

**Attachment D: Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix**

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter(s)	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation
1	General	1	Ben Ross	N/A	Change the title of the plan from "Pedestrian Master Plan" to "Walking Plan"	Disagree	"Pedestrian" is more inclusive than "walking" because it includes people who roll to get around, including wheelchairs, strollers, etc.
2	General	6	Kimbllyn Persaud	N/A	People within communities of color should have the same pedestrian safety measures as our affluent neighbors.	Agree	Communities across Montgomery County should expect a high quality, safe and direct pedestrian experience. The county should take steps to address inequitable pedestrian conditions that negatively affect safety and connectivity. Planning staff has used an equity lens through the Pedestrian Master Plan process, including: 1) broad-based engagement efforts to data collection, 2) analysis that parsed disparities based on Equity Focus Areas, and 3) an approach to prioritizing future investments with a focus on equity. This plan is a serious attempt to ensure an equitable pedestrian future for Montgomery County.
3	General	7	Kimbllyn Persaud	N/A	Representation is extremely important. In a county that is majority people of color, we need to see these people sitting at the table. You don't see it tonight or at these other meetings. Planning and the county must do better.	Neutral	There is always room for improvement in master plan engagement, especially for a countywide plan.  Engagement with the plan's Community Advisory Group was an integral component of the planning process. Members of this group include residents from across the county, the disability community, and racial and ethnic groups including the county's African Affairs Advisory Group, the African American Advisory Group, the Caribbean American Advisory Group, the Latin American Advisory Group, and the Middle Eastern American Advisory Group.  While public testimony can be very helpful in guiding the plan forward, the plan recommendations are built on a foundation of diverse voices and perspectives from people who may or may not have shared testimony with the Planning Board. Planning staff understand that addressing inequities will require a sustained effort over many years and are committed to engaging with groups that represent the county's diversity as the plan proceeds toward implementation.
4	General	15	Megan Brown	N/A	Concern that the Pedestrian Master Plan had insufficient engagement with churches, synagogues and private schools.	Disagree	In July 2022, Planning staff reached out via mail to 572 houses of worship to share information about the Pedestrian Master Plan, direct interested people to the project website, and encourage these communities to host a meeting about the plan. While no groups requested a meeting, this effort enabled these institutions to inform their membership about the plan. Staff focused outreach on public schools rather than private schools. This is because public school students are more likely to live within a walkable distance to their school.
5	General	5, 8, 11, 12, 14, 17	Cathie Cooper, Kimbllyn Persaud, Max Bronstein, Megan Brown, Megan Brown, Stephen Blank	N/A	The plan should not penalize drivers as most Montgomery County residents require cars to travel in the county.	Agree	It is not the intention of the plan to penalize drivers. This plan complements the 2013 Countywide Transit Corridors Functional Plan and the 2018 Bicycle Master Plan in creating additional travel choices for Montgomery County residents, employees and visitors. As the county has spent 70 years almost exclusively focused on improving access to motor vehicles, it is likely that the recommendations in the master plan will have localized impacts on driving. Each of the recommendations in the plan will be thoroughly evaluated at the time of implementation and limiting negative impacts to drivers will be considered.
6	General	2	Cathie Cooper	N/A	County resources should focus on addressing root problems rather than make cosmetic changes that may create additional problems.	Agree	No change is needed as this plan proposes systemic change to improve pedestrian conditions in the county.
7	General	3	Cathie Cooper	N/A	Ensure existing roads are maintained before planning additional infrastructure.	Disagree	The purpose of master plans is to establish a vision for the future and develop recommendations about how best to achieve that vision. Maintenance is an important part of achieving that vision, and while the plan includes recommendations to improve maintenance, planning for a distant future must proceed independently of more immediate efforts to improve maintenance.
8	General	4	Cathie Cooper	N/A	Safety is a shared responsibility and all road users need to look out for each other.	Agree	No change is needed as the comment expresses support for the plan.
9	General	9	Lee Keiser	N/A	Plan maps should include symbols for Metro, Purple Line, Libraries	Agree	Planning Staff recommends making this change.
10	General	10	Lee Keiser	N/A	The Plan uses the word "country" instead of "county." This appears throughout the narrative, and on the Montgomery County map title (p. 208).	Disagree	"Country" is a Complete Streets Design Guide area type designation and is used appropriately throughout the plan.
11	General	13	Megan Brown	N/A	Every recommendation won't be suitable for every situation.	Agree	While some recommendations apply countywide, most key actions are written to ensure implementing agencies have discretion to treat different places within the county differently based on the unique context. For instance, many of the recommendations pertaining to signals are focused on the county's Downtowns and Town Centers (Key Action B-2a on page 68, for example), while there is a whole set of recommendations identifying sidepaths (shared pedestrian and bicycle paths) along country roads (pages 259 to 266).
12	General	16	Megan Brown	N/A	This is not a data-driven plan. A big blind spot is data about the projected uses of some things like bike lanes during inclement weather.	Disagree	In addition to using regional and national information on pedestrian activity in Montgomery County, Planning Staff developed several unique data sources to provide the most helpful existing conditions backbone for plan recommendations. These data sources include a statistically-valid countywide survey about pedestrian travel and preferences, a detailed Pedestrian Level of Comfort analysis that examined every single sidewalk, street, and crossing in the county, a student travel tally that incorporated more than 70,000 responses, and an analysis of pedestrian crashes between 2015 and 2020. This extensive data collection effort allowed the project team to understand disparities and inequities in pedestrian safety and access.  Bike lane usage was not considered as bicycling is not a focus of the Pedestrian Master Plan.

**Attachment D: Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix**

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter(s)	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation
13	General	18	Montgomery County Climate Action Plan Coalition	N/A	Implicit references to climate change and the plan's relationship to climate change mitigation/adaptation should be made explicit.	Agree	<p>Planning Staff recommends the following changes to the plan to incorporate additional references to climate change and the relationship between plan recommendations and the climate:</p> <p>On page 48, add the following as the second-last sentence in the first paragraph of the Tree Canopy section: "<u>Tree canopy cover will only become more important as climate change increases temperatures over time.</u>"</p> <p>On page 59, add the following in the "A Comfortable, Connected, Convenient Pedestrian Network" section as the last sentence in the final bullet: "<u>All things equal, people traveling along less comfortable sidewalks in EFA communities will experience higher temperatures as a result of climate change than those in other parts of the county.</u>"</p> <p>On page 74, add the following in the description of Key Action B-4a: "<u>Making it easier to walk to more destinations within the same distance will encourage more people to choose walking over other travel modes, which will reduce vehicle miles traveled and reduce the county's transportation emissions.</u>"</p> <p>On page 75, add the following in the description of Key Action B-4c: "<u>Making it more likely future students will walk to school has numerous benefits, including operational savings from reduced busing, reduced transportation emissions, and fewer pedestrian-vehicle conflicts at arrival and dismissal.</u>"</p> <p>On page 85, add the following in the description of Key Action B-7g: "<u>These investments can provide substantial public benefits, including reduced transportation emissions and economic development, but poor pedestrian and bicycle connectivity in the surrounding area makes it difficult for these projects to reach their full potential ridership.</u>"</p> <p>On Page 88, add the following in the description of Key Action B-8e: "<u>This makes it more difficult for pedestrians to travel through these communities and encourages driving for walkable trips, increasing the county's transportation emissions and the climate impact of development.</u>"</p> <p>On Page 107, add the following as the last sentence in the description of Key Action P-5d: "<u>Reducing vehicular trips to schools lowers the likelihood of student-involved pedestrian crashes at arrival and dismissal and minimizes the transportation emissions associated with the public school system.</u>"</p>
14	General	19	Montgomery County Climate Action Plan Coalition	N/A	Make countywide pedestrian survey data more accessible for purposes of climate impact assessment.	Agree	Planning Staff recommends posting the complete pedestrian survey report on the plan website.
15	General	20	Montgomery County Climate Action Plan Coalition	N/A	It's important to consider how civil rights, socioeconomic justice, and transportation equitability intersect and can affect even the research intended to right the historical wrongs of redlining and racism, and it is unclear whether the data analysis considered these factors, which in turn could skew the GHG assessment.	Discuss	<p>Planning Staff has used an equity lens through the Pedestrian Master Plan process, from broad-based engagement efforts to data collection and analysis that parsed disparities based on Equity Focus Areas to a prioritization approach for where future bicycle and pedestrian improvements should be built that centers equity. This plan is a serious attempt to ensure an equitable pedestrian future for Montgomery County.</p> <p>The climate assessment will be conducted appropriately as required by county law.</p>
16	General	21	Montgomery County Climate Action Plan Coalition	N/A	Disability groups should evaluate the recommendations in the Pedestrian Master Plan.	Agree	Over the course of the plan, community members with disabilities were regularly consulted, and their input has been invaluable in developing the draft document. The project team had regular conversations with the Commission on People with Disabilities, the National Capital Chapter of the American Council of the Blind of Maryland, and other groups like the Commission on Aging.
17	General	22	National Capital Area Chapter of the National Federation of the Blind of Maryland	N/A	Conflicts in existing plans and policies towards pedestrians, bicyclists, transit riders and safety should be eliminated.	Agree	While Planning Staff has worked diligently to align the Pedestrian Master Plan with other plans, policies and guidelines, we acknowledge that some inconsistencies likely remain. As a countywide functional plan, the Pedestrian Master Plan amends all existing master plans countywide. To the extent that there are inconsistencies, the Pedestrian Master Plan recommendations supercede other recommendations.
<b>Table of Contents</b>							
18	Table of Contents	23	Larry Cole	N/A	Add a list of references used to create the Pedestrian Master Plan.	Agree	Planning Staff recommends adding a reference section to the plan.
<b>Introduction</b>							
19	Introduction	25	Larry Cole	6	While the Introduction indicates that the plans focus is on "policies, programs, and priorities to improve walking", this is misleading as a sizeable section of the plan focus on Pedestrian Infrastructure Recommendations (including Pedestrian Shortcuts and Country Sidepaths).	Disagree	While the plan dedicates over 50 pages to infrastructure recommendations, these are likely to have localized benefits only. The most impactful recommendations are focused in these three sections: 1) Design, Policy, and Programming, Bicycle, 2) Pedestrian Priority Area Prioritization, and 3) Complete Streets Design Guide Area Type Designations.
20	Introduction	15, 26	Megan Brown, Larry Cole	N/A	School references in the document are specific to Montgomery County Public Schools. Other schools like private school and Montgomery College likely have different travel mode splits and pedestrian needs.	Agree	Planning Staff acknowledges that travel patterns among public school students and private school students will differ as public school students are more likely to live within a walking distance of their school than private school students.
<b>Racial Equity and Social Justice Statement</b>							
21	Racial Equity and Social Justice Statement	7		7 27	Projects should aim to meet ADA Best Practices, rather than just ADA minimums.	Agree	No changes are needed, as Key Action EA-7a recommends going beyond current accessibility requirements to improve access for people with vision, hearing, cognitive, and other types of disabilities. It states: "Modify the County Code and associated regulations to include additional accessibility requirements that address barriers to traveling to and through all commercial, residential, and institutional buildings for people with vision, hearing, cognitive, and other types of disabilities."
<b>Vision and Goals</b>							

