

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
General								
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.	N/A
2	General	6	Kimblyn 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 Pedestrian Master Plan is a holistic effort 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.	1
3	General	7	Kimblyn 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	<p>There is always room for improvement in master plan engagement, especially for a countywide plan.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	1

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
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.	1
5	General	5, 8, 11, 12, 14, 17	Cathie Cooper, Kimbly Persaud, Max Bronstein, 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.	1
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.	N/A
7	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.	N/A
8	General	9	Lee Keiser	N/A	Plan maps should include symbols for Metro, Purple Line, Libraries	Agree	Planning Staff recommends making this change.	1
9	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.	N/A
10	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).	1

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
11	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.	1
12	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.	N/A
13	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	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. The climate assessment will be conducted appropriately as required by county law.	N/A
14	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.	1

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
15	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.	N/A
Table of Contents								
16	Table of Contents	25	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.	2
Introduction								
17	Introduction	27	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.	N/A
18	Introduction	15, 28	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.	N/A
Racial Equity and Social Justice Statement								
19	Racial Equity	36	County Executive	30	The use of "equity community" doesn't make sense. Is "equity community" being used for shorthand for communities with higher rates of non-white residents, lower-income households as the equity emphasis area methodology does? If there is a lack of equity, that should be called out.	Neutral	Yes, it is being used as shorthand. Planning staff recommends changing "for equity community" to " <u>across race, ethnicity, income, and disability.</u> "	1
Vision and Goals								

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
20	Goals	31, 32	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.	N/A
21	Goals	26, 33	Larry Cole, Larry Cole	10	Pedestrian Safety should be the top goal, not increased walking. Increased walking follows from walking being safer.	N/A	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> "	1
22	Goals	35, 36	Jane Lyons-Raeder, County Executive	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.	1

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
23	Goals	32	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.	1
24	Goals	37	Jane Lyons-Raeder	11	Increase the walking rate targets. How will these targets reduce greenhouse gas emission reductions?	Agree with Modifications	<p>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.</p> <p>To address this comment, Planning Staff recommends the following addition to the plan's Monitoring section, page 273:</p> <p><u>MO-1g: Consider revising the targets for each objective as part of the Pedestrian Master Plan Biennial Monitoring Reports.</u></p> <p><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></p> <p><u>Goal: Walking Rates</u> <u>Leads: Montgomery Planning</u></p>	1
25	Goals	38	County Executive	11	The % walking to work dropped from roughly 2.4% in 2019 (2019 ACS 1-year estimate Table B08006) to 1.6% in 2021 (2021 ACS 1-year estimate Table B08006) in large part due to the increase in working from home (7% in 2019 to 37% in 2021). Should the change in work-from-home rates, which is taking vehicles off the road during peak hours, be factored into this metric?	Neutral	The plan targets are aspirational. The targets can be revisited as part of the first biennial monitoring report.	N/A

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
26	Goals	39	County Executive	12	How do these recommendations compare to the current TMD targets and which would take priority?	Neutral	Planning staff has requested this data and will share the results with the County Executive's office.	N/A
27	Goals	40	County Executive	11	These are very high rates for walking and transit. Should they include bicycling as a component? My concern is that if we create a robust bikeway network: that could act against these performance metrics if people (especially in the 1-5mi range) opt to be a bicyclist rather than pedestrian.	Neutral	The plan targets are aspirational. The targets will be revisited as part of the first biennial monitoring report.	N/A
28	Goals	41	County Executive	12	Objective 1.4- How does this compare to current levels? For previous metrics, baseline data were provided.	Neutral	While the baseline data do not yet exist for recent years, walking rates to transit is an important metric and Planning staff will work with partner agencies to collect this data in the coming years.	N/A
29	Goals	42	County Executive	13	Objective 1.5- Since school buses are public transportation, the walk+public transportation metric is already exceeded. It is unclear how these targets were arrived at and whether the targets are feasible. Getting to 50% of ES students walking across the County would require many schools to reach 100% walk rates to balance out the exurban and rural schools.	Agree with Modifications	Planning staff recommends removing the "public transportation" component of the school-based objective because school buses are public transportation. The purpose of the metric is not to increase school busing. It is to increase walking.	1

