identify the level of effort involved in identified projects.	No change.
93	Design Standards	MCDOT	121-122	Avoid prescribing pavement design requirements.	Page 121-122, Change as follows: 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. 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.
94	Design Standards	MCDOT	123	Considerations - Delete "wide"	No change.
95	Design Standards	MCDOT	129	Rigid bollards are not recommended due to collision (and potential projectile) risks.	Page 129, Remove entire page about Rigid Bollards.
96	Design Standards	Greater Colesville Citizens Assoc, Richardson		The plan violates Montgomery County's road design standards.	No change.
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	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".	Page 134, In the short paragraph before the numbered list, remove the two uses of the word "facility".
99	Implementation Mechanism	MCDOT	134	Numbered List, #1 - Remove the word "facility".	Page 134, Numbered List, #1 - Remove the word "facility".

Attachment E: Final Responses to Public Testimony

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony	Planning Board Decision
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.	<p>Page 135, Blue Box: Change the “Facility Planning Process” description to more broadly describe the “Transportation Project Development Process” as follows:</p> <p>“Montgomery County Department of Transportation’s (MCDOT) Transportation Project Development Process</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). 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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Capital Funding Process</u>: 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. • <u>Planning & Analysis (Facility Planning Phase I)</u>: 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. • <u>Preliminary Design and Engineering (Facility Planning Phase II & 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. • <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. • <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.”

Attachment E: Final Responses to Public Testimony

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony	Planning Board Decision
101	Implementation Mechanism	Dalrymple	136	Separated bicycle facilities and protected intersections are an allowable credit under the County Code.	Page 136: Remove the sentence: "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."
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.	Page 136, 1st Paragraph, 1st Sentence: "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 environmental 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.	See response to #101.
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.	Page 136, Second Paragraph, Change to: "For on-road striped bikeways, the developer must also pave <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.	Page 136: "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 <u>also contribute</u> 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 <u>for improvements to the local bikeway network</u> to implement bikeway projects within the vicinity of the right of way frontage of the development project."
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.	Page 140, 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).	See response to Comment #106.

Attachment E: Final Responses to Public Testimony

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony	Planning Board Decision
108	Implementing Separated Bike Lanes	MCDOT	142	Table - The type of bikeway may affect the priority of treatments used.	See response to Comment #106.
109	Prioritization	MCDOT	144	Consider including Breezeways in these priorities.	No change.
110	Prioritization	MCDOT	145	Consider highlighting breezeways in this graphic.	No change.
111	Prioritization	Washington Grove, Shady Grove Advisory Committee, Everhart, Allen	145-182	Increase the prioritization of this trail from Tier 3 to Tier 1.	Change priority per staff recommendations.
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).	Increase priority of New Hampshire Avenue bikeway, between I-495 and Prince George's County, to Tier 3.
113	Prioritization	Allen	145-182	Small gaps that need higher priority between Rockville and Gaithersburg, especially over I-370.	Increase the priority of Industrial Dr and Gaither Rd between I-370 and Shady Grove Rd to Tier 2.
114	Prioritization	City of Takoma Park		Designate Flower-Piney Branch and Takoma/Langley Crossroads bikeways as Tier 1 instead of Tier 2.	Make these Tier 1 projects: 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)	Page 146, First sentence, Change to "Programmed bikeways include those that are completely or partially funded for <u>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)	No change.

Attachment E: Final Responses to Public Testimony

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony	Planning Board Decision
117	Prioritization	MCDOT	148	Confirm mileage & limits of the Woodmont Ave bikeway; something here isn't correct.	No change.
118	Prioritization	MCDOT	155	Confirm mileage & limits of the Woodmont Ave bikeway; something here isn't correct.	No change.
Monitoring the Vision					
119	Monitoring Report	WABA, Dennis	26	The plan falls short on connectivity to schools, libraries and recreation centers.	<p>Assume that residential streets with sidewalks are bikeable. Keep sidepaths recommendations on residential streets. Where it is impossible to implement the sidepath recommendation, recommend traffic calming.</p> <p>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."</p>
120	Monitoring Report	MCDOT	193	Monitoring should consider how to track and relate to capital expenditures.	Page 193, Add bullet at the bottom of the page: "Expenditures on bikeway improvements."

Attachment E: Final Responses to Public Testimony

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony	Planning Board Decision
Bikeway Recommendations					
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.	Page 318, Add note to Batchellor's Forest Road bikeway: "This bikeway recommendation is advisory only until such time as the Rustic Road designation is removed."
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	No change
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

Attachment E: Final Responses to Public Testimony

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony	Planning Board Decision
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.	In the transmittal letter, state: 1. Adjust the public benefits point system for the Commercial - Residential (CR) zone to account for bicycle infrastructure, including both bikeways and bicycle parking stations. 2. Council should consider legislation that provides an offset for all transportation infrastructure that are required to be constructed as part of development approvals.
Appendix A: Detailed Monitoring Report					
126	Objectives	MCDOT	A-2 to A-30	Consider discussing the level of investment needed for each objective to be met.	Metrics will be updated.
127	Tables	City of Takoma Park	A-33	The connectivity to Takoma Park ES should increase by more than 3% by 2033.	No change.
Appendix B: Bicycle Facility Design Toolkit					
128	Interstate Ramps	Dennis	N/A	The plan needs to articulate ways for bicyclists and pedestrians to safely cross interstate ramps.	Page 79, add a third bullet at the end of the page that says: "Geometric changes."
129	Separated Bike Lanes	MoBike	B-11	Add these considerations: o Likelihood of pedestrian encroachment, in particular when the barrier is parked cars or the facility is at sidewalk level adjacent to the sidewalk. 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.	No change.
130	Separated Bike Lanes	MCDOT	B.11	"Less likely ned for signal modifications" -- Only for one-way separated bike lanes	No change.
131	Conventional Bike Lanes	MCDOT	B.14	Conventional bike lanes might be used in addition to sidepaths (see comment on p108-109)	No change.
132	Bikeable Shoulders	MCDOT	B.17	Last Bullet - rephrase as "must comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act or seek a wavier"	Appendix B, Page 17, Last Bullet - rephrase as: "must comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act or seek a waiver."
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 signaled would be prohibited from turning left on red even without a sign.	Appendix B, Page 26: 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.

Attachment E: Final Responses to Public Testimony

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony	Planning Board Decision
134	Protected Intersections	MCDOT	B.28	Guidance #6 - This is a standard action; why is this being called out on this page?	No change.
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".	Appendix B, page 36: Change "may only" 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.	<p>Add policy to page 113:</p> <p>Enable Traffic Calming and Access Restrictions on Neighborhood Greenways</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>
137	Loading Zones	WABA		Add guidance related to loading zones.	<p>We recommend adding a policy to pages 114:</p> <p>Loading Zones</p> <p>Develop a policy on loading zones that minimizes conflicts and increases safety for pedestrians and bicyclists, including steps that encourage loading zones to be located on-site and that consolidate 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 Department</p>

Attachment E: Final Responses to Public Testimony

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony	Planning Board Decision
Appendix C: Issue Papers					
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 & 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>	<p>Page 78, add: "Floating Bus Stops In this design, the bus 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 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)	No change.
140	Dual Bikeways	MoBike	C-48	Portions of River Road are retained as a dual bikeways in the plan, so remove this example.	No change.
Appendix I: Breezeway Network					
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.	No change.
Other					
142		Helms	N/A	The plan needs better integration with Montgomery County's Vision Zero plan.	No change.
143		Everhart	N/A	This Level of Traffic Stress on Crabbs Branch Way should be reduced. It is currently rated "high" stress.	No change.
144		Hoffer	N/A	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.	No change.
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".	No change.

Attachment E: Final Responses to Public Testimony

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony	Planning Board Decision
Non-Master Plan Issues					
146		Nuttycombe	N/A	County should insist that bikeshare providers maintain a higher standard of care in monitoring where their product winds up.	No change.
147		PBTSAAC	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.	No change.
148		Greater Colesville Citizens Assoc, Richardson	N/A	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.	No change.
149		Greater Colesville Citizens Assoc, Richardson	N/A	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.	No change.
150		Greater Colesville Citizens Assoc, Richardson	N/A	Would substantially increase the amount of stormwater runoff.	No change.
151		Greater Colesville Citizens Assoc, Richardson	N/A	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.	No change.
152		Greater Colesville Citizens Assoc, Richardson	N/A	The cost of the bike plan is excessive and the budget is insufficient to implement it.	No change.
153		Greater Colesville Citizens Assoc, Richardson	N/A	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.	No change.
154		Greater Colesville Citizens Assoc, Richardson	N/A	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.	No change.