**Attachment D: Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix**

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter(s)	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation
22	Goals	28, 29	Civic Federation, Greater Colesville Citizens Association	10	General support for the four goals of the master plan: Goal 1: Increasing Walking Rates and Pedestrian Satisfaction Goal 2: Creating a Comfortable, Connected Convenient Pedestrian Network Goal 3: Enhance Pedestrian Safety Goal 4: Build an Equitable and Just Pedestrian Network	N/A	No change is needed as the comment expresses support for the plan.
23	Goals	24, 30	Larry Cole	10	Pedestrian Safety should be the top goal, not increased walking. Increased walking follows from walking being safer.	Disagree	The goals are not intended to be prioritized, but rather to reflect that higher walking rates are the result of achieving the other three goals. Planning Staff recommends revising page 10 of the plan to clarify this:  "The vision is defined by four goals.  Goal 1: Increasing Walking Rates and Pedestrian Satisfaction Goal 2: Creating a Comfortable, Connected Convenient Pedestrian Network Goal 3: Enhance Pedestrian Safety Goal 4: Build an Equitable and Just Pedestrian Network  <u>These goals are not listed in order of importance. Rather they are intended to show that the ultimate success of this plan will be reflected in higher rates of walking in Montgomery County (Goal 1), which will come about only if we are successful in creating a more comfortable, connected and convenient pedestrian network (Goal 2) that enhances public safety (Goal 3) in a way that is equitable and just (Goal 4).</u> "
24	Goals	32	Jane Lyons-Raeder	10	Include a target year for each of the objectives.	Disagree	This plan explicitly avoids providing a target year as the County Council has previously requested that target years be excluded from metrics in master plans. For example, target years were not included in the metrics in two recently approved countywide plans: Thrive Montgomery 2050 and the Bicycle Master Plan.
25	Goals	29	Greater Colesville Citizens Association	11	To better reflect the different areas types in the county, analyses should use the area type recommendations in the Complete Streets Design Guide (Downtown, Town Center, Suburban, Industrial, Country), and subdivide Town Center per the "Centers" typology identified in Thrive Montgomery 2050 (Medium Centers, Small Centers, and Neighborhood / Village Centers).	Agree	Objectives 1.1 and 1.2 on page 11 are tied to urban areas, transit corridors and exurban/rural areas. Planning staff acknowledges that moving forward, it is better to align to the Downtown, Town Center, Suburban, Industrial and Country areas identified in the Complete Streets Design Guide and potentially to subdivide Town Centers based on the Medium, Small and Neighborhood areas identified in Thrive Montgomery 2050. Exceptions to this will be made based on the need to get a statistically valid sample size for data related to pedestrian satisfaction and to tie to the geographic boundaries established in data sources such as the US Census. Planning staff will reconsider the geographic areas of analysis when the initial Pedestrian Master Plan Biennial Monitoring Report is prepared in 2025.
26	Goals	33	Jane Lyons-Raeder	11	Increase the walking rate targets. How will these targets reduce greenhouse gas emission reductions?	Agree with Modifications	While Planning Staff would like to achieve higher walking rates, the rates identified in the plan are ambitious given the county's existing and planned land use pattern. However, as conditions continue to change, the targets can be amended.  To address this comment, Planning Staff recommends the following addition to the plan's Monitoring section, page 273:  <u>MO-1g: Consider revising the targets for each objective as part of the Pedestrian Master Plan Biennial Monitoring Reports.</u>  <u>As the Pedestrian Master Plan is implemented, there may be opportunities to adjust objective targets in response to county policy, changes in existing conditions, and other factors.</u>  <u>Goal: Walking Rates</u> <u>Leads: Montgomery Planning</u>
27	Goals	31, 34, 35	Greater Colesville Citizens Association, Larry Cole	12	Additional Objectives and Performance Measures should be added: - Access to BRT - Percentage of roads with appropriate posted speed limit - Frequency and severity of speeding - Frequency of red light running - Frequency of driver failure to yield to pedestrians - Percentage of roadway lighting up to standards and operational - Percentage of crosswalk markings in good condition - Percentage of stop bars and roadway lane markings that reflect the safest roadway operation for pedestrians  There should be additional safety metrics for transportation capital projects to ensure agencies responsible for roadway safety are held accountable. This should include a one-year post-installation evaluation to determine if the project goals when it comes to pedestrian safety/comfort and roadway target speed have been met.	Agree with Modifications	In the experience of Planning staff, objectives are more likely to be measured when they do not require substantial new data collection. As the Pedestrian Master Plan already proposes many new data sources that will need to be measured biennially (countywide pedestrian survey, school travel survey, etc.), Planning staff proposes exploring the feasibility and value of including additional performance measures, such as those listed in the comment, as part of the development of the 2023 - 2024 Pedestrian Master Plan Biennial Monitoring Report.

**Attachment D: Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix**

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter(s)	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation
28	Goals	36	Sligo Park Hills Community Association	16	Support for Objective 2.3 "Access to Parks".	N/A	No change is needed as the comment expresses support for the plan.
<b>Existing Conditions</b>							
29	Mode Share	41	Montgomery County Climate Action Plan Coalition	26	Connect with students from higher walking-rate schools to provide more information about their experiences, providing more context about why they walk with the goal of increasing walking to school countywide.	Agree	Collecting first-hand perspectives from students at schools where walking is common is a great way to provide a better understanding of the factors that are responsible for the decision to walk. The county's Safe Routes to School efforts should consider incorporating this approach into their programming.
30	Pedestrian Accommodations	37	Commission on People with Disabilities	38	We disagree with the assertion on page [38] that, "Missing sidewalks on local streets are not classified as sidewalk gaps because traffic volumes and speed limits often allow for a comfortable experience for those pedestrians travelling in roadways." As mobility impaired individuals, low vision/blind pedestrians and or those with low hearing (amongst other disabilities), we know that walking in roadways is never safe or comfortable and must not be the only option for pedestrians of all ages.	Neutral	While a shared roadway experience is not safe or comfortable for many types of pedestrians, the note referenced in the text is specific to Table 11. It is not a general statement intended to downplay the importance of sidewalks. Planning staff will continue to update the sidewalk data to allow the future measurement of sidewalk gaps along local streets.
31	Pedestrian Safety	38, 39, 40	Doug Scott, Larry Cole, Larry Cole	51	This section should include: 1) Crashes occurring within federal, state, and local parks 2) Data on speeding citations, illegal right turns, red light running, violations of pedestrian right-of-way 3) A survey of lighting conditions 4) A table showing where current posted speeds exceed statutory and/or target speeds, and a rationale from SHA or MCDOT justifying the higher speed.	Agree	(1) Planning staff used the county's publicly-available crash data for the plan's pedestrian crash analysis. All crashes within that dataset were used except for those along limited-access highways such as I-270. (4) Planning staff believes that the upcoming update to the Master Plan of Highways and Transitways is the appropriate opportunity to compare posted speed limits to statutory and target speeds. Recommended Action: (2) Planning staff will request data on speeding citations, illegal right turns, red light running, violations of pedestrian right-of-way and will update the plan with the data to the extent they are available and useful and update the Existing Conditions section accordingly. (3) Planning staff recommend adding the following key action for a lighting survey: Key Action B-5d: Conduct a survey of lighting conditions countywide. In addition to developing lighting standards that will improve the quality of lighting over time (B-5a), it will be helpful to conduct a study to understand where existing lighting conditions are deficient. This study will help guide implementation of the updated lighting standards in a data-driven way. Goal: Pedestrian Safety Leads: MCDOT
<b>Recommendations General</b>							
32	General	55, 70	Larry Cole	N/A	Reorganize the recommendations section from Build, Maintain, etc. to ensure the entities responsible for making changes can clearly understand what they need to do.  All recommendations that would require changes to an agency's standards, policies and practices should be grouped together to make it easier for the agency to see clearly what they need to address. Such a reorganization would also help the public understand where an agency's policies adversely affect pedestrian safety and where to apply pressure to make the right thing happen.	Disagree	Planning Staff believes it is helpful to introduce the Design, Policy, and Programming recommendations and key actions thematically, but agrees that to assist in implementation, the recommendations could also be presented in a format that makes it easy for agencies to understand their responsibilities. Planning staff recommends adding a summary table at the beginning of the Design, Policy, and Programming recommendation section that identifies each recommendation the applicable lead and support agencies, and the Plan goals the recommendation addresses.
33	General	67	Town of Kensington	N/A	Include municipalities as stakeholders in the key actions and as implementation partners.	Agree	Planning staff recommends adding "Municipalities" to the list of entities on pages 61 and 62 that will be responsible for implementing the key actions. As applicable "Municipalities" will be added.

Attachment D: Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter(s)	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation
34	General	42, 69	Adam Carlesco, WABA	N/A	Reduce automobile speed limits comprehensively to ensure pedestrian safety	Agree	<p>Planning Staff can add the following recommendation to address this comment:</p> <p><u>P-9: Comprehensively lower speed limits countywide</u> Higher speeds are directly linked to increased crash severity. In pursuit of Vision Zero, the county should continue efforts to lower speed limits in neighborhoods and along major roadways, with a goal of having the roadway's posted speed limit match the target speed outlined in the Complete Streets Design Guide.</p> <p><u>Key Actions:</u> P-9a: Support state legislation to allow jurisdiction-wide speed limit reduction. Montgomery County's ability to lower the posted and statutory speed limit along residential streets is limited by state law. Recent legislative efforts to allow jurisdictions to lower speed limits to no less than 15 miles per hour have failed (HB 404 in 2022). The county should support all legislation that offers local agencies more flexibility in setting speed limits in-line with county goals. Precedent: Washington, D.C. lowered speed limits on residential streets across the city to 20 mph. Goal: Pedestrian Safety Lead: State Delegation</p> <p>P-9b: Ensure speed limits and observed speeds along county roads are in line with target speeds identified in the Complete Streets Design Guide. Building on data collection through the upcoming Master Plan of Highways and Transitways, this key action encourages addressing discrepancies between the speed of vehicles along county roadways today and the roadway's intended speed. To implement this key action, it is essential to go beyond changing posted speed limits to addressing roadway geometry and other factors to make the roadway design speed compatible with the target speed. Goal: Pedestrian Safety Lead: MCDOT, MDOT SHA</p>
35	General	50	Commission on Aging	N/A	Additional emphasis should be placed on improving areas where older adults are active, not just where schools and playgrounds are.	Disagree	<p>No change is needed as the Public Hearing Draft currently includes the following recommendations that explicitly improve access for older adults:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•B-4h: Provide public seating, restrooms, and other pedestrian amenities in Downtowns, Town Centers, and along Boulevards.</li> <li>•EA-2c: Provide additional on-street parking corrals for dockless vehicles in high-use areas and coordinate with operators to provide incentives to encourage their use.</li> <li>•EA-3a: Lower the pedestrian walking speed standard at signalized intersections frequented by older pedestrians, younger pedestrians, and those with disabilities.</li> </ul> <p>Many other recommendations would benefit older adults, even without specific mention of those benefits, including the sidewalk maintenance actions in MA-1 and MA-2, the crossing improvement recommendations in P-2, and all of the other recommendations to expand access not described above.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Planning staff reviewed the draft plan for other opportunities to emphasize improving access for older adults and does not believe additional changes are needed.</li> </ul>
36	General	51	Commission on People with Disabilities	N/A	Tactile crosswalks should be installed so a blind person can easily figure out where they are.	Agree	<p>A tactile crosswalk is a crosswalk that has tactile delineator strips down the middle or along both sides of a crosswalk to help people with vision disabilities successfully navigate across the street. This treatment is included in MCDOT's Planning and Designing Streets to be Safer and More Accessible for People with Vision Disabilities document and Planning staff will work with MCDOT staff to implement it.</p>
37	General	46, 47, 63	Bruce Schwalm, Civic Federation, Montgomery Square Citizens Association	N/A	Provide/require reflector vests for pedestrians walking at night.	Disagree	<p>Planning Staff agrees that the visibility of pedestrians, especially at night, is a problem in Montgomery County. However, we do not agree that requiring pedestrians to wear reflective vest is a practical or effective means to address this issue. That said, Montgomery County Commuter Services offers lights and reflective gear to pedestrians at safety events throughout the county.</p>
38	General	44	Alexander Edwards	N/A	Plan for people, not cars.	Agree	<p>No change is needed as the comment expresses support for the plan.</p>
39	General	56	Larry Cole	N/A	The county should consider halting the construction of new roadway capacity projects until the county has a safe pedestrian network.	Disagree	<p>Building out a network of streets will continue to be an important part of improving Montgomery County's Downtowns, Town Centers and transit corridors and as part of new subdivisions.</p>
40	General	45	Bruce Schwalm	N/A	Strengthen pedestrian education and enforcement recommendations.	Disagree	<p>Planning Staff does not recommend any changes as two recommendations in the draft plan that are focused on pedestrian and bicycle safety education are sufficient:</p> <p>P-4a: Conduct pedestrian and bicycle safety educational programs in partnership with agencies such as MCPL, MCPS, and MCR. P-4c: Shift the programming and education elements of the county's Safe Routes to School (SRTS) Program to MCPS and create SRTS initiatives, including pedestrian/bicycle education, in individual schools.</p>
41	General	61, 62	League of Women Voters, Mike Bailey	N/A	Ensure drivers understand their responsibilities at intersections and elsewhere to improve pedestrian safety.	Agree	<p>Driver education is addressed in the following recommendations:</p> <p>P-1d: Develop legislation to create a new class of commercial driver's license required to operate vehicles with identified pedestrian safety and visibility issues. P-1e: Develop legislation to improve pedestrian and bicycle safety by implementing a knowledge test requirement as part of the driver's license renewal process.</p>
42	General	43	Adam Carlesco	N/A	Install bollards along sidewalks in urban areas to prevent drivers from mounting curbs and hitting pedestrians.	Disagree	<p>While bollards are an approach that MCDOT can use to address these types of crashes at some locations, it is not practical to install them throughout the county's urban areas. Doing so would present accessibility challenges, particularly along already narrow sidewalks.</p>
43	General	48	Bruce Schwalm	N/A	Support more median fencing to guide pedestrian behavior.	Disagree	<p>Pedestrian mid-block crossings are a result of infrequent safe crossing opportunities for pedestrians. While the Pedestrian Master Plan Design Toolkit (Appendix B) includes median fencing as an effective treatment to reduce pedestrian mid-block crossings in the short term, the preferred solution to address this issue to provide more frequent opportunities for pedestrians to cross the street safely, especially in Downtowns, Town Centers and along transit corridors.</p>
44	General	49	Civic Federation	N/A	If capacity on limited-access roadway is insufficient, motorists with drive on residential streets, which will reduce pedestrian safety.	N/A	<p>Planning Staff believes that while the capacity of limited-access highways is a topic worthy of discussion, it is beyond the scope of this master plan to consider.</p>