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
30	Goals	34, 50, 51	Greater Colesville Citizens Association, Larry Cole, Larry Cole	12	<p>Additional Objectives and Performance Measures should be added:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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 <p>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.</p>	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.	1
31	Goals	43	County Executive	15	<p>Many of the metrics under Goal 1 feel very ambitious, but these under Goal 2 feel less so. Increasing comfortable pathways from 58% to 70%, and crossings from 44% to 55%, feels a bit too achievable (not that it probably isn't already a big lift).</p> <p>And a goal of only 30% comfortable for high schools feels too low.</p> <p>Could we aim higher for more of these?</p>	Neutral	Planning staff will evaluate the magnitude of infrastructure improvement required to make measurable progress on achieving these targets as part of a future monitoring report.	N/A
32	Goals	44	County Executive	15	<p>How are these PLOC lengths measured? The methodology (Appendix page 3) appears to only consider pathways, excluding crossings. Are crossings to be considered in these metrics?</p>	Neutral	From the appendix, "The total distance of all these trips forms the denominator of the respective comfortable pedestrian connectivity equations (pathways and crossings). The numerator of those is equations is the total distance traveling to the specific destination along very comfortable or somewhat comfortable links only. Figure 1 shows the pathway comfort equation." There is also an identical crossing comfort equation for the crossing-related objectives.	N/A

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
33	Goals	45	County Executive	16	By prioritizing these connections to schools and parks, this would take away attention from critical gaps in the sidewalk network along arterial and collector roadways. The growth of sidewalk connectivity should also be matched to safety needs and prioritized.	Disagree	Given the limited street grid in the county, primary school and park access routes are frequently along the same arterial and collector roadways that are the critical gaps.	N/A
34	Goals	46	County Executive	18	4.1- This seems extremely low for a baseline number. I am assuming a very high threshold was set for defining "ADA faults" that may not match the current ADA guidelines and standards on width and sidewalk condition. (Not that it should get improved, but we should not sell the work done in the past short or appear that 93.8% of our sidewalks are unusable for people with disabilities).	Agree	Planning staff have learned that the data source for this metric was not developed with the objective's intent in mind. Planning staff believe the objective "All pathways countywide will be accessible to persons with disabilities" is an important one. Planning staff recommends continued coordination with MCDOT and the county's Vision Zero Coordinator to develop a suitable replacement data source for this objective in the coming years.	1
35	Goals	47	County Executive	18	What distance from each of these facilities is presumed for these measurements? And is that distance measured directly "as the crow flies", or by path as someone would actually travel it?	Neutral	1, 1.5, and 2 miles (elementary, middle, and high school, respectively) using the actual pedestrian network. 1 mile (transit, parks, libraries, recreation centers) using the actual pedestrian network.	N/A
36	Goals	48	County Executive	19	4.3- Should include metrics for BRT stations as well as bus stops.	Agree with Modifications	Planning staff recommends adding (with percents to be identified prior to transmitting the plan to the County Council: * <u>Montgomery County BRT stations</u> * <u>Pathways (###% comfortable EFA/## non-EFA)</u> * <u>Crossings (###% comfortable EFA/## non-EFA)</u> Planning staff does not recommend adding an evaluation of comfortable access to local bus stops. As there are nearly 5,000 local bus stops in Montgomery County, an evaluation of comfortable access to bus stops would produce more data than is useful.	1
37	Goals	49	County Executive	18	Would it be worthwhile to have an additional Objective that compares overall Satisfaction within EFAs versus non-EFAs?	Disagree	Planning staff recommends excluding this objective at this time because the has insufficient responses for a statistically valid comparison of EFAs and non-EFAs.	N/A

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
38	Goals	52	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.	N/A
Existing Conditions								
39	Existing Conditions	68	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.	N/A
40	Existing Conditions	56	County Executive	25	The blue text in the blue callout boxes (appearing on many pages from this page onward) might not contrast enough for people with vision impairments. Try running it through the accessibility checker to see if it flags the color contrast as an issue.	Neutral	There is no contrast problem per the Adobe Accessibility Checker.	N/A
41	Existing Conditions	57	County Executive	29	Amend the caption to read "Pedestrian Trip Purpose", or perhaps "Walk Trip Purpose" per the section title.	Agree	Planning staff recommends changing the title of Figure 5 (Page 30) to read: <u>Pedestrian Trip Purpose by Land Use Type in the Prior Month</u> Planning staff recommends changing the title of Figure 6 (Page 31) to read: <u>Pedestrian Trip Purpose by Reported Disability</u>	1
42	Existing Conditions	58	County Executive	32	The series "no reported disability" is white or transparent, so not able to see the bars.	Agree	Planning staff recommends changing the color of the white bars in Figure 8 (Page 33) to the orange in Figure 6.	1
43	Existing Conditions	59	County Executive	33	Amend the "Transit" label to read "Transit Corridor"	Agree	Planning staff recommends changing "Transit" in Figure 8 (Page 33) to read <u>"Transit Corridor"</u> .	1
44	Existing Conditions	61	County Executive	35	Consider hyperlinking the text to MCAtlas and MPOHT (perhaps for the latter use: https://mcatlas.org/mpoht/)	Neutral	Planning staff does not recommend including additional hyperlinks in the plan. While this plan is intended to set forth a 20+ year vision, hyperlinks change over time and can become obsolete.	N/A
45	Existing Conditions	62	County Executive	36	In comparing EFA vs Non-EFA areas, consider the age of the areas and their infrastructure. Wider sidewalks tend to be in newer neighborhoods since the standards have increased .	Agree	No change is needed.	N/A