Attachment E: Final Responses to Public Testimony

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony	Planning Board Decision
General Bikeway Recommendations					
155		MoBike	General	Would prefer to see "dual bikeways", which include both an off-road bikeway (sidepath) and an on-road bikeway (conventional bike lanes or bikeable shoulders).	No change
156		MoBike	General	Nuance on "qualified dual bikeways" – Where existing shoulders (or bike lanes) get frequent use, comprise parts of longer road routes, etc. but a separated bikeway (usually a path) is a "must have", I still want the plan to call for both facilities, with a note saying the path is higher priority. I call these "qualified dual bikeways". They are often connectors to rural areas or link distant centers. I know this isn't the plan's approach currently, but it's really equivalent. It's more likely to ensure that designers try to preserve the shoulders when adding a path or making intersection improvements. I'm trying hard to ensure no loss of existing shoulders on these important routes, while acknowledging the need for low stress facilities.	No change
157		MoBike	General	Trails shown in the plan – I don't know why Parks only wanted four trails shown on this plan, but some other hard surface trails are important to show, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • North Branch Trail/Upper Rock Creek Trail • Lake Frank/Lake Needwood trails • East Gude Drive-Lake Needwood connector trail • Northwest Branch Trail • Muddy Branch Trail 	Page 78, Replace Park Trails paragraph with: 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. <u>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.</u>
158		MoBike	General	Shared use paths and/or protected bike lanes can: 1) be more cumbersome and slower than the roadway, 2) have more pedestrian conflicts, 3) be less safe at higher speeds, 4) make it harder to get around obstacles, and 4) ultimately still have stressful intersections.	No change
159		Helms	General	Better integration with Trails Plan, including current and planned trail plan bicycle infrastructure (hardscape and natural) as well as identifying targeted trails linking communities to services.	See response to Comment #157.
160		Malec, Peters	General	The plan should include existing and new park trails.	See response to Comment #157.

Attachment E: Final Responses to Public Testimony

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony	Planning Board Decision
161		WABA	General	The plan relies too heavily on sidepaths. If built to standards of existing sidepaths they will not be attraction for many bicyclists. MCDOT needs to implement sidepath to the standards recommended in plan. To alleviate this concern, the plan should recommend separated bike lanes in more locations.	No change
162		Migdall	General	Add language such as: "A bikeway segment not identified in the Plan may be implemented if it offers significant benefit to the plan and its goals."	Make change
163		Migdall	General	Add language such as: "if during the design of a bikeway, the specific route or type is found to entail costs or impacts disproportion to its benefits, then an alternative route or type that serves the same general purpose and need may be built and would be consistent with this plan."	No change
164		Nuckols	Multiple	Provide bike lanes on Beach Drive and close to traffic on weekends / holidays.	No change

Attachment E: Final Responses to Public Testimony

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony	Planning Board Decision
165		Tull	General	Prefers separated bike lanes outside of the curb as opposed to in the road. For example, why is Montgomery County considering separated bike lanes in the road on 2nd Avenue and Wayne Ave, when the Silver Spring Green Trail already exists as a separated bikeway (for example, along the Discovery Building). Providing separation with paint and flexible posts (as was done on Spring Street) represent a downgrade.	No change
166		Knudson	General	Please coordinate with the rural & rustic roads program and identify our most precious bikeways (such as Peach Tree Road, Whites Store Road), then create a bicycling preservation designation that 1) prevents these roads from being widened to ruin their scenic value and 2) create signage and pavement striping to alert motorists and inform cyclists that this is a Bikes-First corridor.	No change
167		Warner	General	Need bike lanes on Georgia Ave, especially between Seminary Pl and Wheaton.	No change
168		Gerharz	General	Get feedback from actual bicyclists and bicycle groups to make sure plan is feasible.	No change
169		MoBike	General	Believes that bikeable shoulders, conventional bike lanes and shared lanes are better for confident riders and that sidepaths and separated bike lanes can be problematic for experienced riders, due to pedestrian encroachment, cars pulling out from side streets and debris and because sidepaths and separated bike lanes will slow them down.	No change
170		Genn	General	Be careful about analyzing bicycle mobility in isolation (other competing uses of public right-of-way need to consider pedestrians, transit, autonomous vehicles, etc). Bicycling projects will increase costs of development projects, which hurts affordability.	No change
171		Genn	General	Competing objectives: How do we maintain affordability in housing if bikeway infrastructure increases project costs?	No change
172		Hall	General	Bikeway lighting needs to be improved.	No change

Attachment E: Final Responses to Public Testimony

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony	Planning Board Decision
Aspen Hill Policy Area					
173		MCDOT	226	Consider whether the Renn St Sidepath should be extended eastward to Parkland Dr.	No change
174		MCDOT	226	I'm not sure how these separated bikeways will fit within the existing paving section. It doesn't appear that additional ROW will be acquired as they are established neighborhoods. Also, the road classifications appears to be tertiary or secondary residential. A sidepath may be a better solution.	No change
Bethesda CBD Policy Area					
175		MCDOT	232	Consider showing the ped/bike connection between Montgomery Ave the CCT / Lynn Dr as a more definitive path.	No change
176		MoBike	232	Wisconsin Ave from Bradley to Nottingham Dr – Widen the sidewalk on the west side of Wisconsin for this block to help get riders from downtown Bethesda to Nottingham Drive so they can easily get to the Stratford/Warwick greenway.	No change
177		Barron	232	Show that Stratford is not an unofficial continuation of the Bike Trail and that folks should travel down the park to the Capital Crescent Trail or out to Wisconsin Avenue.	Page 232: Extend the trail to Norwood Drive and removing the arrow.
Bethesda-Chevy Chase East Policy Area					
178		Filice	236	Need a direct connection along Norwood Rd / Stratford Rd / Warwick Pl / Fallstone Ave / Vinton Park / Park Ave	Page 236: Add Norwood Rd / Stratford Rd / Warwick Pl / Fallstone Ave / Vinton Park / Park Ave bikeway as guidance in appendix.
179		MoBike	236	Stratford/Warwick Greenway (or whatever you want to call it) – What happened to this? It was in the previous plan draft and is important. These streets connect Norwood to Dorset and to the Vinton Park Connector to Friendship Heights at the south end. The cut-thru path from Hunt to Drummond is usable but should be made more bike-friendly is possible.	See response to Comment #178.

Attachment E: Final Responses to Public Testimony

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony	Planning Board Decision
180		MoBike	236	Norwood Neighborhood Connector (Chevy Chase Dr to Norwood Dr) – Needs to be shown on both the Bethesda CBD and Bethesda East maps, and it's split across tables which is a little confusing. While useful, this cut-thru is very narrow to be a major bike route. What's needed is a wide path on the west side of Wisconsin from Bradley to at least Nottingham, and a good path from the west end of Nottingham to the Norwood/Stratford intersection. Then cyclists can get on the Stratford/Warwick Greenway.	See response to Comment #178.
181		MoBike	236	Vinton Park Connector – I say again, this path is of critical importance for access to Friendship Heights. It should be upgraded or at least acknowledged. Linking it to the Westbard Ave trail would be a bonus but would require a bridge.	See response to Comment #178.
182		Raskin, Nellis	236	Wilson Lane is too narrow to safely add dedicated bicycle lanes or to ignore the potential danger to both drivers, riders, and pedestrians.	No change
183		Sobel	236	Implement continuous bike lane on East West Hwy from Connecticut Ave to Wisconsin Ave.	No change
184		Sobel	236	Implement continuous bike lane on Connecticut Ave from Chevy Chase Circle to Rock Creek Park/Beech Drive (and beyond).	No change
185		Wade	236	Include shared lanes / signs and bikeable shoulders on Wisconsin Ave. (Wade)	No change
186		Wade	236	Include shared lanes / signs and bikeable shoulders on Connecticut Ave. (Wade)	No change
187		Larson	236	The map is incorrect - there is no bikeway on Wisconsin Ave between Bethesda and Friendship Heights. (Larson)	No change
188		WABA	236	Provide a separated bikeway on East-West Highway from Downtown Bethesda to Beach Dr.	Page 236, Add note: "A bikeway and / or sidewalk should be considered on East-West Highway between Downtown Bethesda and Beach Drive."
189		Baskir	236	Remove the Wisconsin Av - Connecticut Ave Neighborhood Greenway (Rosemary Street, Stanford Street, East Avenue, and Leland Street)	Page 236: Remove the Wisconsin Av - Connecticut Ave Neighborhood Greenway (Rosemary Street, Stanford Street, East Avenue, and Leland Street) and add to the appendix.
190		WABA, MoBike	236	Keep the Wisconsin Av - Connecticut Ave Neighborhood Greenway.	No change
191		Ochoa	236	Community does not support a trail along the GEICO property between Willard Ave and Western Ave. They would like to keep it as a natural path. Friendship Blvd is a more logical alternative and will attract more bicyclists.	No change
192		Ochoa	236	Support separated bike lanes on Willard Ave, but instead of routing it all the way to River Road, use the existing path through the Willard Avenue Neighborhood Park so that the bikeway does not back up traffic at the intersection of River Road and Willard Avenue.	No change