**Attachment D: Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix**

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter(s)	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation
45	General	52	Commission on People with Disabilities	N/A	The county should limit designated bike lane installation because they have a negative impact on pedestrian safety and people who need to drive and park.	Disagree	Where separated bike lanes create new conflict points for pedestrians and motorists, the appropriate response is to mitigate these conflict points as part of individual construction projects, not to limit the construction of bikeways that are needed to improve transportation choice and bicyclist safety. The Montgomery County Department of Transportation is a national leader in mitigating conflicts between different roadway users along separated bike lanes.
46	General	64	National Capital Area Chapter of the American Council of the Blind of Maryland	N/A	Floating bus stops need to be designed safely.	Agree	A floating bus stop locates bike lanes behind bus stops to avoid conflicts between bicyclists and buses. While this configuration improves safety for bicyclists, it creates additional conflicts for pedestrians, and is especially concerning to people with little or no vision. The Montgomery County Department of Transportation has continued to work closely with members of the disability community to ensure the design of floating bus stops mitigates pedestrian-bicycle conflict.
47	General	53	Doug Scott	N/A	Pressure-treated wood should not be allowed on bridges for bicyclists or pedestrians because it is slippery when wet and can cause injuries.	Agree	Montgomery Parks is looking into moving away from pressure-treated wood in these situations. In fact, some of the newer paved trail bridges will have concrete decking. Unfortunately, for the natural surface trail system, concrete decking is typically not feasible due to the remoteness of the locations and is almost always cost-prohibitive.
48	General	57	Larry Cole	N/A	In addition to looking at what other agencies can do better, the Planning Department should closely examine which of its own policies may adversely affect pedestrians. For instance, the data for determining Level of Service should reflect only legal behavior and the maximum speed used for the off-peak speed should be the lower of the posted speed, the statutory speed, and the target speed in the Road Code.	Agree	While the Planning Department no longer uses Level of Service as an evaluation metric, the Planning Department will need to continue to consider how internal policies impact pedestrians. While this will be an ongoing effort, the following recommendations are included in the draft plan:  B-7d: Preserve paper streets and other rights-of-way if they could potentially provide future pedestrian connectivity benefits, like pedestrian shortcuts. B-7e: Update development standards to require or incentivize new developments to connect to nearby sidewalks and trails that exist or may be built in the future. B-8c: Write Forest Conservation Plans to allow accessible pedestrian pathways to make important connections and rewrite existing Forest Conservation Plans to allow pathways where it would be beneficial for pedestrian connectivity. B-8d: Study lowering impervious surface caps in relevant Special Protection Areas (and other areas with impervious surface restrictions) to account for the perviousness of planned pedestrian pathways and bikeways.
49	General	58	Larry Cole	N/A	Pavement resurfacing projects should ensure that ADA requirements are met within their project limits and opportunities for increasing pedestrian safety should be pursued. For example, the SE corner of East-West Hwy at 16th Street should be made ADA complaint during the resurfacing process.	Disagree	Disagree. ADA improvements should not be required to be implemented as part of routine pavement maintenance projects.
50	General	59	Larry Cole	N/A	The SHA 8" curb height should be lowered to MCDOT's 6" standard in areas with pedestrian activity to allow more accessible sidewalks and crossings to be created.	Agree	Planning Staff recommends adding the following key action:  <u>B-1h: Update state curb height standards to 6" in areas with pedestrian activity</u>  <u>Curb ramps allow people using wheelchair and other wheeled vehicles to transition between the road surface and the sidewalk. By law, the running slope of the curb ramp (from the street to the sidewalk) cannot exceed 8.33 percent for new sidewalks or 10 percent for those built before the ADA went into effect. To achieve these running slopes, a taller curb ramp requires more space because ramps need to be longer. This additional space requirement often requires adjustments to the slope of adjacent sidewalks, which can have a negative effect on accessibility. Lowering the state's 8" standard curb height to the county's 6" standard will allow shorter ramps and more accessible sidewalks.</u>  <u>Goals: Equitable and Just Pedestrian Network</u> <u>Leads: MDOT SHA</u>
51	General	60	Laura	N/A	Bikes, scooters and skateboards are dangerous to pedestrians, especially the elderly and disabled, and should not be allowed on sidewalks.	Disagree	In many parts of the county, sidewalks are the only place to safely use bikes, scooters and skateboards. While there may be inconsiderate users of these devices, as there are with all modes of transportation, banning them will not be effective at reducing conflicts. Instead, building out the separated bike lane network envisioned in the Bicycle Master Plan will provide a dedicated space for people who use bicycles, scooters and skateboards to travel.
52	General	71	Larry Cole	N/A	A speed limit of 5 mph should be set for scooter users on public sidewalks to ensure pedestrian safety.	Disagree	The GPS technology used by shared scooters is not sensitive enough to differentiate between a sidewalk and the roadway immediately adjacent, so sidewalk-specific speed limits are not practical. Applying a blanket 5mph speed limit for scooters would make them unsafe to use on roadways. Instead of a lower speed limit, building out the separated bike lane network envisioned in the Bicycle Master Plan will provided a dedicated space for people using scooters to travel. All people using sidewalks should be courteous when approaching and passing people traveling more slowly.
53	General	61, 68	League of Women Voters, Marie Dean	N/A	Ensure private development is constructing sidewalks and making connections to the existing sidewalk network.	Agree	This is existing Planning Department policy, but Key Action B-7e (Update development standards to require or incentivize new developments to connect to nearby sidewalks and trails that exist or may be built in the future) strengthens this by emphasizing the importance of these connections.
54	General	65	Patricia Mulready	N/A	Historic district sidewalks should maintain the look of the neighborhood and not kill trees. Brookeville Road's 2.5' permeable sidewalks are a correct approach. Other historic districts should get similar treatment if sidewalks are being considered.	Disagree	Sidewalk construction should make every effort to minimize tree loss, but accessibility for those with disabilities is a primary concern. The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) establishes a minimum sidewalk width of 3', with 5' passing spaces provided every 200 feet or less. That said, sidewalks in historic districts require special permits and coordination under County Code Section 24A-6.
55	General	66	Sligo Park Hills Community Association	N/A	Permit short-term residential block closures.	N/A	Montgomery County's Block Party Street Closure Request process is available at: <a href="https://www3.montgomerycountymd.gov/311/Solutions.aspx?SolutionId=1-3FQC36">https://www3.montgomerycountymd.gov/311/Solutions.aspx?SolutionId=1-3FQC36</a>
56	General	61	League of Women Voters	N/A	Better bus stop access and accessibility is needed. Either reintroduce/expand the Bus Stop Improvement Program.	Agree	Planning staff recommends adding the underlined text to Key Action B-7a on page 82: Key Action B-7a: Increase funding for the Annual Sidewalk Program and other related Capital Improvement Program efforts, <u>including the Bus Stop Improvements capital funding program</u> , to address missing, broken, or substandard sidewalks and other infrastructure.

**Attachment D: Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix**

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter(s)	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation
<b>Design Policy and Programming Recommendations</b>							
57	B-1	54, 72, 75, 79, 80, 74	Joel and Connie Lesch, Lauren Saunders, Maddie Glist and Tim Pohle, Bernard Barrett, Jr., Elizabeth Wehr, Sinaly Roy	64	The sidewalk program should be revamped to be holistic, cross-departmental -- not focused just on sidewalks but on all ways to maximize neighborhood safety, preserve trees, and enhance the pedestrian experience.	Disagree	The Annual Sidewalk Program should continue to construct sidewalks in residential neighborhoods. MCDOT can continue to coordinate between the different groups responsible for sidewalks, traffic calming, trees, and other streetscape elements to ensure the best, most effective projects are moving forward to construction.
58	B-1	76	Tim Soderquist	64	Our sidewalk program is not working. Restructuring is as outlined in the plan and increasing funding will help neighborhoods that need sidewalks get them faster, and without having to fight and advocate for limited resources.	N/A	No change is needed as this comment is addressed by Recommendation B-1.
59	B-1	73	Lauren Saunders	64	Inform homeowners, landscapers and others about County right of ways and encourage improvements that do not interfere with future sidewalk construction.	Discuss	Current homeowners, prospective homeowners, and contractors should always be aware of property boundaries, easements, and other land encumbrances as part of due diligence. Montgomery County has a plat map ( <a href="http://www.mcatlas.org/plats">www.mcatlas.org/plats</a> ) to help interested parties understand where public rights of way are located.
60	B-1a	77, 78, 82, 83, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89	Annie Tulkin, Barbara Sanders, Joel and Connie Lesch, John and Beni Devine, Lauren Saunders, Maddie Glist and Tim Pohle, Rich Kuzmyak, Jordan Day, Sanjida Rangwala	64	Support for a data-driven approach to sidewalk construction	N/A	No change is needed as this comment is addressed by Key Action B-1a.
61	B-1a	81	Gael Cheek	64	In recommendation B-1a, the proposed shift from a "reactive" sidewalk project to a "proactive" sidewalk project should not remove existing sidewalk requests from the queue and should continue to permit residents to request sidewalks.	Agree with Modifications	The plan envisions the Annual Sidewalk Program proactively building sidewalks based on considerations that would include pedestrian safety (crashes). By moving away from a request-based system, county residents can be more confident that the sidewalks that are built will improve pedestrian safety and connectivity. However, sidewalks projects that are already in the construction queue should not be removed.  Planning Staff recommend adding language to the description of Key Action B-1a to read: " <u>Sidewalk requests already in the Annual Sidewalk Program queue should continue to be considered for future construction.</u> "
62	B-1a	84	Larry Cole	64	Where new homes are built on already platted lots, including those where an older home is demolished, and where existing homes are undergoing a significant renovation, the building permit should require that a sidewalk be built to current standards along the street frontage in all areas where the zoning supports this construction.	Agree	No change is needed as this comment is already county policy.
63		96	Larry Cole	64	Sidewalks should be built on the intersecting streets of all arterials and roads of a higher classification. Drivers leaving these major roadways often continue to drive at a higher than appropriate speed that is incompatible with pedestrians walking in the roadway.	Agree	Planning Staff recommends transmitting this comment to MCDOT for further action.
64		97	Larry Cole	64	We should ensure that sidewalks along roadways classified as arterials and higher have adequate space for pedestrians. The reasons for deviations from the County's road standards and ADA Best Practices should be made part of the project record and made publicly available. All too often with retrofit projects, there is a tendency to start not even with the appropriate road standard on whose creation and adoption a lot of staff time and legislators' time has been spent, but to minimize the footprint of the project to reduce impacts on residents' perceived property line. While a smaller footprint may be more acceptable to the abutting property owner, the pedestrian space is often the loser by means of a much narrower landscape panel separating them from traffic or by that panel's complete elimination. There may be sufficient reasons for making such a decision, but written documentation is needed to deter such decisions being made just because it's politically easier in the moment and the decision-makers (Planning Board and County Council) should be aware of the trade-offs being made.	Agree	Planning staff recommends adding Key Action B-1X between B-1d and B-1e to read: <u>Key Action B-1X: Document deviations from Complete Streets Design Guide streetscape default widths where applicable. The Complete Streets Design Guide identifies preferred, default, and minimum widths of different roadway elements from travel lanes to sidewalks and landscape buffers. These widths were agreed upon through a collaborative process between MCDOT, MCDPS, and Montgomery Planning. Where public or private projects are not providing the default widths, staff must document the reasons that prevent achieving the CSDG dimensions as part of regulatory staff reports.</u> <u>Goal: Comfortable, Connected Pedestrian Network</u> <u>Lead: Montgomery Planning, MCDPS, MCDOT</u>
65	B-1b	88, 89, 91, 98	Jordan Day, Sanjida Rangwala, Commission on People with Disabilities, Larry Cole	65	Support for streamlining the sidewalk construction public engagement process and changing the conversation from whether a sidewalk will be built to how the sidewalk will be built in a contextually-appropriate way.	Agree	No change is needed because this comment supports Key Action B-1b.