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
46	Existing Conditions	63	County Executive	36	<p>What it be possible to make all this data (street type, sidewalk gaps, sidewalk width, Street Buffer width, etc) somehow digestible on https://mcatlas.org/pedplan/ ? Maybe an additional Tab beside "Welcome" and "Info" that allows a deeper dive into the info.</p> <p>So like if a user wanted to find all the narrow sidewalks on Urban Arterials... or if they wanted to highlight all the gaps in the County... they could click some checkboxes accordingly.</p>	Agree	Planning staff believes that this type of analysis is better conducted using the actual data set. The dataset will be posted to montgomeryplanning.org/gis so that it is publicly available.	N/A
47	Existing Conditions	53	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.	1
48	Existing Conditions	29	County Executive	38	How readily could the street classifications be updated to the new Chapter 49 classifications created by Complete Streets? If it's a pretty easy conversion using new shapefiles: I'd suggest using the new classifications, unless that erases any useful info gleaned under the old classifications.	Neutral	Planning staff will update the analysis to use the Complete Streets classification system as part of the 2023 - 2024 monitoring report.	N/A

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
49	Existing Conditions	64	County Executive	41	How are the counts of Unmarked, Standard, and High-Vis crossings tallied? Country Arterial and Country Road are given as 100% unmarked crossings, but I can think of several marked crossings along these street types. Or is this data actually something like 99.9% unmarked, and those marked crossings are so few along the full length of those types that it's rounding to 100%?	Neutral	The counts are collected from the Planning Department's Pedestrian Level of Comfort dataset. As some limited changes to the dataset have been made since the Planning Department published the Public Hearing Draft, Planning staff recommends rerunning these analyses prior to transmitting the plan to the County Council.	N/A
50	Existing Conditions	65	County Executive	41	How are Unmarked tallied? If there are sidewalks on a side-street, but at the main road there's a median and both side streets are right-in/right-out, then is that being counted as a pair of unmarked crosswalks across the median? I know Planning *used* to consider those situations as still having unmarked crosswalks, but I'm not sure if y'all still consider things that way. Case law in Maryland ruled that a median nullifies unmarked crosswalks unless a median opening is provided.	Neutral	Unmarked crosswalks identified in the Pedestrian Level of Comfort dataset are intended to identify all legal crossings that do not have a marked crosswalk.	N/A

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
51	Existing Conditions	54, 55, 67	Doug Scott, Larry Cole, Larry Cole	51	<p>This section should include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Crashes occurring within federal, state, and local parks 2) A table showing where current posted speeds exceed statutory and/or target speeds, and a rationale from SHA or MCDOT justifying the higher speed. 3) Data on speeding citations, illegal right turns, red light running, violations of pedestrian right-of-way 4) A survey of lighting conditions 	Agree	<p>(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.</p> <p>(2) 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.</p> <p>Recommended Action:</p> <p>(3) 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.</p> <p>(4) Planning staff recommend adding the following key action for a lighting survey:</p> <p><u>Key Action B-5d: Conduct a survey of lighting conditions countywide.</u></p> <p><u>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.</u></p> <p><u>Goal: Pedestrian Safety</u></p> <p><u>Leads: MCDOT</u></p>	1
52	Existing Conditions	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>	1