Attachment E: Final Responses to Public Testimony

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony	Planning Board Decision
193		MoBike	236	Old Georgetown Rd from Greentree to Southwick – Widen the sidewalk on the WEST side to a full path in order to connect the Bethesda Trolley Trail to the Grant St greenway (in lieu of the Suburban Hospital cut-thru).	Page 236: Add sidepath on the west side of Old Georgetown Rd between Greentree Rd and Southwick St.
194		MoBike	236	Greentree Rd from Old Georgetown to Grant – Adding a path here is not feasible.	No change
195		MoBike	236	Old Georgetown Rd from Lincoln to McKinley – Widen the sidewalk on the EAST side to full path width to provide a quick connection from the Bethesda Trolley Trail to McKinley and thus Grant St.	Page 236: Add a sidepath on the east side of Old Georgetown Rd from Lincoln St to McKinley St.
196		MoBike	236	Old Georgetown Rd from Lincoln to Battery Lane – Better yet, widen the sidewalk on the EAST side to full path width for this entire segment for better connectivity to McKinley, Grant, Park Lane, the CCT, (via Maple Ridge), Battery Lane, etc. It's also a BTT alternate, since the BTT is narrow and crowded on the NIH grounds. Richard Hoye is championing this, and SHA may already be on board.	No change
197		MoBike	236	Glenbrook Road (south of Bradley Blvd) – This should be identified as a dual bikeway, because it's already a shared roadway southbound and has a contraflow bike lane northbound.	No change
198		MoBike	236	Little Falls Parkway between the CCT and Glenbrook Rd – As I said in my previous round of comments, this should be planned as a shared roadway (shoulders) as well as a separated facility. You asked why both? It's an odd situation that requires some thought, but there's a LOT of existing pavement to work with, so the shoulders basically come for free, but it could be organized a little better. Bikeable shoulders are needed to match the rest of Little Falls, which gets a ton of use by moderately confident cyclists. But a separated bikeway is needed for CCT users wanting a low-stress connection between the CCT and neighborhoods along Bradley Blvd. This should be a path or two-way protected bike lane on the west side. In reality the southbound half of the protected bike lane and the southbound shoulder could be one and the same if it's done right, but that's a design detail. There's lots of room to make it work.	No change

Attachment E: Final Responses to Public Testimony

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony	Planning Board Decision
199		MoBike	236	Little Falls Parkway south of the CCT – I said specify it as shared roadway in my last round of comments because I didn't realize we could specify bikeable shoulders. So please plan it as bikeable shoulders, because the shoulders get frequent use already. The CCT is the parallel alternative for interested but concerned cyclists.	No change
200		MoBike	236	Massachusetts Ave from Goldsboro Rd to Sangamore Rd – A path would really be suboptimal here due to driveways, and road cyclists can go quite fast downhill. It seems like "interested but concerned" riders could manage in the shoulder or use the sidewalk, or take another route entirely. The stress level is not bad until you get to Sangamore. Probably no one wants to pay for a path anyway. I would really make this a dual bikeway.	No change
201		MoBike	236	Kensington Parkway south of Beach Drive – This is another street with limited space that's difficult to master plan without more study, so facility type should be TBD. The new plan is contradictory, since the map says shared roadway, but the table says a shared use path north of Husted and protected bike lanes south of Husted. South of Husted, adding almost any bikeway would have impacts on the neighborhood. North of Husted, the best solution is one-way protected bike lanes, conventional bike lanes or shoulders – but please not just a shared use path or two-way PBLs, since this is traditionally an on-road route (and I fear I'm betraying my fellow road cyclists by saying protected bike lanes are okay). There are no easy answers from Husted south, but getting to Inverness is essential since that's an alternate route to Jones Bridge and Manor Rd. South of Inverness, it's not quite as critical.	No change
202		MoBike	236	Grafton St at Wisconsin Ave – Possibly improve this two-way cut-thru for bikes, since it's one-way "in" (eastbound) for cars and narrow.	No change
203		Barron	236	The trail between Little Falls Trail and Chevy Chase Blvd includes a staircase that is not appropriate for bikes.	No change
Bethesda Chevy Chase West Policy Area					
204		MCDOT	242	Add the Capital Crescent Trail to the MacArthur Connector.	Page 242: Add trail between Broad Street and the Capital Crescent Trail. Add note that says: "The implementation of this bikeway is contingent upon evaluation of potential impacts to park land."
205		MCDOT	242	Consider whether Burdette Rd should have defined bikeway facilities, particularly between MD 190 (River) and MD 191 (Bradley).	No change
206		MCDOT	242	Consider whether a defined connection should be provided between the Fernwood sidepath and MD 191 (Bradley).	Page 242: Extend the Fernwood Road sidepath to Bradley Blvd.

Attachment E: Final Responses to Public Testimony

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony	Planning Board Decision
207		MCDOT	242	Consider whether a defined connection should be provided between the Ewing Dr neighborhood greenway and MD 191 (Bradley).	No change
208		MCDOT	242	Consider whether a defined connection should be provided along Sangamore Rd and Brookes La, connecting between MD 386 (Mass Ave) and MacArthur Blvd and improving access to the Intelligence Campus.	No change
209		Gerharz	242	The MacArthur Blvd trail is insufficient and the bike lanes are too narrow.	No change
210		Dennis	242	MacArthur Blvd between Brickyard Rd and Falls Rd needs a shoulder in the uphill direction.	No change
211		Mellema	242	Continue the Fernwood Rd sidepath to Greentree Rd. Elevate the sidepath to Tier 1.	Page 242: Extend the Fernwood Road sidepath to Bradley Blvd.
212		Mellema	242	Add a sidepath between Fernwood Rd and Grant St. Make this a Tier 1 bikeway.	Page 242: Add a sidepath on Greenwood Rd between Fernwood Rd and Grant St.
213		Dennis	242	An alternative path to avoid the steep hill on MacArthur Blvd is needed through the River Falls subdivision.	No change
214		MoBike	242	Fernwood Road (Democracy Blvd to Marywood) – This might become a project very soon based on urgings of myself and the Fernwood community. Try not to predetermine the design now. The draft plan calls for a shared use path on the east side here, but it's a primary street that has numerous driveways, relatively slow speeds and traffic calming. Better solutions than just a path are possible. There's more flexibility north of I-495 where either protected bike lanes or a dual bikeway (path + shoulders) would work with some extra pavement. South of I-495 and on the overpass, protected bike lanes that allow pedestrian use might work as an innovation. Or try a hybrid solution, like a shared use path on the east side and a shoulder on the west side. Hard to figure all this out in a master plan. ALSO... make this Tier 1 priority. Poor WSSC restriping in the past few months has really brought this to a head.	See response to Comment #156.

Attachment E: Final Responses to Public Testimony

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony	Planning Board Decision
215		MoBike	242	River Road west of Westbard – Dave Anspacher's response to my request for a dual bikeway was "I'm okay with adding a second recommendation to this road, but we should state that it is either bike lanes or bikeable shoulders." Please say path + bike lanes. They're already marked as bike lanes. Also call for the path, which can be built if cost is reasonable. Touring/training cyclists ride to Potomac on this route, and even the strong and fearless probably don't want to take the lane here.	See response to Comment #156.
Burtonsville Policy Area					
216		MCDOT	246	Show the Burtonsville Access Road and any connector streets between the BAR and MD 198. Identify any proposed bike facilities for these streets.	Page 246: Add Burtonsville Access Road and connector streets to the map and add a sidepath on a TBD side of the road.
Chevy Chase Lake Policy Area					
217		MCDOT	248	Jones Mill Road has very high existing bicycle volumes. Consider context as to why this route is shown only as "bikeable shoulder" while there are many other roadways with lower existing volumes that are recommended as separated bikeway or striped bikeway.	No change
Clarksburg Policy Area					
218		MCDOT	250	It may be helpful to have a blow-up image of the area around Gateway Center Dr + Roberts Tavern Dr.	Page 250: Expand area in insert map.
219		MCDOT	250	Consider showing that the bikeway along B-10 (PB-10) and the bikeway along A-304/307 (PB-11) connect.	No change
220		MCDOT	250	Consider a connection along Clarksburg Square Road, at least between Overlook Park Dr and Burdette Forest Rd; perhaps along a longer span.	No change
221		MCDOT	250	Recently completed separated bikeway should be shown as Existing on Stringtown Road east of Overlook Park Drive	Page 250: Show that sidepath has been constructed on Stringtown Rd east of Overlook Dr.
222		Knudson	250	Connect Street B-10 bikeway to Cabin Branch neighborhoods	No change
Cloverly Policy Area					
223		MCDOT	256	Consider whether there should be a short trail connection between Old Orchard Rd and Norbeck Rd.	No change
224		MCDOT	256	There appears to be an existing trail connection between Notley Rd and Johnson Rd that is not reflected on this map.	No change
225		MCDOT	256	Consider whether any connections may be feasible between Gladbeck Lane and the ICC Trail, or Crest Hill La and the ICC Trail.	No change
226		MCDOT	256	Consider connecting the Notley Rd bikeway with the end of the Stonegate Dr bikeway.	No change
227		WABA	256	Ednor Rd from Norwood Rd to New Hampshire Ave should be a separated bikeway, not bikeable shoulders.	No change