**Attachment D: Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix**

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter(s)	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation
66	B-1b	80, 90, 92, 94, 95, 99, 100, 101, 102, 93	Elizabeth Wehr, Bernard Barrett, Jr., Diana Huffman and Kenneth Levine, Joel and Connie Lesch, John and Beni Devine, Lauren Saunders, Maddie Glist and Tim Pohle, Paula Whyman, Rich Kuzmyak, Sinaly Roy	65	Opposition to streamlining the sidewalk construction public engagement process in favor of earlier engagement and additional neighborhood by neighborhood engagement about whether sidewalks are wanted.	Disagree	No change. Key Action B-1b is intended to be implemented in concert with B-1a. The intention is that the county should proactively build sidewalks in residential areas where they provide the largest connectivity and safety benefits. This proactive approach will not be successful if constructing the highest priority connections requires neighborhood approval. Community members are welcome to oppose sidewalk construction, but the feedback MCDOT should be looking for as they construct sidewalks is how to make the necessary sidewalks context-sensitive, not whether the sidewalk should be built at all.
67	B-1c	103	Civic Federation	65	Add all parks to paragraph, including both Montgomery County and Maryland-National Park and Planning Commission parks.	Discuss	Montgomery Parks supports the recommendations listed in the Bicycle Master Plan and is committed to these improvements being constructed as required after environmental review.
68	B-1d	104	Larry Cole	65	Adjust Key Action B-1d so the minimum standard is "Comfortable" on the six-point Pedestrian Level of Comfort scale in the plan appendix.	Disagree	The Pedestrian Level of Comfort index is referenced as an existing county tool that was approved by the Council and that is not proposed to be modified at this time.
69	B-1d	105	Northwood-Four Corners Civic Association	65	Sidewalks should be installed on streets where there are none and existing sidewalks should be improved or widened to allow access by pedestrians, strollers, and wheelchairs.	Agree	No change is needed as this comment is addressed by Key Action B-1d.
70	B-1e	106, 107	Rich Kuzmyak, Sligo Park Hills Community Association	66	General support for Key Action B-1e, which would explore the use of temporary materials to create dedicated pedestrian spaces where sidewalks are not feasible.	Agree	No change is needed as this comment is addressed by Key Action B-1e.
71	B-1e	108	Tuuli Lipping	66	On Goldsboro Road, consider installing flexposts to delineate pedestrian space where sidewalks do not currently exist.	Disagree	The Goldsboro Road speed limit and limited space make a temporary sidewalk delineated by flexposts not feasible, however, as this project is currently under design by MCDOT, the comment can be directed to the project team.
72	B-f	109	Civic Federation	66	This recommendation should not include removal of parking restrictions near high schools.	Disagree	Where bikeways, wider sidewalks, and other transportation facilities could be provided in the area around high schools, Residential Permit Parking removal should be considered.
73	B-2a	110	David Lechner	68	Requiring pedestrians to push a button to cross the street is reasonable as oftentimes there are no pedestrians waiting to cross the street.	Disagree	Pedestrians are more likely to comply with traffic signals if they are certain they will be provided an opportunity to cross the street. Pushing a button does not provide that certainty for several reasons: 1) The delay between the button press and the walk signal may be so long that pedestrians do not believe the walk signal will come 2) The pedestrian may have pushed the button too late in the signal cycle for a walk signal to be included, so the pedestrian has to wait even longer to cross the street, even though motor vehicle traffic proceeding parallel to the path of travel will receive a green signal.  Uncertainty and unnecessary delay both limit the effectiveness of pedestrian push buttons and make it more likely that pedestrians will not comply.
74	B-2a	113	Civic Federation	68	Change pedestrian recall default to only hours between 7:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m. to reduce pollution caused by vehicles waiting for green light at late night hours.	Disagree	From a pedestrian perspective, this is not appropriate because we need to establish a consistent expectation among pedestrians about whether they do or do not have to push a button to cross the street, otherwise compliance will suffer during the time of day when pedestrians are less visible. From a drivers perspective, it does seem inappropriate to have to wait at a red light for an extended period of time late at night when there is no traffic, but instead of limiting pedestrian recall, traffic signal cycles should be modified.
75	B-2a	111, 112	Jordan Day, Larry Cole	68	Supports making pedestrian recall the default in Downtowns and Town Centers and adjacent to rail and bus rapid transit stations, schools, parks and community centers, but recommends also including trail crossings.	Agree	Planning Staff recommends updating Key Action B-2a to read: "Make pedestrian recall the default configuration for signalized intersections in Downtowns and Town Centers and adjacent to rail and bus rapid transit stations, schools, parks, <u>major trail crossings</u> , and community centers."
76	B-2b	114	Rich Kuzmyak	69	Without pedestrian recall, the pedestrian push button should be responsive to a press such that the green signal comes sooner.	Agree	No change is needed as this is included in Key Action B-2b.
77	B-2c	115	Rich Kuzmyak	69	A diagonal crossing (aka a Barnes Dance) is desirable at major intersections in downtowns, along transit corridors, and in proximity to transit stations/bus stops. Establish threshold criteria for their implementation.	Agree	No change is needed as this is included in Key Action B-2c.
78	B-2d	116	Rich Kuzmyak	69	Supports reducing the number of intersections with permissive left turns on higher classification streets and recommends developing criteria to guide their implementation at individual intersections.	N/A	No change is needed as this comment is addressed by Key Action 2d.
79	B-3a	117	Larry Cole	70	The graphic shown is useful but should be modified to show one of the ramps occurring on a curved sidewalk section to forestall any misunderstanding that these ramps can only be constructed on a straight section of curb.	Agree with Modifications	As Planning Staff did not develop this graphic, instead of modifying the graphic, we recommend adding the following text to the recommendation: " <u>Perpendicular curb ramps aligned with the crosswalk can be provided on both straight and curved sections of curb.</u> "
80	B-3a	118, 119	Marybeth Cleveland, National Capital Area Chapter of the American Council of the Blind of Maryland	70	The recommendation addresses the problem of ramps guiding blind users and people using wheelchairs into the intersection.	N/A	No change is needed as this comment is addressed by Key Action B-3a.
81	B-3a	120	Rich Kuzmyak	70	A related issue to curb ramps that guide pedestrians into the middle of the street is when crosswalk alignment suffers due to wide curb radii.	N/A	No change is needed



**Attachment D: Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix**

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter(s)	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation
82	B-3b	121, 122	Larry Cole, Game Changers	71	Wider crosswalks should be provided to accommodate heavier volumes of pedestrians in commercial areas, near schools and where the crosswalk is part of a named trail.	Agree	<p>Planning Staff recommends adding the following key action:</p> <p><u>Key Action B-3c: Crosswalk markings and associated curb ramps should be at least as wide as the sidewalks and trails they connect on either side.</u></p> <p><u>Pedestrian facilities like sidewalks and crosswalks should be designed to comfortably accommodate the anticipated number of users. In commercial areas, near schools, and where major trail crossings are present, wider crosswalk markings are necessary to maintain the pedestrian experience across the intersection and inform drivers that the crossing has significant pedestrian activity.</u></p> <p><u>Goals: Walking Rates, Pedestrian Safety, Equitable and Just Pedestrian Network</u></p> <p><u>Leads: MCDOT, MDOT SHA</u></p>
83	B-3c	123, 124	Adam Carlesco, Rich Kuzmyk	72	Support for raised crossings as they reduce pedestrian injuries and deaths and increase compliance with stop signs.	N/A	No changes is needed as the comment supports Key Action B-3c.
84	B-3d	125, 126, 171	Action Committee for Transit, Rich Kuzmyk, Patricia Mulready	73	Marking crosswalks at all intersection legs will benefit all walkers and rollers.	N/A	No changes is needed as the comment supports Key Action B-3d.
85	B-3e	127	Rich Kuzmyk	74	In support of this recommendation, there should be additional advance signage for drivers approaching crosswalks.	Agree	Planning Staff recommends updating the Key Action B-3e description to include the following text: <u>"To support improved driver yielding, additional signage in advance of crosswalks should be installed across the county over time, particularly at locations where there may be sight distance issues."</u>
86	B-4a	128, 129, 130	Coalition for Smarter Growth, Montgomery County Climate Action Plan Coalition, Rich Kuzmyk	74	Walking will increase if we encourage land uses supportive of walking.	N/A	No change is needed as this comment is addressed by Key Action B-4a.
87	B-4b/c	131	Alison Gillespie	75	Supports constructing schools with safe and direct pedestrian access and lowering the minimum acreage requirements for school sites to improve walkability.	N/A	No change is needed as this comment is addressed by Key Action B-4b and B-4c.
88	B-4b/c	132	Greater Colesville Citizens Association	75	Since the county is largely built out, it is too late to locate schools and other public buildings where there is good pedestrian access. Steps need to be taken to improve walking access where the buildings are located.	Disagree	Planning Staff agrees that the walkability of existing schools must be improved. However, the county continues to build new schools and renovate others and so there are opportunities to implement Key Actions B-4b and B-4c.
89	B-4c	171	Patricia Mulready	75	Support for smaller school sites	Agree	No change is needed.
90	B-4d	133, 134	Coalition for Smarter Growth, Rich Kuzmyk	75	Supports providing a transit corridor overlay in the Complete Streets Design Guide as this will improve safety along arterial roadways, which are among the most dangerous in the county.	N/A	No change is needed as this comment is addressed by Key Action B-4d.
91	B-4e	135	Rich Kuzmyk	76	A street grid is essential to improving access management to commercial businesses and making it easier to access bus stops and cross streets safely.	N/A	No change is needed as this comment is addressed by Key Action B-4e.
92	B-4g	136, 140	Alison Gillespie, Sligo Park Hills Community Association	78	Support existing Open Parkways configuration	N/A	No change is needed as this comment is addressed by Key Action B-4g.
93	B-4g	137, 138	Anonymous, Byeforde Rock Creek Highlands Citizens Association	78	Oppose Open Parkways due to residential cut through traffic and difficulty accessing amenities within the adjacent parkland. Open Parkways do not achieve the Pedestrian Master Plan Vision.	Disagree	Open Parkways are not inherently a problem, and they need to be evaluated on a case-by-case basis to consider how they may divert traffic through residential neighborhoods and reduce access to park amenities.
94	B-4g	139	Rich Kuzmyk	78	The parkways should have better vehicular speed management and distracted driving enforcement.	Agree	Planning Staff recommends incorporating this sentiment into the proposed Key Action P-8b, and has included relevant text in that location.
95	B-4h	142, 143, 146	Jane Lyons-Raeder, Marybeth Cleveland, Game Changers	78	Supports Key Action B-4h to provide public seating, restrooms, etc in Downtowns, Town Centers and along Boulevards. Public restrooms should have adult changing tables or family bathrooms available.	Agree	Planning Staff recommends adding the following text to the description of Key Action B-4h: <u>"Public restrooms should provide an adult changing table or family bathroom option"</u>
96	B-4h	141	Greater Colesville Citizens Association	78	Restrooms and public seating should be in downtowns and medium-sized town centers next to premium transit stations.	N/A	Planning Staff does not recommend a change to the plan, as this comment is not in conflict with Key Action B-4h.
97	B-4h	144	Sligo Park Hills Community Association	78	Supports expanding Key Action B-4h to include respite locations.	Agree	Planning Staff recommends changing the Key Action B-4h description to include the following text: <u>"Benches and other seating can be provided along the sidewalk and also set back from the street in pocket parks and other small green spaces."</u>
98	B-4h	145	Civic Federation	78	Supports expanding Key Action B-4h to include parks and trails.	Agree	Planning Staff recommends changing B-4h to read: <u>"Provide public seating, restrooms and other pedestrian amenities in Downtowns, Town Centers, in parkland, and along Boulevards."</u>
99	B-4i	147	Rich Kuzmyk	79	Supports updating Key Action B-4i tighten curb radius dimensions.	N/A	No change is needed as this comment is addressed by Key Action B-4i.