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
53	Existing Conditions	66	County Executive	53	Do we have any decent volume data that might allow a similar Table here comparing pedestrian crash *rates* along each street classification?	Neutral	The Predictive Safety Analysis developed models that estimate pedestrian, bicycle and motor vehicle counts on all roadway segments in the county.	N/A
Recommendation Overview								
54	General	82, 97	Larry Cole, Larry Cole	N/A	<p>Reorganize the recommendations section from Build, Maintain, etc. to ensure the entities responsible for making changes can clearly understand what they need to do.</p> <p>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.</p>	Disagree	<p>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.</p>	2
55	General	94	Town of Kensington	N/A	Include municipalities as stakeholders in the key actions and as implementation partners.	Agree	<p>Planning staff recommends adding "Municipalities" to the list of entities on pages 61 and 62 that will be responsible for implementing the key actions. "Municipalities" will be identified as "Lead" partners on individual key actions as applicable.</p>	2

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
56	General	23	County Executive	N/A	<p>Many of the action items identified in this plan are already in various stages of implementation within MCDOT and other Executive Agencies, as well as the Vision Zero Action Plan. There are many duplicate items in the Pedestrian Master Plan recommendations that exist in the Vision Zero Action Plan. For example B-1a (proactive sidewalks) is being addressed in the VZAP under S-13 (sidewalk construction and upgrades) and S-17 (equitable project intake and selection). Where there is overlap, a connection between plans should be shown.</p>	Agree	<p>Planning staff recommends updating the descriptions of the following recommendations and key actions to mention efforts in the Vision Zero Action Plan as follows:</p> <p>B-1a (Page 64): <u>Part of Vision Zero Action Plan Item S-16 is to use data in the budget and decision-making process to improve safety and equitable outcomes. Item S-17 is also focused on data-driven, proactive implementation.</u></p> <p>B-1e (Page 66): <u>Part of Vision Zero Action Plan Item S-13 is to leverage temporary measures like walking lanes on low traffic streets.</u></p> <p>B-5 (Page 79): <u>Part of Vision Zero Action Plan Item S-11 is improving nighttime illumination.</u></p> <p>B-7g (Page 85): <u>Part of Vision Zero Action Plan Item T-1 is building new pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure to access Purple Line and future BRT routes.</u></p> <p>B-11 (Page 90): <u>Part of Vision Zero Action Plan Item T-7 is to address curbside management.</u></p> <p>MA-1a (Page 91): <u>Part of Vision Zero Action Plan Item S-12 is ensuring sidewalks are in good repair in a more proactive way.</u></p> <p>MA-2d (Page 93): <u>Part of Vision Zero Action Plan Item T-8 is clarifying the county's sidewalk snow clearance responsibility.</u></p>	2

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
57	General	23	County Executive	N/A	<p>Many of the action items identified in this plan are already in various stages of implementation within MCDOT and other Executive Agencies, as well as the Vision Zero Action Plan. There are many duplicate items in the Pedestrian Master Plan recommendations that exist in the Vision Zero Action Plan. For example B-1a (proactive sidewalks) is being addressed in the VZAP under S-13 (sidewalk construction and upgrades) and S-17 (equitable project intake and selection). Where there is overlap, a connection between plans should be shown.</p>	Agree	<p>Planning staff recommends updating the descriptions of the following recommendations and key actions to mention efforts in the Vision Zero Action Plan as follows:</p> <p><u>MA-3a (Page 94): Part of Vision Zero Action Plan Item S-10 is utilizing roadway and other maintenance schedules to address safety upgrades.</u></p> <p><u>P-1b (Page 95): Part of Vision Zero Action Plan Item V-1 is to ensure county vehicles have crash avoidance technology and are right-sized for the areas they serve.</u></p> <p><u>P-2 (Page 99): Part of Vision Zero Action Plan Item S-4 is modifying signal timing and phasing where appropriate to provide protection for all road users.</u></p> <p><u>P-2a (page 99): Part of Vision Zero Action Plan Item S-3 is providing additional protected crossing locations in high crash risk areas with infrequent crossing opportunities.</u></p> <p><u>P-2b (Page 99): Part of Vision Zero Action Plan Item T-2 is providing safe crossings to and from transit stops.</u></p>	2
58	General	23	County Executive	N/A	<p>Many of the action items identified in this plan are already in various stages of implementation within MCDOT and other Executive Agencies, as well as the Vision Zero Action Plan. There are many duplicate items in the Pedestrian Master Plan recommendations that exist in the Vision Zero Action Plan. For example B-1a (proactive sidewalks) is being addressed in the VZAP under S-13 (sidewalk construction and upgrades) and S-17 (equitable project intake and selection). Where there is overlap, a connection between plans should be shown.</p>	Agree	<p>Planning staff recommends updating the descriptions of the following recommendations and key actions to mention efforts in the Vision Zero Action Plan as follows:</p> <p><u>P-2g (page 102): Part of Vision Zero Action Plan Item S-2 is conducting an inventory of these locations and identifying priority for safety upgrades.</u></p> <p><u>P-4c (Page 104): Part of Vision Zero Action Plan Item P-7 is expanding the county's Safe Routes to School activities and providing comprehensive traffic safety education.</u></p> <p><u>P-5e (Page 108): Part of Vision Zero Action Plan Item S-9 is evaluating opportunities to improve safety around MCPS schools to expand access and encourage walking to school.</u></p> <p><u>P-6a (Page 108): Part of Vision Zero Action Plan Item S-5 is assessing and mediating safety concerns from uncontrolled turning movements to and from arterial and collector roads to neighborhoods and driveways.</u></p> <p><u>P-8 (Page 112): Part of Vision Zero Action Plan Item P-5 is the expansion of automated enforcement.</u></p>	2