Attachment E: Final Responses to Public Testimony

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony	Planning Board Decision
228		MoBike	256	Bonifant Rd – I'll reiterate what I said last year. Robust sidepathing is needed, but where to put it is the question. Either say the side (north or south) is TBD or say the path should be on the south side from Notley to Pebblestone and on the north side from Pebblestone to the ICC trail, in order to avoid driveways, provide access to the ICC trail, and cross Bonifant at a signal (Pebblestone). Whether or where to build the rest of the path west of the ICC should be TBD, depending on ICC trail analysis that's probably not in the scope of this plan.	No change
229		MoBike	256	Norbeck Rd (Layhill Rd to New Hampshire Ave) – Shoulders are worth explicitly requiring here due to the semi-rural character and role in the network. The plan was updated to note shoulders east of New Hampshire but still doesn't note them west of New Hampshire. The dual facility already exists here, and the recommended second path (on the other side of the street) seems lower priority, except between Norwood and Layhill (in front of Northwest Branch Regional Park).	Page 256: Add bikeable shoulders on Norbeck Rd between Layhill Rd and New Hampshire Ave.
230		MoBike	256	Briggs Chaney Road – This merits a dual bikeway (shoulders + path) if at all possible. It's part of a fast on-road connection between distant centers and has rural cycling implications.	No change
231		MoBike	256	Norwood Road – Qualified dual bikeway. Provides rural access and has existing shoulders, so the plan should recommend keeping the shoulders as well as adding a path. The path may be identified as higher priority.	No change
232		MoBike	256	Fairland Road - Qualified dual bikeway. Has fairly important existing shoulders, so the plan should recommend keeping the shoulders as well as adding a path. The path may be identified as higher priority (qualified dual bikeway).	No change
233		Helms	256	Bryans Nursery Neighborhood Bikeway- Norbeck -Old Orchard Neighborhood Bikeway Trail Connector FROM Bryans Nursery Neighborhood Bikeway TO Norbeck (Hard Surface Trail)	No change
234		Helms	256	Bryants Nursery FROM New Hampshire TO Norwood (Striped Bikeway)	No change
235		Helms	256	Carona FROM Notley TO Bonifant (Striped Bikeway)	No change
236		Helms	256	Cloverly Park Trail Connector FROM Rainbow TO Gallaudet (Striped Bikeway)	No change
237		Helms	256	Crest Hill FROM Briggs Chaney TO Paint Branch Trail-N(north) (Striped Bikeway)	No change
238		Helms	256	Gallaudet FROM Cloverly Park Trail Connector TO New Hampshire (Striped Bikeway)	No change

Attachment E: Final Responses to Public Testimony

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony	Planning Board Decision
239		Helms	256	Harding FROM Harding-Good Hope Trail Connector TO New Hampshire (Striped Bikeway)	No change
240		Helms	256	Harding-Good Hope Trail Connector FROM Harding TO Good Hope (Striped Bikeway)	No change
241		Helms	256	Hildegard-Peachstone- Seibel FROM Peach Orchard TO Timberlake (Striped Bikeway)	No change
242		Helms	256	Holly Spring-Kaywood FROM Peach Orchard TO Kaywood-Miles Trail Connector (Striped Bikeway)	No change
243		Helms	256	Hopefield-Kings House FROM Good Hope TO Kings House Trail Connector (Striped Bikeway)	No change
244		Helms	256	Johnson-Notley FROM Norbeck TO Bonifant (Striped Bikeway)	No change
245		Helms	256	Kaywood-Miles Trail Connector FROM Holly Spring- Kaywood TO Miles (Hard Surface Trail)	See response to Comment #157.
246		Helms	256	Kings House FROM Kings House Trail Connector TO Peach Orchard (Striped Bikeway)	No change
247		Helms	256	Kings House Trail Connector FROM Hopefield-Kings House TO Peach Orchard (Hard Surface Trail)	No change
248		Helms	256	Murphy FROM Good Hope TO Paint Branch Trail-N(west) (Striped Bikeway)	No change
249		Helms	256	Pamela Trail Connector FROM Rainbow TO Harding (Striped Bikeway)	See response to Comment #157.
250		Helms	256	Paint Branch Trail Fairland2Briggs Chaney (West) Trail Extension FROM Murphy TO Fairland (Hard Surface Trail)	See response to Comment #157.
251		Helms	256	Paint Branch Trail Fairland2Briggs Chaney Trail Extension- Bart/Ansted Spur FROM Paint Branch Trail-ICC Trail TO Briggs Chaney (Hard Surface Trail)	See response to Comment #157.
252		Helms	256	Paint Branch Trail Fairland2Briggs Chaney Trail Extension- Crest Hill Spur FROM Paint Branch Trail-ICC Trail TO Briggs Chaney (Hard Surface Trail)	See response to Comment #157.
253		Helms	256	Rainbow FROM Cloverly Park Trail Connector TO Good Hope (Striped Bikeway)	No change

Attachment E: Final Responses to Public Testimony

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony	Planning Board Decision
254		Helms	256	Thompson FROM Spencerville TO Rainbow (Striped Bikeway)	No change
255		Helms	256	Timberlake FROM Timberlake-Lions Den Trail Connector TO Hildegard- Peachstone- Seibel (Striped Bikeway)	No change
256		Helms	256	Timberlake-Lions Den Trail Connector FROM Timberlake TO Lions Den (Hard Surface Trail)	See response to Comment #157.
257		Helms	256	Timberlake-Perrywood Trail Connector FROM Hildegard- Peachstone- Seibel TO Perrywood (Hard Surface Trail)	See response to Comment #157.
Damascus Policy Area					
258		MCDOT	258	Consider whether the Oak Dr sidepath should be extended either to the utility ROW (per next comment), or along the full length of Oak Dr.	<p>Add the following on page 78:</p> <p>"Utility Corridors</p> <p>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:</p> <p>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</p> <p>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."</p>
259		MCDOT	258	Consider whether the utility ROW in this area might be proposed for a trail linking Clearspring Rd, Conrad Ct, MD 27, and Oak Dr to points westward, into Clarksburg Town Center and potentially Sugarloaf Mtn.	No change

Attachment E: Final Responses to Public Testimony

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony	Planning Board Decision
Derwood Policy Area					
260		MCDOT	260	Consider extending the Needwood Rd sidepath to Timbercrest Dr / Bethayres Rd, across the trail connector to Malabar St, and linking into Shady Grove Rd's sidepath.	No change
261		MCDOT	260	Consider highlighting trails around Needwood Lake.	No change
262		Palakovich-Carr	260	Recommends two-way separated bike lanes on the east side of Frederick Rd, between Shady Grove Road and College Parkway to be consistent with City of Rockville recommendations.	No change
Fairland-Colesville Policy Area					
263		MCDOT	264	Consider showing the Paint Branch Trail, and whether any connectivity across the stream may be warranted (perhaps extending Jackson to Cedar Hill, or connecting Pilgrim Hill Local Park and Featherwood St).	No change
264		MCDOT	264	Consider a bikeway connection between Cannon Rd and Randolph Rd.	No change
265		Helms	264	Paint Branch Trail-Menlee Trail Connector FROM Paint Branch Trail-MLK-OCP- WO Trail Connector TO Paint Branch Trail-Menlee- Milestone-Stewart Bikeway Connector (Striped Bikeway)	No change
266		Helms	264	Perrywood FROM Timberlake- Perrywood Trail Connector TO Miles-Friendlywood- Carson- Oakhurst (Striped Bikeway)	No change
267		Helms	264	Robey -Sir Thomas Trail Connector FROM Robey TO Sir Thomas (Hard Surface Trail)	Page 264: Add neighborhood connector between Robey Rd and Sir Thomas Rd.
268		Helms	264	Ballinger FROM Robey TO Wexhall (Striped Bikeway)	No change
269		Helms	264	Briarcliff Manor Way FROM Miles- Friendlywood- Carson-Oakhurst TO Lions Den (Striped Bikeway)	No change
270		Helms	264	Briggs Chaney-Tapestry Trail FROM Briggs Chaney TO Wexhall (Hard Surface Trail)	No change

Attachment E: Final Responses to Public Testimony

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony	Planning Board Decision
271		Helms	264	Cannon Road/Shaw Road/Springloch Dr/Springtree Dr FROM Randolph TO E Randolph (Striped Bikeway)	No change
272		Helms	264	Castle FROM Briggs Chaney TO Ballinger (Striped Bikeway)	No change
273		Helms	264	Castle-Ballinger Trail Connector FROM Castle TO Ballinger (Hard Surface Trail)	No change
274		Helms	264	Cotton Tree Lane/Blackburn/Tolson FROM N-FRP Trail TO Old Columbia Pike (Striped Bikeway)	No change
275		Helms	264	Fairdale FROM Miles TO Briggs Chaney (Striped Bikeway)	No change
276		Helms	264	Galway FROM Fairland TO Calverton (Striped Bikeway)	No change
277		Helms	264	Leister/Billington Rd/Laurie/Montclair/Downs FROM E Randolph TO Jackson (Striped Bikeway)	No change
278		Helms	264	Lions Den FROM Timberlake-Lions Den Trail Connector TO Spencerville (Striped Bikeway)	No change
279		Helms	264	McKnew/Cotton Tree Trail Bridge FROM N-Fairland Regional Park Trail TO Sparrow House/McKnee (Hard Surface Trail)	See response to Comment #157.
280		Helms	264	Miles FROM Kaywood-Miles Trail Connector TO Old Columbia Pike (Striped Bikeway)	No change
281		Helms	264	Miles-Friendlywood-Carson- Oakhurst FROM Fairdale TO Oakhurst-Praisner- Briarcliff Manor Trail Connector (Striped Bikeway)	No change
282		Helms	264	North Extension Fairland Regional Park Trail (N- FRPT) FROM Cotton Tree/Blackburn TO Greencastle (Hard Surface Trail)	See response to Comment #157.
283		Helms	264	Notley FROM New Hampshire TO ICC (Striped Bikeway)	No change
284		Helms	264	Northwest Branch Trail-West Trail to Springbrook Dr Bridge Connector FROM Northwest Branch Trail TO Springbrook (Hard Surface Trail)	No change
285		Helms	264	Oakhurst FROM Miles- Friendlywood- Carson-Oakhurst TO Old Columbia Pike (Striped Bikeway)	No change