**Attachment D: Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix**

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter(s)	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation
100	B-5a	148, 149, 152	Cathie Cooper, Larry Cole, Montgomery Square Citizens Association	79	Poor lighting makes it difficult for pedestrians and motorists to see each other at intersections.	N/A	No change is needed as this comment is addressed by Key Action B-5a.
101	B-5a	150	Larry Cole	79	Revise section title to Lighting for Roadways, Intersections, and Pedestrian and Bike Facilities.	Agree	Planning Staff recommends updating the section title to read " <u>Lighting for Roadways, Intersections, and Pedestrian and Bike Facilities</u> "
102	B-5a	151	Larry Cole	79	These standards already exist as prepared by AASHTO and IESNA. We need to determine whether our current lighting levels are up to standards before asking if pedestrians are satisfied.	Agree	This process of updating county standards to reflect best practices is currently underway through a joint MCDOT-Montgomery Planning Transportation Land Use Connections grant from the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments.
103	B-5a	153	Civic Federation	79	There should be a requirement for street lights in all areas with sidewalks; there should not be more than 150 feet between street lights.	Disagree	Key Action B-5a recommends an update to lighting standards. That update is in progress and will provide context-sensitive standards for different parts of the county and different street classifications. The suggestion that street light spacing should not exceed 150 feet may be inappropriate for some places in the county.
104	B-5b	154	Larry Cole	80	Rather than encourage pedestrian-scale lighting, the zoning code should require it where beneficial.	Disagree	No change is needed as Key Action B-5b is consistent with the comment.
104	B-5a/b	171	Patricia Mulready	80	Who is going to pay for lighting on private property plus mitigate environmental impacts?	N/A	Key Action B-5a recommends an update to lighting standards. That update is in progress and will provide context-sensitive standards for different parts of the county and different street classifications that include sensitivity around environmental concerns. This is lighting installed and
105	B-5c	155	Greater Colesville Citizens Association	80	This is not practical because repair efforts will not occur on weekends or holidays, and the public reports malfunctions, so they are not immediately known. Also, this is a maintenance recommendation, not a build one.	Disagree	Weekends and holidays notwithstanding, this is a reasonable goal given the importance of street lights to safe travel. Planning Staff recommends shifting this key action to the maintenance section to become Recommendation MA-4.
106	B-5c	156	Civic Federation	80	Require all government agencies to report malfunctioning streetlights. Include Police and Fire Departments.	Disagree	While Planning Staff supports maintenance of streetlights, it is not a good use of staff time to focus on issues outside their job functions.
107	B-6a	157, 158, 159, 160, 161	Rich Kuzmyk, Robin Gaster, Sligo Park Hills Community Association, Sligo Park Hills Community Association, Game Changers	81	More trees and shade should be provided along pedestrian pathways to make walking more pleasant.	Agree	No change is needed as this comment is addressed by Key Action B-6a.
108	B-7a	162	Rich Kuzmyk	82	Recent federal funding programs should be used to increase funding for sidewalk construction.	N/A	No change is needed
109	B-7c	163	Civic Federation	83	Add words requiring sidewalks in front of all parks.	Disagree	Planning Staff believes the current language achieves the goal of increasing park access to and through park land.
110	B-7e	164	Civic Federation	84	Remove incentive but keep requirement in new developments to connect to nearby sidewalks. Make it a requirement.	Disagree	The current language provides some flexibility for future efforts to determine the best way to accomplish the pedestrian connectivity goal.
111	B-7f	165	Rich Kuzmyk	85	Be sure to target this recommendation to areas where residential communities are separated from local goods and services.	Agree	<p>Planning Staff recommends updating the B-7f description to make clear that the priority locations for funding should be those where making improvements would make it easier and more direct for people to access local goods and services on foot.</p> <p>The description would read: "Many residential communities and commercial areas were constructed at a time when pedestrians were not prioritized. While today, pedestrians are a larger priority and Montgomery Planning and county agencies work with those pursuing private development projects on pedestrian-friendly site and frontage design, there are not many opportunities currently to encourage property owners who are not pursuing redevelopment to make pedestrian-friendly changes. This key action would provide a sum of money annually to support two types of important projects:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The provision of pedestrian shortcut connections and through-block connections across common areas of Homeowners Association and Condominium Association property—where these connections would improve pedestrian access to local businesses, transit, and community destinations. =</li> <li>2) The reconfiguration of parking lots to be more pedestrian friendly—reducing the number and severity of conflicts between motor vehicles and pedestrians</li> </ol> <p>Goals: Comfortable/Connected Pedestrian Network, Walking Rates, Pedestrian Safety Leads: MCDOT, County Executive, County Council</p>
112	B-7g	166, 167, 168, 169	Barbara Sanders, Coalition for Smarter Growth, Purple Line Now, Rich Kuzmyk	85	Support, especially when it comes to the Purple Line stations.	N/A	No change is needed as this comment is addressed by Key Action B-7g.

**Attachment D: Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix**

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter(s)	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation
113	B-8b	171	Patricia Mulready	86	Lit ADA impermeable sidewalks in parks, forested areas, and wetlands defeats the purpose of those areas, which includes protection of wildlife, especially structures like the "bridge" shown in the draft Master Plan. Lighting hurts biological clocks.	Disagree	There are opportunities to provide lighting and improved pedestrian connectivity through parkland in ways that are environmentally sensitive. Montgomery Parks is pursuing these opportunities.
114	B-9a	172	Northwood-Four Corners Civic Association	89	To promote walkability and bike-ability in the Four Corners community, county planning and transportation agencies should take steps to reduce cut-through traffic and discourage speeding by prohibiting turns onto arterial roads at certain points and installing traffic calming measures in residential neighborhoods. If east/west flow on Route 193 could be improved, fewer frustrated drivers would resort to cutting through these neighborhoods.	Agree	Planning Staff support the goal of improving traffic calming efforts, and are encouraged by the opportunities presented by the Complete Streets Design Guide to expand the use of traffic calming to more types of streets. Because the Complete Streets Design Guide is relatively new, Key Action B-9a recommends assessing how the updated guidance has changed traffic calming implementation, and if there are opportunities for improvement.
115	B-9b	173, 174, 176, 177	Rich Kuzmyak, Sligo Park Hills Community Association, Jane Lyons-Raeder, Sligo Park Hills Community Association	89	Support. It should also be easier to get a Traffic Engineering Study.	Agree	No change is needed as this comment is addressed by Key Action B-9b.
116	B-9b	175	Greater Colesville Citizens Association	89	Oppose. Pedestrian volumes should remain to allow the limited funding available to be used where the need is greatest.	Disagree	Pedestrian demand is one factor of many in determining whether a specific improvement should be made at a particular location. Using existing pedestrian volumes as a major factor is flawed because existing pedestrian activity may not be indicative of future activity when connectivity and safety improvements are made. People may not be making pedestrian trips because the requested improvements are not there.
117	B-10a	178, 180, 182, 183, 188, 190, 191	Annie Tulkin, Coalition for Smarter Growth, Jamie Herr, Jane Lyons-Raeder, Sligo Park Hills Community Association, Tim Soderquist, Town of Kensington	90	General support for evaluating approaches to assuming control of state highways as this will make it easier to address the other issues within the plan.	Agree	No change is needed
118	B-10a	188	Sligo Park Hills Community Association	90	Support. Wants Piney Branch Road included in the recommendation.	Disagree	Assuming control of state highways would be a challenging endeavor and therefore the plan prioritizes those state highways where the greatest safety issues are present (Downtowns, Town Centers and Bus Rapid Transit corridors), and therefore where the need for change is the greatest. If this approach is successful, the county could then consider taking control of additional state highways based on criteria.
119	B-10a	179, 181	Civic Federation, Greater Colesville Citizens Association	90	Concern that the cost of taking control of state highways is high due to operations and maintenance requirements.	Disagree	The key action aims to start a conversation about how such a transfer would occur. There are certainly financial considerations that will need to be dealt with as part of any transfer, and this process would evaluate that.
120	B-10a	186, 187, 189	Rich Kuzmyak, Rich Kuzmyak, Sligo Park Hills Community Association	90	If this recommendation does not proceed, additional cooperation between the county and state is essential to achieving county goals.	Agree	No change is needed
121	B-10a	185	Lee Keiser	90	Would county control make improvements along formerly state roads happen more quickly than they do today?	N/A	Transferring control of certain state highways to county control would have several benefits. The first is increased design flexibility. The second is improved accountability for achieving county goals. The third is a streamlined design process to allow improvements to happen more quickly.
122	B-10a	184	Lee Keiser	90	The plan should provide scenarios for what county control of residential "main streets" would look like.	Disagree	The key action does not recommend county control of residential streets.
123	MA-1a	213	Larry Cole	91	Park trails have become increasingly subject sediment and debris washed up on the pavement from more frequent and severe storms. This sediment and debris is often swept to the lower side of the trail, resulting in ponding on the trail that becomes an obstacle for users, often for days after the storm. Park maintenance policies should be changed to ensure that sediment and debris is moved to a location that maintains positive drainage for the trail.	Discuss	Montgomery Parks continues to expand its trail maintenance and trail work capabilities and seeks to address these issues. Parks staff can work to remove washed up sediment and debris and make sustainable improvements adjacent to the trail in order to prevent future build up. More extensive sediment and debris issues require planning, design, and permitting to address issues in environmentally sensitive areas.

Attachment D: Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter(s)	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation
124	MA-1a	171	Patricia Mulready	91	Support for repairing existing sidewalks	Agree	No change is needed
125	MA-2a	212	Larry Cole	91	Sidewalks should be checked every two years to ensure that adjacent landscaping has not encroached on sidewalks and paths. Where encroachments occur, adjacent property owners should be notified that vegetation should be removed within two feet of the sidewalk or path.	Agree	Planning Staff recommends updating the description of Key Action MA-2a to add: " <u>MCDOT should develop a plan for how often streets and pathways will be audited.</u> "
126	MA-2b	214	Greater Colesville Citizens Association	92	The proposed action is to require property owners to clear snow on pathways for a width of at least 5 feet. This is not possible if the path is not 5 feet in width. Also, even if the concrete is 5 foot wide, many places grass has grown over the edges so it is no longer that width.	Disagree	The key action description reads: "If the sidewalk is narrower than five feet (the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) preferred sidewalk width), the entire sidewalk width should be cleared."  Additionally, if grass has grown over the sidewalk so that it is no longer its original width, it is the property owner's responsibility to remove the vegetation to maintain the full sidewalk width.
127	MA-2d	215, 216, 217, 218, 219	Rich Kuzmyk, Sanjida Rangwala, Cathie Cooper, Jane Lyons-Raeder, Larry Cole	93	Support for increased county snow removal, and ensuring sidewalk snow clearance is prioritized over keeping all adjacent travel lanes free of snow.	Agree	The sidewalk snow clearance recommendation in Key Action MA-2d addresses this comment.
128	MA-2d	220, 221	Larry Cole, Civic Federation	93	Ensure pedestrian crossings and transit stops are kept clear of snow.	Agree	The sidewalk snow clearance recommendation in Key Action MA-2d is inclusive of transit stops and pedestrian crossings.
129	P-1	222	Larry Cole	95	County employees need to drive more safely. While red light-running is rampant at the intersection of Georgia Avenue and Colesville Road, the frequent occurrence of Ride-On bus drivers running the red light and cutting off pedestrians in the crosswalk is the most egregious. (I have personally witnessed this happen even in groups of two or three buses and recently even by an articulated FLASH bus, the County's premier transit service. The current driver expectation of punishment in such a high-visibility location apparently must be quite low.) In addition to punishing drivers who break the law, MCDOT should also consider adopting an operation policy to require bus drivers to stop on a yellow light as long as it is safe to do so.	Agree	Planning Staff recommend amending the description of Key Action P-1a with the following: " <u>To ensure compliance with traffic laws, county agencies should consider additional driver monitoring technologies. Additionally, as a policy, county and public agency drivers should stop on a yellow signal as long as it is safe to do so.</u> "
130	P-1	223	Trevor Frith	95	The county should support switching from a right foot braking method to a left foot braking method.	Disagree	Planning Staff will defer to the Maryland Motor Vehicle Administration on the best approach to vehicular braking.
131	P-1a	226	Civic Federation	95	Require all current county and public agency vehicles to have backup cameras and require all future new vehicles have forward and rear pedestrian detection equipment.	Agree	Planning Staff recommends amending Key Action P-1a to add: " <u>In addition, all current county and public agency vehicles should be equipped with backup cameras when feasible. Vehicles purchased in the future should have forward and rear pedestrian detection equipment.</u> "
132	P-1b	224	Rich Kuzmyk	95	County vehicles, such as Ride-On buses, school buses, WSSC trucks, county utility trucks (e.g., trash and leaf removal) and even police vehicles not on call can frequently be observed driving much faster than the posted speeds. This not only poses an immediate danger because of the large mass of the vehicle, but sets a poor example for all other drivers.	N/A	No changes is needed as Key Action P-1b recommends installing speed governors or intelligent speed control devices on these vehicles.
133	P-1b	225	Montgomery Square Citizens Association	95	There should be a tax credit or requirement for people to get pedestrian detection systems for their cars.	Agree	Planning Staff recommends adding the following after Key Action P-1e to explore requiring or incentivizing pedestrian detection systems in cars registered in Montgomery County.  The text should read: <u>Key Action P-1f: Study requiring or incentivizing the use of pedestrian detection systems in vehicles registered in Montgomery County.</u>  <u>Pedestrian detection systems are becoming increasingly common in new motor vehicles. These systems inform drivers about pedestrians in their vicinity and may perform automatic braking to avert a pedestrian crash. The county should study whether requiring or incentivizing the use of these technologies would be a cost-effective approach to reducing pedestrian injuries and fatalities.</u>  <u>Lead: County Executive, County Council</u> <u>Goals: Pedestrian Safety</u>
134	P-1e	227	Cathie Cooper	98	Support for improved driver education.	N/A	No change is needed as this comment is addressed by Key Action P-1e.
135	P-1e	228	Greater Colesville Citizens Association	98	While the comment supports the recommendation to require knowledge test requirement as part of the driver's license renewal process, it specifies that this should occur every other renewal cycle.	Disagree	Maryland drivers licenses are valid for between five and eight years. If the education requirement were implemented for every other renewal, drivers could potentially go sixteen years between education opportunities. That is too long given the pace the transportation system changes.

**Attachment D: Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix**

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter(s)	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation
136	P-1e	229	Civic Federation	98	Require the county to mail to each resident at least yearly all changes to traffic rules and regulations, instead of requiring drivers to have an in-person knowledge test every eight years.	Agree with Modifications	Planning Staff recommends adding the following sentence to the end of the paragraph in Key Action P-1e: <u>"Additionally, each year the county should mail a postcard to all county households identifying changes to traffic rules and regulations that have taken effect over the past year."</u>
137	P-2a	230	Cathie Cooper	99	Some locations where crossing improvements have been made are ignored or abused by pedestrians, so providing more safe crossings may not be the solution.	Disagree	While there will always be instances where pedestrians do not follow the rules, it is still important to make crossing improvements.
138	P-2a	231, 232, 233, 171	Rich Kuzmyk, Sligo Park Hills Community Association, Larry Cole, Patricia Mulready	99	Support for developing a methodology for identifying and prioritizing implementation of new protected crossings at mid-block or uncontrolled locations with a few suggestions:  - opportunities to signalize uncontrolled intersections adjacent to signalized ones where properly accommodating pedestrian volumes at the main intersection would cause other problems - pedestrian crossing improvements along Piney Branch Road from Long Branch to Takoma Park.	Agree	These are suggestions that MCDOT and SHA could consider as the methodology recommended in Key Action P-2a is developed.
139	P-2b	234, 235, 236, 171	Larry Cole, Jane Lyons-Raeder, Rich Kuzmyk, Patricia Mulready	99	Supports establishing standards for the distance between bus stops and the nearest protected crossing to encourage pedestrians to cross the street at safe locations.	N/A	No change is needed as this comment is addressed by Key Action P-2b.
140	P-2b	237	Civic Federation	99	Require marked crosswalks at the nearest intersection for all bus stops.	Agree	The current language in Key Action P-2b provides flexibility to determine the best way to improve pedestrian safety boarding and alighting from bus stops. In many cases, this may include adding a marked crosswalk. In other cases, it may involve moving a bus stop to a signalized intersection or other approach.
141	P-2c	238, 239	Larry Cole, Rich Kuzmyk	100	Supports making No Turn on Red (NTOR) the default in Downtowns and Town Centers and evaluated elsewhere on a case-by-case basis and enforcing NTOR using automated enforcement approaches and additional traffic control devices as needed.	N/A	No change is needed as this comment is addressed by Key Action P-2c.
142	P-2d	240, 241	Rich Kuzmyk, National Capital Area Chapter of the American Council of the Blind of Maryland	101	Supports prioritizing pedestrian crossings using Leading Pedestrian Intervals (LPIs) (or Leading Through Intervals) at signalized intersections along Downtown Boulevards, Downtown Streets, Town Center Boulevards, and Town Center Streets.	N/A	No change is needed as this comment is addressed by Key Action P-2d.
143	P-2e	243, 245, 244	Larry Cole, Larry Cole, Larry Cole	102	The Plan's recommendations for more pedestrian crossing time but not increasing traffic signal cycle lengths need to be reconciled.  'If pedestrian safety is the highest County priority, traffic signalization phasing and timing decisions should be made on that basis. DC's operation of 16th Street handles large rush hour traffic flows into and out of the District but still manages to have good pedestrian crossing times, and in the off-peak the traffic signal system is timed to keep speeds low. While Montgomery County for the most part does not have a grid street network like the District does, MCDOT should investigate the potential for controlling speeding problems by adjusting traffic signal cycles.  Consider creating a database of the pedestrian timings at each intersection including what walking speed the crossing time was based on.	Agree	In some locations, the pedestrian crossing time should be increased. In other locations, it may be more appropriate to shorten the traffic signal cycles to allow pedestrians more frequent opportunities to cross.  Planning Staff recommend adding the following text to both Key Actions P-2e and EA-3a: <u>"Note: Key Action P-2e and Key Action EA-3a may somewhat work at cross purposes, as providing more time for pedestrians to cross the street may require a longer signal cycle length."</u>
144	P-2e	242	Greater Colesville Citizens Association	102	We strongly oppose reducing traffic signal cycle lengths so pedestrians don't need to wait as long. Shorter cycle times just reduces intersection capacity and thus leads to more congestion. More congestion will lead to more dangerous driving habits.	Disagree	Shorter signal cycles do not necessarily increase congestion, and may actually reduce congestion on side streets as drivers are provided more frequent opportunities to travel through an intersection.
145	P-2e	246	Rich Kuzmyk	102	Supports reducing pedestrian wait times by developing a policy on target and maximum traffic signal cycle lengths by street type.	N/A	No change is needed as this comment is addressed by Key Action P-2e.
146	P-2f	247	Rich Kuzmyk	102	Would pedestrian refuges diminish the ability for a pedestrian to cross the entire street on one cycle, instead of having to wait for a separate crossing opportunity?	N/A	While the presence of a refuge may make it easier to justify creating a two-phase pedestrian crossing, this is not a desirable outcome and is not recommended.
147	P-2g	248, 249	Rich Kuzmyk, Sligo Park Hills Community Association	102	Support for removing free-flow channelized right turn lanes where roadway geometry allows and improve their design where it does not.	N/A	No change is needed as this comment is addressed by Key Action P-2g.
148	P-3a	250, 251	Civic Federation, Rich Kuzmyk	103	Support for developing parking lot design standards that improve safety and reduce conflicts between pedestrians and motor vehicles.	N/A	No change is needed as this comment is addressed by Key Action P-3a.

Attachment D: Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter(s)	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation
149	P-4a	252, 253	Cathie Cooper, Greater Colesville Citizens Association	104	Support for conducting pedestrian and bicycle safety educational programs in partnership with agencies such as MCPL, MCPS, and MCR. Additionally:  - We need pedestrian education, and that means education that actually sticks and changes bad behavior - Pedestrian and bicycle safety education needs to include the requirement for them to use paths rather than use roads when a sidewalk is available.	Agree	Education is an important component of improving the pedestrian experience in Montgomery County. Education should effectively articulate where walking and rolling can and should take place given the presence of different types of infrastructure, including sidewalks and paths.
150	P-4c	254	Civic Federation	104	Require sidewalks at pickup / drop-off locations at public schools.	N/A	No change is needed, as Key Action B-1c already addresses this issue: "Require all new public buildings, as well as major renovations, to design and construct bikeways and walkways along their frontage as recommended in master plans and the CSDG, as well as to dedicate right-of-way where required."
151	P-5	255	Rich Kuzmyk	105	Supports making the walk to school safer and more direct, but requests pedestrian improvements where at the home end of the walk to school trip.	Agree	No change is needed, as Key Action P-5e already addresses this issue: "Identify walking and bicycling routes to school within each MCPS school catchment area and ensure all students within the area can safely walk and bicycle to school."
152	P-5c	256	Greater Colesville Citizens Association	106	Opposes closing streets near schools during arrival and dismissal as those streets are needed by the general public and parents dropping off their children and in the case of high schools, students driving to school.	Disagree	No changes is needed as Key Action P-5c indicates that closing streets near schools will not be appropriate at all schools.
153	P-5d	258	Greater Colesville Citizens Association	107	Transportation Demand Management is often not practical for schools, except for encouraging parents to carpool when taking children to school or picking them up.	Disagree	While students carpooling with other families is one potential way to reduce car trips to and from schools, a transportation demand management plan could identify other strategies to reduce vehicle trips. Private schools in Montgomery County are already required to complete these plans.
154	P-7a	259	Larry Cole	109	MSHA's longstanding practice of violating Maryland's own version of the national policy on lane striping obscures the presence of unsignalized intersections and is the biggest insidious safety hazard to pedestrians on state highways that serve as our major transit corridors.	Agree	No change is needed, as Key Action P-7a already addresses this issue: "Paint lane markings to indicate the presence of minor streets along state highways in line with Maryland Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MdMUTCD) guidance."
155	P-7b	260	Rich Kuzmyk	110	There are many locations where stop bars don't exist at all, or which have been neglected for so long that they are not visible/functional. Consider as supplemental strategies: flashing stop signs at critical intersections; raised crosswalks; double posting of stop signs where visibility is impaired; adding painted stop "boxes" or writing "STOP" at the intersection.	Agree with Modifications	Planning Staff recommends adding the following to the description of Key Action P-7b: " <u>There are many locations across the county where stop bars are missing completely, either because they have worn away or were never installed in the first place.</u> "
156	P-7c	261	Larry Cole	110	Support location guardrails between the pedestrian space and the roadway.	N/A	No change is needed as this comment is addressed by Key Action P-7c.
157	P-7d	262	Greater Colesville Citizens Association	111	We oppose eliminating breakaway traffic signals and other poles in locations with pedestrian activity. That would just increase the injury rate for vehicle operators.	Disagree	In locations with pedestrian activity, breakaway poles reduce motor vehicle occupant crash severity by putting pedestrians at risk for injury or worse. This is an uncomfortable trade-off, but pedestrian safety should be prioritized.
158	P-8	263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268	Larry Cole, Rich Kuzmyk, Sligo Park Hills Community Association	112	Supports increasing the number of Automated Traffic Enforcement locations with the following changes: -Supplementary in-person police enforcement is needed to reinforce the posted speed limit. Other methods of improving the usefulness of cameras should be considered such as keeping a log of ALL speeding violations and having MCPD contact the worst repeat offenders. -Police enforcement to protect pedestrians should be at least eight times what it is currently and MCPD should consider having a dedicated group of motivated officers in charge of enforcement so that proper training and accountability are assured. A list of all potential traffic and pedestrian-related violations should be included on the County's Vision Zero website, along with a tally of all tickets given for each offense every year. -The assessment of the adequacy of police enforcement of pedestrian safety needs to be focused on the reduction of pedestrian collisions and fatalities not on tickets given or hours spent on enforcement. - Consideration should be given to discussing with the State Delegation the possibility of allocating the fines collected for pedestrian violations to pedestrian enforcement and pedestrian improvements rather than going into the state's general coffers as with other traffic violations. - interest in ATE being used for other violations like running stop signs, etc.	Agree	Planning Staff recommends changing Recommendation P-8 to read: " <u>Increase traffic enforcement activities</u> "  Planning Staff recommends rewriting the description of Recommendation P-8 to read: " <u>Enforcement is an important strategy to help achieve Vision Zero and make the county a better place to walk. Engineering and education both provide substantial benefits, but ensuring traffic laws are followed is essential. The following key actions identify approaches to increasing the depth and breadth of traffic enforcement countywide.</u> "  Planning Staff recommends changing Key Action P-8a to read: " <u>Increase the number of Automated Traffic Enforcement (ATE) locations.</u> "  Planning Staff recommends shifting the description of Recommendation P-8 to Key Action P-8a: " <u>The goal of the county's ATE program of speeding cameras and other similar devices should be to eliminate dangerous driving behaviors and make the transportation system safer. An Insurance Institute of Highway Safety study from 2016 found that Montgomery County ATE reduced likelihood of speeding by 62% and severe/fatal crash likelihood by 39% along roads where ATE was present. To bring these benefits countywide, the network of ATE devices needs to be much more extensive. A plan should be developed to increase the number of these devices to address as many different kinds of traffic violations as are permitted by state law. If a driver breaks traffic laws in the county, they should be confident that they will receive a ticket. With the likelihood of a pedestrian being killed in a traffic crash dramatically increasing as a function of vehicle speed, improving compliance with speed limits will save pedestrian lives.</u> "  Planning Staff recommends adding Key Action P-8b to read: " <u>Increase in-person traffic enforcement activities</u> "  <u>While there are many benefits to automated enforcement, there are opportunities to provide enhanced in-person traffic enforcement, especially of violations that automated enforcement does not detect or in locations where automated enforcement is not present. Of particular relevance for this master plan include violations of pedestrian right-of-way, stop sign compliance, and other pedestrian-vehicle conflicts. Strategies should be developed to identify the best approach to increasing this necessary enforcement activity.</u>  <u>Lead: County Executive, County Council, MCPD, Montgomery Parks</u> <u>Goals: Pedestrian Safety</u>