Attachment E: Final Responses to Public Testimony

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony	Planning Board Decision
286		Helms	264	Oakhurst-Praisner-Briarcliff Manor Trail Connector FROM Miles-Friendlywood- Carson-Oakhurst TO Briarcliff Manor Way (Hard Surface Trail)	See response to Comment #157.
287		Helms	264	Paint Branch Trail-Menlee-Milestone- Stewart Bikeway Connector FROM Stewart TO Paint Branch Trail (Striped Bikeway)	No change
288		Helms	264	Paint Branch Trail-MLB-OCP-WO Underpass US29 FROM Paint Branch Trail TO Old Columbia Pike (Hard Surface Trail)	See response to Comment #157.
289		Helms	264	Paint Branch Trail-MLK-OCP-WO Trail Connector FROM Jackson TO Old Columbia Pike (Hard Surface Trail)	See response to Comment #157.
290		Helms	264	Quaint Acres FROM Northwest Branch Trail TO New Hampshire (Striped Bikeway)	No change
291		Helms	264	Serpentine Way FROM Fairland TO E Randolph (Striped Bikeway)	No change
292		Helms	264	Springbrook FROM Northwest Branch Trail Bridge TO New Hampshire (Striped Bikeway)	No change
293		Helms	264	Tamarack FROM Fairland TO E Randolph (Striped Bikeway)	No change
294		Helms	264	US29 Bikeway Milestone- Hillwood Extension FROM Stewart TO Lockwood (Separated Bikeway)	No change
295		Helms	264	US29-Red Cedar Trail Connector FROM Red Cedar TO US29 (Hard Surface Trail)	No change
296		Helms	264	Vierling-Scott-Locksley- Hawkesbury FROM Notley TO Randolph (Striped Bikeway)	No change
297		Helms	264	Wexhall FROM N-FRP Trail TO US29 (Striped Bikeway)	No change
298		Bokow	General	There is insufficient space for US 29 bikeway, especially is bus rapid transit is going to be implemented.	No change
299		Greater Colesville Citizens Assoc	264	A sidepath is not needed on Cannon Road as young children can ride on the sidewalk and teenagers can ride in the street.	No change

Attachment E: Final Responses to Public Testimony

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony	Planning Board Decision
300		Greater Colesville Citizens Assoc	264	Neighborhood greenway is 1) undesirable as it would limited auto access for local residents, 2) unneeded since adults can bicycle in the street today and kids can ride on sidewalks.	No change
301		Deegan	264	Would support neighborhood greenway on Autumn Dr if: 1) neighborhood safety is maintained and on-street parking is preserved.	No change
302		Winter	264	Investigate a crossing of Northwest Branch between Colesville Rd and Randolph Rd.	No change
Friendship Heights CBD Policy Area					
304		MCDOT	268	While we support the proposal, note that Western Ave is under jurisdiction of DC. This facility should only be shown if it is included in DC's Bike Plan, and should also not be accounted for in the total proposed mileage (as this may skew the fiscal estimate).	No change
305		Village of Friendship Heights, Somerset House Condo Assoc	268	Remove bikeway on Somerset Terrace, as this is a private street.	Page 268: Remove the bikeway from Somerset Terrace, but include in the appendix as guidance.
306		Village of Friendship Heights, Tauben	268	Separated bike lanes on South Park Ave (North Park Ave to Willard Ave) and Friendship Blvd (South Park Ave to Somerset Terrace) are unsafe and impractical because commercial vehicles need to occupy curb lane on daily basis and because of the large number are elderly persons crossing the street.	Page 268: Remove the bikeway from South Park Ave (North Park Ave to Willard Ave) and Friendship Blvd (South Park Ave to Somerset Terrace), but include in the appendix as guidance.
307		Village of Friendship Heights	268	Concerned that separated bike lanes on the north side of Willard Ave will conflict with truck access to buildings on the north side of the street.	No change
Germantown East Policy Area					
308		MoBike	274	Germantown Rd/Watkins Mill Rd (MD 355 to Stedwick Rd) – Qualified dual bikeway. Important Gaithersburg-Germantown link and occasional rural connector. Plan should probably recommend shoulders as well as the path, though path is higher priority. This is not a critical dual bikeway however.	No change

Attachment E: Final Responses to Public Testimony

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony	Planning Board Decision
Germantown Town Center Policy Area					
309		MCDOT	278	Middlebrook Locbury to Crystal Rock notes TWO-way Separated Bikeway on east side of Roadway but Seneca Valley HS is on west side. Should we have bikeway on west side?	No change
310		WABA	278	There should be bikeways on both sides of Germantown Road road to avoid forcing bicyclists to cross the road.	No change
Germantown West Policy Area					
311		WABA	282	There should be bikeways on both sides of Germantown Road to avoid forcing bicyclists to cross the road.	No change
312		WABA	282	There should be bikeways on both sides of Great Seneca Hwy to avoid forcing bicyclists to cross the road.	No change
313		WABA	282	There should be bikeways on both sides of Middlebrook Rd to avoid forcing bicyclists to cross the road.	No change
314		MoBike	282	Corridor Cities Transitway Trail – Is this not going to be a quality trail that could be identified as a breezeway?	No change
315		MoBike	282	Schaeffer Rd (Clopper Rd to Richter Farm Rd) – Qualified dual bikeway (path higher priority) if not an actual full dual bikeway. Important rural connector. Plan should recommend keeping existing shoulders as well as adding a path.	No change
Glenmont Policy Area					
316		MCDOT	286	Parts of Layhill Road Path and bicycle lanes are existing between Glenallan and Briggs	Page 286: Show existing bike lanes on Layhill Rd.
317		MCDOT	286	Not to necessarily disagree with the proposed routing, but clarify the benefits of the Breezeway being offset along Flack St instead of remaining continuously along Georgia Ave.	No change
Grosvenor Policy Area					
318		Crist	290	Remove the Montrose Ave sidepath, as it will not fit in the right-of-way.	No change

Attachment E: Final Responses to Public Testimony

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony	Planning Board Decision
Kensington-Wheaton Policy Area					
319		MCDOT	292	Consider a blow-up of the Forest Glen Metro area. It is not clear where the separated bikeway along Georgia is intended to be, nor the trail shown immediately east of it.	No change
320		MCDOT	292	Consider a blow-up of the Kensington area, which is slightly too busy to discern each line with reliable acuity.	Page 292: Add blow-up map of the Kensington area.
321		Helms	292	Lamberton Sq - Greencastle Ridge FROM Lamberton Square TO Greencastle Ridge (Hard Surface Trail)	See response to Comment #157.
322		Helms	292	Northwest Branch Trail-West Trail FROM Northwest Branch Trail Bridge Connector 2 TO Kemp Mill (Hard Surface Trail)	See response to Comment #157.
323		Helms	292	Alderton-Trivoli Lake FROM Bonifant TO Randolph (Striped Bikeway)	No change
324		Helms	292	Brookhaven-Stonington- Hermleigh FROM Northwest Branch Trail TO Kemp Mill (Striped Bikeway)	No change
325		Helms	292	Lamberton FROM Arcola TO Northwest Branch Trail (Striped Bikeway)	No change
326		Helms	292	Monticello-Conti-NHS- Caddington-Gabel-Tenbrook FROM Lamberton TO Dennis (Striped Bikeway)	No change
327		Helms	292	Northwest Branch Trail Bridge Connector 2 FROM Quant Acres TO Lamberton (Hard Surface Trail)	No change
328		Greater Colesville Citizens Assoc	292	Plan recommends a sidepath on both sides of Briggs Chaney Road from Old Columbia Pike to Prince George's Co. There is not enough demand to justify sidepath on north side of road.	No change
329		Bucholz	292	The proposed bikeway on Capitol View Ave should follow the existing road alignment, not the alignment in the 1982 Capitol View Sector Plan.	Page 292, add note to bikeway recommendation that says: "This bikeway can be constructed on either the existing or master-planned alignments of Capitol View Avenue."
330		Warner	292	Need a bikeway on Capitol View Ave.	No change
331		MoBike	292	Kensington Parkway north of Beach Drive – Were priority shared lanes going to be the recommendation, as hinted by your response to my previous comment on this road? If not, would advisory bike lanes work, or is traffic too heavy?	No change