**Attachment D: Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix**

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter(s)	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation
159	EA	192, 193, 195, 196	Annie Tulkin, Helen Heinrich, Marybeth Cleveland, National Capital Area Chapter of the American Council of the Blind of Maryland	113	Support for how the plan emphasizes improving the pedestrian experience for people with disabilities, families, elderly populations, and those interested in aging in place.	N/A	No change is needed
160	EA	194	Larry Cole	113	Ensure that approved maintenance of traffic plans in regard to pedestrian accommodation during construction are followed but also improved. The MCDOT division chief in charge of design should be required to sign off on all diversions of pedestrians during construction, as well as diversions from ADA Best Practices and diversions from county roadway standards. Detailed reasons should be included with the package submitted for sign-off.	Agree with Modifications	County legislation from 2020 improved the maintenance of pedestrian detour through construction zones. While there continue to be concerns, many of these are along state highways where maintenance of traffic is the state's responsibility. One helpful update to county policy would be the publication of approved pedestrian detour plans in an easily accessible format so members of the public can understand what is permitted and follow up with the appropriate staff if they believe a permit condition is not being adhered to.  Planning staff recommends adding Key Action EA-9b on page 125: <u>Key Action EA-9b: Publish approved Maintenance of Traffic plans in an easily accessible format.</u> <u>Maintenance of Traffic plans explain how different travel modes will be handled through construction zones. These plans are developed so travel can continue safely and with minimal detour through these areas. However, the approved plans are not readily available for public review, and it is not straightforward for community members to know who at what agency to contact about a potential violation. Making the plans accessible and providing points of contact will make it easier for pedestrian access to be maintained appropriately.</u> <u>Goals: Equitable and Just Pedestrian Network</u> <u>Leads: MCDOT, MCDPS</u>
161	EA-2a/b	197, 198	Pablo Collins, Sanjida Rangwala	115	Obstructions are a major issue for pedestrian accessibility across the county today.	Agree	No change is needed as this comment is addressed by Key Action EA-2a and EA-2b.
162	EA-2c	199, 206	Commission on People with Disabilities, Larry Cole	116	We appreciate the inclusion of recommendation EA-2c as movable sidewalk obstructions, such as electric scooters, pose barriers to people of	N/A	No change is needed as this comment is addressed by Key Action EA-2c.
163	EA-3	200, 201	Rich Kuzmyak, Game Changers	117	Supports providing pedestrians more time to cross the street.	N/A	No change is needed as this comment is addressed by Key Action EA-3.
164	EA-4	202	Rich Kuzmyak	119	Pedestrian signals are currently operating far short of their potential benefit and value, given their cost.	N/A	No change is needed as this comment is addressed by Key Action EA-4.
165	EA-4b	203	Game Changers	120	Support for passive detection	N/A	No change is needed as this comment is addressed by Key Action EA-4b.
166	EA-6	204	Larry Cole	113	Bring park trails up to ADA standards and ensure adequate temporary accommodation during repairs. While there is likely a problem with bringing some of the existing local connections to park trails up to ADA standards, the main paved trails should be accessible to all at a minimum. As one example of an existing problem, Sligo Creek Trail between Colesville Road and the Beltway has substandard cross-slopes that do not meet ADA standards and makes its use difficult for people with mobility problems even though it is otherwise a heavily used downcounty facility.  As an example of the need for temporary ADA-accessible accommodation for park facilities, the Sligo Creek Trail bridge at Garland Avenue was closed to trail traffic for several months last year. While there were signs on the bridge saying it was closed, there was no advance notice of the closure, which created a big potential problem for mobility-impaired people approaching from the south, and there was no alternative accommodation.	Discuss	While the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA) does not contain Trail standards, the Parks Department does follow the Architectural Barriers Act of 1968 (ABA) guidelines on Outdoor Developed areas as they relate to trails and other outdoor elements such as picnic areas, camp sites, and more. The ABA provides guidelines on surface, width, slopes, cross slopes, resting intervals, and more and the Parks Department works to adhere to these.
167	EA-8a	205	Sligo Park Hills Community Association	123	Supports a modification to the Maryland Code clarifying that drivers, bicyclists, and scooter riders are required to yield the right of way to pedestrians on shared streets and that drivers are also required to yield to bicyclists and scooter riders.	N/A	No change is needed as this comment is addressed by Key Action EA-8a.
168	EA-8b	206	Larry Cole	124	We should ensure that permitted uses don't degrade the sidewalk, such as outdoor seating, entrance structures, ropes/railings, and scooter and bike parking. For example, while most of the Covid-era outdoor seating has been removed in Silver Spring, the sidewalk is still constricted by permanent or semi-permanent shelters at restaurant and club entrances, sometimes with ropes/railings beyond that shelter, reducing the usable width of the sidewalk.	Agree	No change is needed as this comment is addressed by Key Action EA-8b.

**Attachment D: Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix**

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter(s)	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation
169	EA-9a	207	Larry Cole	125	Violations of approved plans are rampant with unexpected sidewalk closures, lack of handicapped access, and other unsafe conditions; these conditions are easily seen as part of the construction at the Planning Department's former headquarters at 8787 Georgia Avenue and the storage area allowed in the Spring Street median drastically reduces the sight distance of pedestrians approaching the marked crosswalk at Woodland Drive. All worksites should be required to post a contact name and number at the Department of Permitting Services along with a link to the approved traffic plan. In addition to ensuring that the contractor doesn't violate the approved plan, more care needs to be taken in the approval of the plan itself. For example, the restarted Purple Line work has been active on Bonifant Street for many months with the segment west of Georgia Avenue completely closed to traffic and the segment east of Georgia Avenue restricted to eastbound traffic only. Yet the pedestrian signals to cross Bonifant at Georgia have not been modified at all, forcing pedestrians to wait unnecessarily or encourage them to violate the DON'T WALK because there is no longer conflicting Bonifant Street traffic.	Agree	<p>County legislation from 2020 improved the maintenance of pedestrian detour through construction zones. There continue to be concerns with construction blocking pedestrian pathways unnecessarily or without permission. One helpful update to county policy would be the publication of approved pedestrian detour plans in an easily accessible format so members of the public can understand what is permitted and follow up with the appropriate staff if they believe a permit condition is not being adhered to.</p> <p>Planning Staff recommends adding Key Action EA-9b to read: " <u>Publish approved Maintenance of Traffic plans in an easily accessible format.</u></p> <p><u>Maintenance of Traffic plans explain how different travel modes will be handled through construction zones. These plans are developed so travel can continue safely and with minimal detour through these areas. However, the approved plans are not readily available for public review, and it is not straightforward for community members to know who at what agency to coordinate with about a potential violation. Making the plans accessible and providing points of contact will make it easier for pedestrian access to be maintained appropriately.</u></p> <p><u>Leads: MCDOT, MC DPS</u> <u>Goals: Equitable and Just Pedestrian Network</u></p>
170	F-1	208	Larry Cole	126	The proportion of agency budgets allocated to pedestrian safety should increase every year that Vision Zero goals are not met. Continued failure must result in leadership change at these departments. The cost of failure should not continue to be borne solely by pedestrians.	Disagree	Planning Staff believes that performance-based budgeting is something County Council could pursue, but this will not necessarily solve the county's pedestrian safety problem. Instead, the Pedestrian Master Plan identifies systemic policy changes and targets limited resources to high-need areas to achieve county goals.
171	F-1	209	Rich Kuzmyk	126	Fortunately, the availability of resources to address many of the improvements and programs featured in the Plan may be covered with unprecedented new funding programs out of the U.S. Department of Transportation resulting from the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law.	N/A	No change is needed as this comment is addressed by Recommendation F-1.
172	F-1a	210	Jane Lyons-Raeder	126	Excited about additional funding approaches	N/A	No change is needed as this comment is addressed by Key Action F-1a.
173	F-1b	211	David Lechner	126	Raising taxes for this plan is ridiculous and anti-business. Let the policies phase in ONLY as regular equipment, lighting, and roadway maintenance allows it.	Disagree	The county has many competing priorities for limited funding. If implementing the Pedestrian Master Plan is a priority, the county should consider raising additional revenue for this purpose.
174	F-1b	171	Patricia Mulready	126	INCREASED TRAFFIC CAMERAS AND RECORDATION TAXES ARE INAPPROPRIATE FUNDRAISERS. MoCo public school system is already planning on using Recordation Taxes to fund new schools and repair old ones. It's already very difficult to pay for closing costs on expensive homes here. People are opposed to traffic cameras as revenue generators – several lawsuits about this have forced MoCo to say such cameras are not used for such purposes – and prove it.	N/A	The Pedestrian Master Plan views automated traffic enforcement as a tool to improve safety, not raise revenue. Key Action F-1b does not contain any recommendations for specific revenue generating tools. It just highlights that additional revenue generation is needed to achieve plan goals.
<b>Bicycle and Pedestrian Priority Area Designations</b>							
175		269	Greater Colesville Citizens Association	129	<p>GCCA agrees that there needs to be a priority for constructing Bicycle and Pedestrian improvements called for in this plan. We think the priority should be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Areas around BRT and Purple Line stations, constructed when the transit service starts</li> <li>• Downtown areas</li> <li>• Town Centers, in order of geographic size</li> <li>• Major roads that are the most problematic for pedestrians and bicyclists and that will have a significant number of users. Rather than providing new facilities along major roads that will have few users, roads with small numbers of users should use BRT, where it exists.</li> <li>• Neighborhoods</li> </ul>	Disagree	Planning Staff believes the data-driven prioritization approach detailed in the Prioritization Methodology appendix is more appropriate because it allows for much finer-grained analysis and comparison between Downtowns, Town Centers, roadway corridors, and other areas.