Attachment E: Final Responses to Public Testimony

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony	Planning Board Decision
332		Warner	292	Need a safe crossing of Connecticut Ave in Kensington.	No change
333		Warner	292	Need a hard surface trail from Shorfield Rd / Orebaugh Ave to Glenallen Ave via Wheaton Regional Park.	No change
334		Wade	292	Include shared lanes / signs and bikeable shoulders on Connecticut Ave.	No change
335		Herr	292	Add a new bike path from the terminus of Kenton Drive, through the western portion of Pleasant View park to the public parking lot at the end of Upton Drive.	No change
336		Reis	292	Would like designated space for bicycling in the road on Randolph Road between New Hampshire and Georgia Avenue, particularly in the downhill direction.	No change
337		MoBike	292	Knowles Ave (Beach to Summit) – Explicitly recommend shoulders, as the earlier draft did. This is a road biking route from Beach Drive to Kensington (Plyers Mill path is the off-road alternative). But if a path is still needed, put it on the north side and leave the uphill shoulder as a climbing lane on the south side of the roadway. FYI, the road runs east-west, not north-south. Cyclists can use the travel lane downhill.	No change
338		MoBike	292	Plyers Mill Road Path (Plyers Mill Rd to Beach Drive) – This important connector is not shown on the plan map.	Show in Kensington blow-up map
339		MoBike	292	Plyers Mill Road (Georgia to Amherst) – If Plyers Mill west of Georgia is a separated bikeway, this segment probably should be too, due to traffic volume and turning movements.	Page 292: change the recommendation from neighborhood greenway to sidepath for the one block on Plyers Mill Rd between Georgia Ave and Amherst Ave.
340		MoBike	292	Sligo Creek Trail – I still don't see the segment extending to Wheaton Regional Park on the map. The Kensington/Wheaton map is rather small and cluttered.	Page 292: Add a neighborhood greenway on Orebaugh Ave between the terminus of the Sligo Creek Trail and Wheaton Regional Park.
Montgomery Village Policy Area					
341		MCDOT	302	Consider whether a series of trail connectors might unite the limited-outlet neighborhoods east of the Stewartown Rd terminus (effectively allowing a shared street continuation of Stewartown Rd to Snouffer School Rd).	No change
342		MCDOT	302	Show the Trail Connector along Calypso Lane by Nike Park, and consider whether a shared lane route might extend Flower Hill Way to Strawberry Knoll Rd.	Page 302: Add a a neighborhood connector to connect to segments of Calypso Ln at Nike Park.
North Bethesda-Twinbrook Policy Area					
343		Crist	306	Remove the Weymouth St, Kenilworth Ave and Montrose Ave sidepaths, as they will not fit in the right-of-way.	No change
344		McClane	306	Update map to show that trail between Fisher La and Veirs Mill Rd is complete.	Page 306: Show that the trail between Fisher La and Veirs Mill Rd is now complete.

Attachment E: Final Responses to Public Testimony

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony	Planning Board Decision
North Potomac Policy Area					
345		MoBike	312	Dufief Mill Rd – Qualified dual bikeway. Nice existing shoulders make this a good rural biking connection. Plan should recommend keeping existing shoulders as well as a path, though path can be higher priority.	No change
Olney Policy Area					
346		MCDOT	314	Consider extending Utility Corridor #3 from Bowie Mill Rd northward, alongside Wickman Rd & Zion Rd, connecting into the Germantown-Burtonsville Breezeway.	No change
347		MCDOT	314	Consider extending Utility Corridor #4 from Georgia Ave / Prince Philip northward, connecting into the Germantown-Burtonsville Breezeway.	Page 314: Extend Gold Mine Rd bikeway to Germantown - Burtonsville Breezeway.
348		MCDOT	314	Show the Georgia Ave bikeway as extending to the Brookeville Bypass' southern roundabout / Brookeville Town Limits; not terminating at Gold Mine Rd.	Page 314: Extend the Georgia Ave sidepath from Gold Mine Rd to the Longwood Recreation Center on the west side of the road.
349		MCDOT	314	Consider a Trail Connector between Brooke Grove Rd and Hickory Knoll Rd, and perhaps shared roadway linking the Spartan Dr bikeway with the Brooke Rd bikeway. It appears such a connector *might* already exist.	No change
350		MCDOT	314	The insert shows a number of connections not shown on the larger map. In other cases where inserts are used it appears that the larger map nonetheless shows all connections.	Page 314: The Olney map will be made consistent with the Olney inset map.
351		MCDOT	314	Batchellors Forest Rd is a Rustic Rd, and the delineated segment of Emory Church Rd has also been under consideration for Rustic status. While we don't dispute the need for the facilities, these facilities cannot be implemented as proposed for as long as these designations remain.	Page 314: Add a note to the Batchellor's Forest Rd recommendation that says: "This bikeway recommendation is advisory only until the Rustic Road designation is removed or the Rustic Roads policy changes."
352		Pease-Fye, Snee, Smith	314	Supports proposed alignment on Batchellors Forest Rd.	No change.
353		Tworkowski	314	Since Batchellor's Forest Rd is a rustic road, provide a natural surface trail instead of a sidepath.	See response to Comment #351.

Attachment E: Final Responses to Public Testimony

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony	Planning Board Decision
Potomac Policy Area					
354		MCDOT	320	Consider extending Brickyard Rd's sidepath to MacArthur Blvd.	No change
355		MoBike	320	Falls Road (River Road to Dunster) – Adding both shoulders and a path to Falls Road between Dunster and River Road would be all but impossible. DOT was even having trouble just adding a path. Call for either bikeable shoulders or a path, not both.	Page 320: Remove bikeable shoulders from Falls Rd.
356		MoBike	320	PEPCO Trail – I'll just reiterate my point that this should start at Westlake Drive. Don't give up just because some committee made a judgement in 2017. Since when was guaranteed feasibility required in this plan?	No change
357		MoBike	320	Bells Mill Road (Gainsborough Rd to Falls Rd) – Qualified dual bikeway. The nice existing shoulders in this section allow it to serve as a bypass of the high stress part of Democracy Blvd and it's another gateway to rural routes. The plan should strongly recommend keeping the shoulders as well as adding a path. The path may be identified as higher priority (qualified dual bikeway). But east of Gainsborough, only a path needs to be recommended (shoulders will likely remain anyway).	No change

Attachment E: Final Responses to Public Testimony

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony	Planning Board Decision
358		MoBike	320	<p>Tuckerman Lane (Old Georgetown Rd to Falls Rd) – I'll go into detail because this exemplifies the issue of preserving shoulders that are popular with road cyclists. DOT has NOT picked a design yet. This is a summary of my input to DOT on that project: constituency of road cyclists who use it frequently. It's important to retain a network of on-road biking routes conducive for fast cycling in a way that paths and protected bike lanes simply are not.</p> <p>Tuckerman can be thought of as two separate segments. East of Westlake Drive (to Old Georgetown Road), it is more like a park road, with relatively few homes or at-grade crossings along it. But west of Westlake Drive, it has Cabin John Park, the Cabin John shopping center, a high school, a middle school, and many homes with driveways. The need for local bike connectivity is much higher west of Westlake Drive.</p> <p>I recommended a few alternative solutions for DOT's Tuckerman Lane bike improvement project, all of them dual facilities to avoid forcing road cyclists onto paths or protected bike lanes, which can be cumbersome and limiting for these cyclists. All my solutions called for a shared use path on one side of the street and, west of Cabin John Park, a sidewalk on the other side as well. While it is possible to add conventional bike lanes, the easiest of my solutions would leave the road pretty mostly unchanged (cars can park in the shoulders but it's not onerous for cyclists) as well as provide the path (and sidewalk). This is similar to one of DOT's alternatives. As its so-called short term solution, DOT could add a sidewalk or path west of Westlake Drive on just the north side only, since school students (including my kids) often walk along Tuckerman. Another</p>	No change
359				<p>Parking is allowed in the shoulders in several places, so cyclists would be sharing the shoulders with parked cars, as they do today. The shoulders become turn lanes at the intersections but confident cyclists can manage easily enough.</p> <p>Tuckerman Lane between Old Georgetown Road and Falls Road is very popular with road cyclists, whether for transportation or recreation. That's because its shoulders allow for fast and safe cycling over a considerable distance. There are no other east-west road routes crossing I-270/I-495 between Rockville and Bethesda that are as suitable for road riders. Tuckerman serves an important transportation function for riders who are willing to ride somewhat longer distances to work and other destinations. But it's equally important for fast recreational cyclists, and notably it's a gateway route from the east to Potomac routes which in turn lead to the rural west. So Tuckerman has an existing</p>	

Attachment E: Final Responses to Public Testimony

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony	Planning Board Decision
R&D Village Policy Area					
360		MCDOT	324	R&D Village - Recognizing that the lines are not always shown to be representative of what side of a street the facility is intended to be on, for ease of use: consider swapping the two lines along Darnestown Rd, as the sidepath is along the north side.	Page 324: Flip the blue and orange lines on Darnestown Rd.
361		MCDOT	324	R&D Village - Ensure LSC Loop recommendations are reflected in table (understanding that in some segments it will be separated bike lanes AND sidepath.	Page 324: Call out the LSC Loop as a separated bikeway.
362		MoBike	324	Key West Ave – The MD 28 dual bikeway (thank you) should be noted as starting at the intersection of Key West Ave and Shady Grove Road, not at the Darnestown Rd/Key West split. This segment currently exists.	No change
Rural East (East) Policy Area					
363		MCDOT	328	Consider Shoulder Bikeway along the remainder of Bordly Drive to Brighton Dam Road	No change
364		Helms	328	Riding Stable Inter- County Connector FROM Prince Georges County TO Spencerville (Striped Bikeway)	Page 328: Add sidepath on Riding Stable Rd.
365		Helms	328	Amina-Dustin FROM EXELON-PEPCO ROW East Trail TO Old Columbia Pike (Striped Bikeway)	No change
366		Helms	328	Batson FROM Spencerville TO EXELON- PEPCO ROW West Trail (Striped Bikeway)	No change
367		Helms	328	Ednor Road Inter- County Connector FROM New Hampshire TO Howard County (Bikeable Shoulder)	No change
368		Helms	328	EXELON-PEPCO ROW East Trail FROM Spencerville TO Amina-Dustin (Hard Surface Trail)	No change
369		Helms	328	EXELON-PEPCO ROW West Trail FROM Old Columbia Pike TO Ednor (Hard Surface Trail)	No change
370		Helms	328	Kruhm FROM Spencerville TO EXELON- PEPCO ROW West Trail (Striped Bikeway)	No change
371		Helms	328	Oak Hill FROM Spencerville TO EXELON- PEPCO ROW West Trail (Striped Bikeway)	No change