Attachment D: Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter(s)	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation
176		270	Lee Keiser	129	Increase transparency in the prioritization methodology. Provide two examples of arriving at the final score for a specific area (perhaps one in an EFA and one outside). These should be in the plan document itself.	Agree with Modifications	Planning Staff recommends adding two examples of score calculations to the Prioritization Methodology appendix.
177		271	Lee Keiser	129	What is the geographic scope for "access"? For example, with the county's extensive RideOn bus network, access may be possible for many residents; some incur a 20-minute ride to their destination, others may have an option of a 20-minute walk. Yet weights of "12" are assigned to both "school access" and "transit access." Such equal weighting distorts a particular location's proximity to a Central Business District or primary BiPPA area.	N/A	For both transit and schools, access is measured as a count of the number of residential trips that traverse pedestrian network segments within a BiPPA geography divided by the size of the BiPPA geography.  For transit: heavy rail, light rail, and commuter rail station walksheds were assumed to be one mile. Bus Rapid Transit station walksheds were assumed to be a half-mile. For each BiPPA geography, access to each relevant transit station was added together to determine the geography's transit access.  For schools: Walksheds for elementary, middle, and high schools followed Montgomery County Public Schools walking distances (1 mile for elementary schools, 1.5 miles for middle schools, and 2 miles for high schools) and the respective school boundaries. Access to each relevant school within a BiPPA geography was added together to determine to the geography's school access.  Geographies with more transit, more schools, and/or more residential units will score more favorably using this prioritization approach.
178		272	Lee Keiser	129	Inconsistencies in Tier Assignments: Wilson Lane in Tier 2 has sidewalks and crosswalks. Bradley Blvd is in Tier 3 but has no sidewalks for the most part and crosswalks every half mile. Further, one mile of this Bradley Blvd. segment is in CIP #P501733. It's confusing to see on a lower tier a roadway within a CIP without pedestrian infrastructure score, while a close by location with infrastructure is in a higher tier.  Similarly, Wilson Lane between Bradley and River is in Tier 3, and has sidewalks and proximity to two schools. Tier confusion arises, in part, in not knowing the extent to which existing pedestrian safety infrastructure counts toward a final score.	Agree	Planning Staff recommends moving Bradley Boulevard between Huntington Parkway and Downtown Bethesda (Map Reference #5 in Tier 3) into the "Funded in Capital Budget BiPPAs" tier as this project is currently funded in the Capital Improvements Program as project #P501733  Planning Staff recommends evaluating why Wilson Lane is prioritized above Bradley Boulevard, and identify opportunities to include the presence of existing pedestrian infrastructure in the prioritization approach. Planning Staff will return to the Planning Board for their consideration of prioritization approach changes.
179		273	Lee Keiser	129	Cross-reference existing CIP projects in the different geographies in all tiers. Define "currently-funded": does this mean the project is in the current fiscal year budget or is it in the actual construction stage. Given that design funding can proceed for several years before construction, "currently funded" can be difficult to define.	Discuss	Planning Staff recommends adding CIP project numbers to the relevant geographies.  "Currently-funded" should be defined as mostly funded through construction in the six-year CIP.
180		274, 278	Purple Line Now, Northwood-Four Corners Civic Association	129	Supportive of prioritizing pedestrian and bicycle improvements in a data-driven way based on equity, comfortable access, safety and other metrics.	N/A	No change is needed as this comment is supportive of the plan's prioritization approach.
181		275	Ria Malinak	129	I watch with interest as the county works to make our county more pedestrian-friendly. A walking/biking path along Falls Road has been in the proposed phase since 2004 when I purchased my home. Here we are in 2023, and it is still just a plan without any funding. None of the people who live along Falls Road north of the Potomac Village (our shopping area) are able to walk to/from our shopping area: Falls Road lacks a shoulder, the yards slope down onto the road, traffic volume makes it difficult to cross to the other side where walking would be safer. Meanwhile those who live East, West or South of Potomac Village (with much less residential density) were gifted a wide walking/biking path years ago. Now as we compete for funds with the entire county, we can be assured to never have our walking path built. Please move the Falls Road walking path project up in the priority list. We have been waiting for 19 years.	Disagree	Planning Staff believes those projects currently unfunded in the CIP should be prioritized for future funding in a data-driven way in line with the approach advanced by the Pedestrian Master Plan. Resources are limited, so it is imperative that they are spent in a way that provides the largest benefit. That said, the Council will retain the discretion to advance projects that are assigned a lower priority, and projects that have been in the queue for a long time may be one criteria they use to make this determination.
182		276	Sligo Park Hills Community Association	129	In Tables 29-31, several pedestrian arteries near SPH are listed at "Tier 1-3" for future BiPPA improvements. We support future funding for these zones, which include: Piney Branch Rd from Sligo Ave to Long Branch Town Center, Piney Branch Rd from Sligo Rd to Philadelphia Ave, and Sligo Ave from Downtown Silver Spring to Piney Branch Rd.	N/A	No change is needed

**Attachment D: Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix**

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter(s)	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation
183		277	Town of Kensington	129	Most of the pedestrian improvements we urgently seek are contained in the Tier 2 BiPPA list (i.e., the entire stretch of Connecticut Avenue, Knowles Avenue, and Summit Avenue), and thus we encourage the County to progress from Tier 1 implementation to Tier 2 implementation in the CIP as quickly as possible.	N/A	No change is needed
<b>Pedestrian Shortcuts</b>							
184		279, 280	Jordan Day, Montgomery County	N/A	Support for the construction of pedestrian shortcuts	N/A	No change is needed as this comment is supportive of the plan's intent.
185		281	Sam Tacheron	212	The shortcut identified as Map Reference #85 should be removed from the Plan because it is not an existing pedestrian connection, there is no easement, and the Special Exception that governs the GEICO property precludes such a connection.	Disagree	While the current GEICO property may be governed by the Special Exception mentioned, future redevelopment may provide an opportunity to make this connection. The connection is already master-planned in the Bicycle Master Plan.
186		282, 283	Joseph Elbaum, Mona and Sol Freishtat	216	Opposes pedestrian shortcut #186 on page 216 (Kersey Road to Auth Lane) for several reasons:  -Firstly, the stream over which the bridge would be built is in very poor condition, is heavily eroded, and is in need of major stream restoration. -The shortcut in question is used only by local pedestrians to cross from one neighborhood street to another. -I do not believe that building a convenient neighborhood shortcut is a sufficient justification for further deforestation of our beautiful woods. - This project is an unjust and inequitable use of county resources and does not meet the goals of the County's Racial Equity and Social Justice Act. It is located in an affluent neighborhood, and it is not possible to make the bridge ADA accessible due to the steep surrounding terrain.  Therefore a pedestrian bridge built here would only be able to be used by able-bodied walkers. I believe that the county's resources should be	Disagree	Pedestrian Shortcuts provide more direct connections than the existing sidewalk or trail network. These connections save pedestrians time and encourage walking as a mode of transportation. This specific connection has broader community support, and has been used in its current form for decades.  MCDOT is in the process of designing a bridge over the stream at this location, which would make the use of this corridor much more accessible year-round and in different weather conditions. While steep slopes make it challenging to ultimately provide a trail connection between Kersey Road and Auth Lane that meets ADA standards, formalizing this connection as some sort of maintained pathway will make walking easier and safer for pedestrians of all ages and abilities.  At this point, with the design process in motion, Planning Staff defers to MCDOT about the feasibility of this connection. If MCDOT finds the project infeasible or inadvisable, County Council could remove this recommendation or it just becomes moot.
187		284	Elliott Klonsky	216	Potential support for a bridge connecting Kersey Road to Auth Lane, but not a path because: 1) Continuous use "has created a safe dirt path which maintains the natural beauty of this forested area." 2) A formal walkway would create an enticing extended "track" for skateboarding and scootering, which would be a safety issue for all users 3) Lighting would destroy the natural beauty of this area	Disagree	While the community has worn a dirt pathway along this corridor over time, it is not an all-weather connection. It gets muddy and slick. It is not as easily accessible as a paved trail would be for all types of pedestrians.  The intent of this suite of recommendations is to improve the number of direct connections for pedestrians of all ages and abilities. In many places, maintaining a dirt path does not achieve that intent.
188		285	Esther Curry	241	From Dennis Avenue round to the Safeway on University an obvious pedestrian route would be along Gilmoure because it parallels University Blvd but it is chopped up and there is no side access to the Safeway car lot. Who in their right mind would want to walk along University Boulevard to get there?	Agree	Gilmoure Drive is a very good parallel route to University Boulevard, though it currently has a few gaps. Several recommended pedestrian shortcuts (#177, #228) close these gaps and make the Gilmoure Drive alternative viable.
<b>Monitoring</b>							
189		286	Sligo Park Hills Community Association	267	Is there a way to report and tally "near misses," i.e., an incident which doesn't result in a police investigation or hospitalization?	N/A	Emerging technologies may make capturing near misses more feasible, but at this time, such technologies are not available for widescale adoption.
190		287	Town of Kensington	267	We will continue to draw the linkages with this effort and will endeavor to sync our biennial audits with the Pedestrian Master Plan biennial monitoring report (action MO-1a) and the biennial pedestrian and bicycling survey (action MO-1b) so that the data in each are as current as possible.	N/A	No change is needed as this comment is supportive of the plan's intent.
<b>Appendices</b>							
191		288	Sligo Park Hills Community Association	N/A	The toolkit will be extremely helpful to all residents as a sourcebook for specific solutions, because our residents are not infrastructure experts. Given that the Pedestrian Master Plan is high-level and focused on prioritization, goals and measures, we request than an online guide be created from the Design Toolkit, for Montgomery County residents to use as a reference. We would all benefit from photographs of implementations, brief descriptions, and assessments of these engineering options.	Agree	Planning Staff recommend developing an online version of the toolkit once the plan is finalized.
192		289	Larry Cole	N/A	The methodology for prioritizing projects should be moved from the appendix to the body of the Plan so that it can be put into better context.	Disagree	Methodologies are more appropriately located in an appendix.

**Attachment D: Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix**

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter(s)	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation
193		289	Larry Cole	N/A	The prioritization methodology needs to be revised to better promote pedestrian safety. Pedestrian crash history - safety - is only 15% of the total score, and four of the ten prioritization factors specifically address bikes whereas only two address pedestrians - it's not clear why bike factors predominate or even why they're included in a prioritization of pedestrian projects. The methodology should prioritize pedestrian safety for project implementation and the plan should also clearly state what types of projects would do the most to promote pedestrian safety since specific locations are unspecified.	Disagree	Four factors representing 48 points (Pedestrian Activity, Pedestrian Crashes, Pathway Comfort and Crossing Comfort) are focused exclusively on pedestrians, whereas four factors representing 28 points (Bicycle Activity, Bicycle Crashes, Bicycle Comfort, and Bicycle Crossing Comfort) are focused on bicycling. Planning staff believe it is appropriate to consider both pedestrians and bicyclists in the prioritization approach as their infrastructure requirements and funding programs are heavily interrelated. The prioritization approach is in the Pedestrian Master Plan, but it is intended to apply to Bicycle and Pedestrian Priority Areas as a whole, so bicycle variables are essential. The Safety weighting could potentially be strengthened if the Planning Board is interested in doing so.
<b>General Support</b>							
194	General	290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 314	Action Committee for Transit, Adam Carlesco, Purple Line Now, Alison Gillespie, Anna Priddy, Annie Tulkin, Barbara Sanders, Jane Lyons-Raeder, Ben Ross, Calverton Citizens Association, Civic Federation, Coalition for Smarter Growth, Commission on Aging, David Woodward, Don Slater, Greater Olney Civic Association, Jamie Herr, Jordan Day, Kristy Daphnis, League of Women Voters, Marybeth Cleveland, Marybeth Cleveland, Miriam Schoenbaum, Rich Kuzmyak, Sanjida Rangwala, Sligo Park Hills Community Association, Tim Soderquist, Town of Kensington, WABA, Warren Chan, Northwood-Four Corners Civic Association, Brad Schachat	N/A	Plan Support	N/A	No change is needed as this comment is supportive of the plan's intent.
<b>General Opposition</b>							
195	General	321	David Lechner	N/A	Plan Opposition	N/A	No change is needed
<b>Non-Master Plan Issues</b>							
196	Specific Locational Pedestrian Issues	326, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 351, 350	Sally Amero, Alla Corey McCoy, Cabin John Citizens Association, Cris Maina, Davida Fonner, Kyle Woerner, Greater Goshen Civic Association, Kelly Banuls, Melita Patel, Montgomery Square Citizens Association, Ruth Robbins, Stephen Sachs, Steve Warner, Randolph Civic Association & Randolph Civic Foundation	N/A	Recommendations or questions about the installation/maintenance of specific sidewalks, crosswalks, signals and other treatments.	N/A	These comments are about specific locations of existing and desired pedestrian infrastructure that is too specific for this master plan. The plan does not make recommendations for specific sidewalks or crosswalks. Instead, it prioritizes where pedestrian infrastructure should be built using a data-driven approach.
197	Kenwood Park	327, 328, 329, 330, 332, 333, 334, 331	Bernard Barrett Jr., Diana Huffman and Kenneth Levine, Hillary Berman, John and Beni Devine, Leonard Bebchick, Peter Gottesman, Richard and Caroline Berney, Lillian Klein Abennohn	N/A	Sidewalk Opposition	N/A	These comments are in reference to a specific sidewalk construction proposal in a specific neighborhood and are not within the scope of the master plan.
198	Biking Concerns	322, 325	Cathie Cooper, Sally Amero	N/A	How will the Old Georgetown Road bike lanes be kept free of snow and ice?	N/A	This is not relevant to the Pedestrian Master Plan.
199	Biking Concerns	324	Doug Scott	N/A	Opposition to two-way separated bike lanes. Supportive of the county distributing bike lights.	N/A	This is not relevant to the Pedestrian Master Plan.
200	Biking Concerns	323	Cathie Cooper	N/A	What study of biking traffic was done prior to the Old Georgetown Road bike lanes being installed? Can't bicyclists just use the Bethesda Trolley Trail?	N/A	This is not relevant to the Pedestrian Master Plan.
201	Biking Concerns	323	Cathie Cooper	N/A	Bicyclists don't follow traffic rules and block traffic along River Road and other rural roads in the county.	N/A	This is not relevant to the Pedestrian Master Plan.

**Attachment D: Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix**

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter(s)	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation
202	Biking Concerns	323, 325	Cathie Cooper, Sally Amero	N/A	Interest in bicycle safety education.	N/A	This is not relevant to the Pedestrian Master Plan.
203	Other Transportation Concerns	335, 336, 337, 338	Sally Amero	N/A	Questions about the North Bethesda Transitway, Personal Rapid Transit, Woodward High School, and Tuckerman Lane	N/A	This is not relevant to the Pedestrian Master Plan.