Attachment E: Final Responses to Public Testimony

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony	Planning Board Decision
Rural West Policy Area					
372		MCDOT	334	Consider whether any potential connections might be made between Rural West and the C&O Canal Towpath, recognizing that many of the roads are Rustic Roads. Perhaps extend Utility Corridor #1 toward the Dickerson Generating Station?	Page 334: Extend Utility Corridor #1 to Dickerson Rd.
373		Dennis	334	Extend the Germantown - Burtonsville Breezeway to River Rd.	No change
374		Allen	334	The plan includes insufficient connectivity to C&O Canal Towpath. Extend River Rd sidepath to Pennyfield Lock Rd, add sidepath on Seneca Rd and River Rd connecting Darnestown Rd to Violettes Lock Rd, extend sidepath on Germantown Rd and Darnestown Rd connecting PEPCO trail to Seneca Rd.	Page 334: Extend the River Road sidepath to Pennyfield Lock Road.
375		Knudson	334	Add bikeways to Barnesville Road, Comus Road and Old Hundred Road.	No change
376		Knudson	334	Extend Bucklodge-White Ground Connector trail to Dickerson	No change
Shady Grove Policy Area					
377		MCDOT	338	The 355 Breezeway stops at the City of Rockville, several hundred feet short of the signal at Ridgemont Ave. Consider extending this facility at least to Ridgemont; preferably to Redland Rd (with Rockville's concurrence), or shifting the Breezeway to the east side of MD 355.	No change
378		Palakovich-Carr	338	Recommends two-way separated bike lanes on the east side of Frederick Rd, between Shady Grove Road and College Parkway to be consistent with City of Rockville recommendations.	No change for now

Attachment E: Final Responses to Public Testimony

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony	Planning Board Decision
Silver Spring CBD Policy Area					
379		Meyer	340	Supports separated bike lanes on Fenton St.	No change
380		Fenton Village Inc	340	Remove Fenton St separated bike lanes south of Wayne Ave. Premature to include in master plan until MCDOT determines whether they are feasible. Don't remove on-street parking.	No change
381		Leiberman/McCormick	340	Does not support the Fenton Street separated bike lanes especially if it will remove on-street parking because 1) large delivery trucks will have no place to park and will use side streets, 2) removing spaces for buses to pull off the road will back up traffic and will result in cut thru traffic in the neighborhood and 3) customers will park on residential streets.	No change
382		Weinstein	340	Separated bike lanes are needed on Colesville Road between Georgia Avenue and Fenton Street.	No change
383		Weinstein	340	Separated bike lanes are needed on Georgia Avenue.	No change
384		Meszaros	340	Does not support the floating bus stop in the Spring Street / Cedar Street separated bike lanes because they cause congestion, which is bad for business. Believes that floating bus stops favor bicyclists over buses and traffic and that buses and bikes can share the same space.	No change
Silver Spring - Takoma Park (East) Policy Area					
385		MCDOT	344	Consider a connection between E Franklin Ave and Oakview Dr, across the Northwest Branch Trail.	No change
386		MCDOT	344	Show Trail Connectors across Long Branch, linking each side of Melbourne, as well as linking Schuyler-Wayne-Buckingham.	Page 344: add trail connections linking each side of Melbourne Rd and Schuler - Wayne - Buckingham.
387		MCDOT	344	Consider extending the Philadelphia Ave bikeway to connect the Takoma Park ES with the Piney Branch Rd bikeway.	No change
388		Helms	344	Northwest Branch Trail-WO-FDA Trail I495 Overpass Connector FROM Devere TO E Light (Hard Surface Trail)	See response to Comment #157.

Attachment E: Final Responses to Public Testimony

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony	Planning Board Decision
389		Winter	344	Show Northwest Branch Trail on map.	No change
390		WABA	344	On Carroll Ave separated or buffered bike lanes are more appropriate.	No change
391		Lieberman/McCormick, WABA	344	Supports the Wayne Ave - Fenton St neighborhood greenway.	No change
392		Napierala	344	Remove bikeway on Grove St since it places needs of bicyclists over needs of pedestrians and motorists. Grove St is too narrow and has no sidewalks.	No change
393		Cochrane	344	Ellsworth Dr between Cedar and Fenton – Here the plan calls for two-way protected bike lanes on one side of the street, but the Ellsworth segments surrounding it are shared roadway or contraflow bike lane, so won't this require needless switching from one side of the street to the other?	No change
Silver Spring - Takoma Park (West) Policy Area					
394		MCDOT	350	For the line for East West Hwy between Rock Creek & Grubb Rd: consider noting that the contra-flow bike lane is (presumably) along the north side's service road.	Page 350: Change East-West Hwy to East-West Hwy Service Rd between Rock Creek Trail and Grubb Rd.
395		WABA, Norman	350	Extend the separated bike lanes on Dale Dr from Woodland Dr to Piney Branch Rd. (WABA, Norman)	Recommend either a sidepath or a sidewalk on Dale Drive between Woodland Dr and Piney Branch Rd.
396		Cochrane	350	Brookville Road in Silver Spring – The proposed path on the east side from Stewart Ave to Seminary Rd is a good thought, but please add a note saying it may be implemented as a two-way protected bike lane from Stewart to Warren if deemed optimal, because there is a huge amount of pavement width (for trucks AND bikes), very few parking spaces, and little space for a path. I'm asking DOT for these protected bike lanes ASAP since this is the official GBT detour.	No change
397		Reed	350	Show Capital Crescent Trail in the Silver Spring / Takoma Park (West) map as unbuilt.	Page 350: Show Capital Crescent Trail as proposed.
Wheaton Policy Area					
398		Herr	356	Grandview Ave is not a high-speed road and may not need a separated bike path.	No change
White Flint Policy Area					
399		Steiner	360	Bikeways (specifically Woodglen Dr and Nebel St) are not heavily used and are therefore a waste of taxpayer money and needlessly take on-street parking spaces.	No Change

Attachment E: Final Responses to Public Testimony

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony	Planning Board Decision
White Oak Policy Area					
400		Greater Colesville Citizens Assoc	364	The White Oak Local Area Transportation Improvement Plan (LATIP) includes eight bikeways. The Council decided that because of cost shared-use paths (essentially a sidepath) would be used rather than separated bike lanes, which operate in the road. The only exception is when the separated bike lane can be built more cost effectively. The BMP is recommending what the council decided against in a number of spots, including Industrial Parkway, Tech Road, Broadbirch Rd, Plum Orchard Rd, and Cherry Hill Rd.	No change
401		MCDOT	364	My current expectation is that these would be added into the White Oak LATIP numerator as part of the 6-year reanalysis (next expected to occur in 2023). Council action would be required if these are to be included in one of the 2-year updates (next expected in 2019).	No change
402		MCDOT	364	Add a ** to the "White Oak - FDA Connector"	Page 364: Add a ** to the "White Oak - FDA Connector"
403		Helms	364	FDA-US29 BRT Connector FROM FDA TO Lockwood (Hard Surface Trail)	No change
404		Helms	364	Lockwood-NH(MD650) Ped & Bike Bridge FROM Lockwood TO Lockwood (Hard Surface Trail)	No change
405		Helms	364	Northwest Branch Trail-WO-FDA Trail I495 Underpass Connector FROM Northwest Branch Trail TO Devere (Hard Surface Trail)	See response to Comment #157.
406		Helms	364	Old Columbia Pike-Tech Road Ped & Bike US29 Bridge FROM Old Columbia Pike TO Industrial (Hard Surface Trail)	No change
407		Helms	364	US29-Lockwood Ped & Bike Bridge FROM Lockwood TO US29 (Hard Surface Trail)	No change
408		Greater Colesville Citizens Assoc	364	On Calverton Blvd the plan proposes a sidepath on the south side but separated bike lanes already exist of both sides.	Page 364: Change bikeway on Calverton Blvd to conventional bike lanes.
409		Greater Colesville Citizens Assoc	364	The plan indicates a separated bikeway doesn't exist on Broadbirch Dr, but it already exists.	No change
410		Greater Colesville Citizens Assoc	364	On Old Columbia Pike the plan recommends a sidepath but conventional bike lanes already exist.	No change
411		Greater Colesville Citizens Assoc	364	On Cherry Hill Rd, separated bike lanes are not needed on south side of road because sidepath exists on north side of road.	No change
412		Greater Colesville Citizens Assoc	364	On Gracefield Rd between Plum Orchard Rd and Calverton Blvd, the plan indicates a sidepath does not exist but it does. Bicyclists can ride in the road.	No change

Attachment E: Final Responses to Public Testimony

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony	Planning Board Decision
Project Coordination Changes					
413		Planning Staff	314	Extend Utility Corridor #4 trail from Heartwood Dr to Muncaster Mill Rd and add sidepath on the east side of Muncaster Mill Rd between Bowie Mill Road and Utility Corridor #4.	Extend Utility Corridor #4 to Muncaster Mill Rd.
414		Planning Staff	226	On Leland St between Wisconsin Ave and 46th St, specify that the separated bike lanes should be two-way on the north side of the street to align with MCDOT project on Woodmont Ave and to reduce spatial requirements of the bikeway.	Add a note to Leland Street bikeway recommendation that states: "This bikeway configuration should be consistent with the Woodmont Avenue bikeway configuration, between Bethesda Avenue and Wisconsin Avenue."
415		Planning Staff	364	Shift sidepath from the US 29 exit ramp on the east side to Prosperity Dr.	Make change
416		Planning Staff	226, 292, 306	On the south side of Veirs Mill Road, provide continuous two-way separated bike lanes from Montrose Parkway East / Parkland Drive to the Wheaton CBD, except between Newport Mill Road and Pendleton Drive where a sidepath is recommended due to limited right-of-way. The Bicycle Master Plan currently recommends a mix of sidepaths and two-way separated bike lanes on the south side of Veirs Mill Road, with separated bike lanes proposed along commercial frontage and sidepaths proposed everywhere else.	Page 226, 292, 306: On the south side of Veirs Mill Road, provide continuous two-way separated bike lanes from Montrose Parkway East / Parkland Drive to the Wheaton CBD, except between Newport Mill Road and Pendleton Drive where a sidepath is recommended due to limited right-of-way. The Bicycle Master Plan currently recommends a mix of sidepaths and two-way separated bike lanes on the south side of Veirs Mill Road, with separated bike lanes proposed along commercial frontage and sidepaths proposed everywhere else.
417		Planning Staff	226	Extend the sidepath on north side of Veirs Mill Road from Parkland Drive to the City of Rockville.	Page 226: Extend the sidepath on north side of Veirs Mill Road from Parkland Drive to the City of Rockville.
418		Planning Staff	292	Add a sidepath on the east side of Havard Street between Veirs Mill Road and Colie Drive.	Page 292: Add a sidepath on the east side of Havard Street between Veirs Mill Road and Colie Drive.
Corrections					
419		MCDOT	81	The text "Retail" under Long-Term / Work is top-aligned rather than center-aligned.	Page 81: Center align "Retail"
420		MCDOT	88-89	DANAC is shown on p90 as having a long-term bike station, but on p89 no long-term parking needs are identified.	Page 88-89: Remove DANAC station from map.
421		Planning Staff	90	Add Boyds to the bicycle parking stations map.	Add Boyds to the bicycle parking stations map.
422		Planning Staff	179	The bikeway on Johns Hopkins Dr should be Tier 1 priority.	Make Johns Hopkins Dr a Tier 1 bikeway.
423		Planning Staff	192	In Objective 2.3, change "transit station" to "school"	In Objective 2.3, change "transit station" to "school"
424		MCDOT	226	There appears to be a graphic discontinuity in the Matthew Henson Trail immediately west of MD 97. It appears the existing trail spans between the Holdridge/Kilburn connection and MD 97, though no such green line is apparent.	No change
425		Planning Staff	250	Show Stringtown Road sidepath on north side as existing between MD 355 and Snowden Farm Pkwy.	Page 250: Show Stringtown Road sidepath on north side as existing between MD 355 and Snowden Farm Pkwy.
426		Greater Colesville Citizens Assoc	264	Segments of the recommended sidepath exist on Greencastle Rd to the east and west of US 29.	Page 264: Show segment of Greencastle Rd west of US 29 as existing.

Attachment E: Final Responses to Public Testimony

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony	Planning Board Decision
427		WABA, Smith	282	Map does not show Germantown - Life Sciences Center Breezeway on Middlebrook Rd	Page 2682: Show the Germantown - Life Sciences Center Breezeway.
428		Planning Staff	283	The Dorsey Mill Rd sidepath between Century Blvd and I-270 should be located on the north side of the road, not the south side as indicated.	The Dorsey Mill Rd sidepath between Century Blvd and I-270 will be located on the north side of the road, not the south side as indicated.
429		Herr	292	The path through Pleasant View Park should be shown as proposed. It is an existing sidewalk that needs to be upgraded.	No change
430		MCDOT	306	"Flanders Ave" is misspelled as "Flonders Ave"	Page 306: Revise spelling of "Flanders Ave"
431		MCDOT	312	Recognizing that the lines are not always shown to be representative of what side of a street the facility is intended to be on, for ease of use: consider swapping the two lines along Darnestown Rd, as the sidepath is along the north side.	Make change.
432		Planning Staff	314	Show Olney #5 as existing.	Show Olney #5 as existing.
433		MoBike	320	Democracy Blvd (west of Seven Locks Rd) – The bikeway identified in the table (shoulders + path) is correct but the map is wrong.	Page 320: Correct the map to show both a sidepath (orange) and bikeable shoulders (aqua) on Democracy Blvd between Falls Rd and Seven Locks Rd.
434		MoBike	320	Westlake Drive – The bikeway table says bikeable shoulders + path under "bikeway type" column but just a path under "facility type" column and on the map. Dual facility already exists north of Westlake Terrace. Path would be built on the EAST side south of Westlake Terrace (and shoulders added) according to signed agreement with Montgomery Mall.	Page 320, bikeable shoulders should be added to Westlake Dr. Page 322, the Westlake Dr recommendation should be: Facility Type = "Separated Bikeway and Bikeable Shoulders" Bikeway Type = "Sidepath (East Side) and Bikeable Shoulders".
435		Planning Staff	364	Perimeter Road should be shown as green to match the recommendation for an off-street trail on page 365.	Page 365: Change color of Perimeter Road bikeway to green.
436		MCDOT	364	White Oak - Confirm the intention of US 29 as a shared roadway. Perhaps at least a bikeable shoulder?	Page 365: Change the color of the bikeway on US 29 to orange.
437		Planning Staff	365	FDA Blvd should be shown as having two-way separated bike lanes on both sides of the road.	FDA Blvd should be shown as having two-way separated bike lanes on both sides of the road.
438		Planning Staff	340	Add separated bike lanes on the south side of Colesville Rd between Wayne Ave and Georgia Ave to the table on page 341 to match map.	Add separated bike lanes on the south side of Colesville Rd between Wayne Ave and Georgia Ave to the table on page 341 to match map.
Additional Comments					
439		Richardson	236	Remove Glendale Rd and Woodbine St in Section 5 of the Village of Chevy Chase.	Remove the recommendation from the plan, but include in the appendix as guidance.
440		Planning Staff			Prioritize New Hampshire Ave sidepath as Tier 3 between Elton Road and Prince George's County
441					Prioritize Grand Pre Ave sidepath as Tier 3
Planning Board Comments on Working Draft					
442			69	Breezeway could be configured to separated fast and slow users as well.	Page 69, Change to: "Separation Between Bicycling and Walking / <u>Faster and Slower Users</u> : Separation between pedestrians and bicyclists <u>or between fast and slow users</u> will increase comfort for users and allow faster users to travel with minimal delay, especially in areas with higher use."
443				Bicycle-supportive programs and policies should be ordered by priority.	No change.

Attachment E: Final Responses to Public Testimony

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony	Planning Board Decision
444				The plan should include a reference the bicycle camp that the Department of Parks runs as an illustrative program.	<p>Page 99, Program 3.1, Change to:</p> <p>The BikeMontgomery Outreach Program encourages more people to bicycle in Montgomery County through community engagement and community building. Its efforts include organizing a Bicycle Ambassador program, maintaining an online bicycling forum, holding bicycling events, such as bike rodeos and thematic bike rides, <u>organizing bicycle camps using the park trails network</u> and conducting tours of new bicycle infrastructure.</p> <p>Justification: Similar programs, such as the DC Bike Ambassador program and BikeArlington, have helped to expand bicycling in their respective jurisdictions by encouraging communities that strongly support bicycling.</p> <p>Lead Agency: Montgomery County Department of Transportation</p>
445				Language that provides flexibility in implementing bikeways if the state-of-the-practice in bikeway planning changes.	<p>Page 144: Make these changes:</p> <p>The network of bikeways and bicycle parking stations recommended in the Bicycle Master Plan is extensive and it is likely to be only partially completed during the 25-year life of this plan. Such a large network is proposed so that opportunities to implement the preferred bicycling network are not lost when unforeseen circumstances arise. However, it is important to identify bikeway network priorities because funding for implementation is limited.</p> <p>The approach to prioritizing the bicycling network is based on reaching the targets established for each metric in the Goals, Objectives, Metrics and Targets section of this plan. The priorities focus on increasing bicycling in the county as quickly as possible, by focusing initial efforts on constructing networks of bikeways in places that the Montgomery County Council has designated as Bicycle Pedestrian Priority Areas (BPPA) and completing connections between major activity centers. Also prioritized are missing gaps in the existing low-stress bicycling network and low-cost bikeways, such as neighborhood greenways, which will funnel bicyclists to the BPPAs. This prioritization should be reassessed every few years based on available resources and lessons learned during the implementation process.</p> <p><u>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 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.</u></p> <p>A summary of the process used to develop the bikeway recommendations is included in Appendix E."</p> <p>Change priority per staff recommendations.</p>

Attachment E: Final Responses to Public Testimony

#	Section	Commentor	Plan Page #	Testimony	Planning Board Decision
446				Make it clear that when we decide not to build a bikeway (or sidewalk) that there is a payment in lieu. Are changes needed to the subdivision regulations?	<p>Page 137, add before the blue box:</p> <p>Payments In Lieu of Constructing Bikeway Implementation</p> <p>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.</p>