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
59	General	23	County Executive	N/A	Many of the action items identified in this plan are already in various stages of implementation within MCDOT and other Executive Agencies, as well as the Vision Zero Action Plan. There are many duplicate items in the Pedestrian Master Plan recommendations that exist in the Vision Zero Action Plan. For example B-1a (proactive sidewalks) is being addressed in the VZAP under S-13 (sidewalk construction and upgrades) and S-17 (equitable project intake and selection). Where there is overlap, a connection between plans should be shown.	Agree	<p>Planning staff recommends updating the descriptions of the following recommendations and key actions to mention efforts in the Vision Zero Action Plan as follows:</p> <p>EA-2 (Page 115): <u>Part of Vision Zero Action Plan Item T-4 is providing clearance space on sidewalks to eliminate sidewalk obstructions.</u></p> <p>EA-2c (Page 116): <u>Part of Vision Zero Action Plan Item T-6 is installing additional micromobility corrals.</u></p> <p>EA-8a (Page 123): <u>Part of Vision Zero Action Plan Item S-15 is to develop a permanent version of the county's Shared Streets program.</u></p>	2
60	General	77	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"> •B-4h: Provide public seating, restrooms, and other pedestrian amenities in Downtowns, Town Centers, and along Boulevards. •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. •EA-3a: Lower the pedestrian walking speed standard at signalized intersections frequented by older pedestrians, younger pedestrians, and those with disabilities. <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"> •Planning staff reviewed the draft plan for other opportunities to emphasize improving access for older adults and does not believe additional changes are needed. 	N/A
61	General	73, 74, 90	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>	N/A

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
62	General	71	Alexander Edwards	N/A	Plan for people, not cars.	Agree	No change is needed as the comment expresses support for the plan.	N/A
63	General	83	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	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.	N/A
64	General	70	Adam Carlesco	N/A	Install bollards along sidewalks in urban areas to prevent drivers from mounting curbs and hitting pedestrians.	Disagree	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.	N/A
65	General	75	Bruce Schwalm	N/A	Support more median fencing to guide pedestrian behavior.	Disagree	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.	N/A
66	General	76	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	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.	N/A

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
67	General	84	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.	N/A
68	General	93	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: https://www3.montgomerycountymd.gov/311/Solutions.aspx?SolutionId=1-3FQC36	N/A
Design Policy and Programming Recommendations								
69	B-1	81, 139, 142, 146, 147, 141	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.	N/A
70	B-1	143	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.	N/A

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
71	B-1	140	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 (www.mcatlas.org/plats) to help interested parties understand where public rights of way are located.	N/A
72	B-1a	144, 145, 149, 150, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156	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.	N/A
73	B-1a	148	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	<p>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.</p> <p>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>"</p>	2

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
74	B-1a	151	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.	N/A
75	B-1	163	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.	N/A
76	B-1	164	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.</u> <u>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>	2

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
77	B-1a	92	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.	N/A
78	B-1b	155, 156, 158, 165	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.	2
79	B-1b	147, 157, 159, 161, 162, 166, 167, 168, 169, 160	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.	2
80	B-1b	98	County Executive	65	Sidewalk projects are extremely controversial and get heated. Even with a pivoted engagement approach there will be discussions around build vs. no build.	Neutral	No change is needed.	N/A
81	B-1c	170	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.	N/A
82	B-1d	171	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.	N/A

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
83	B-1d	172	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.	N/A
84	B-1d	99	County Executive	65	Need to define "reconstructed." Highway Services replaces concrete as part of maintenance, but if that is considered "reconstructed" then the amount of sidewalk concrete maintenance that can be done goes way down and overall sidewalk conditions deteriorate. Recommendation should exclude sidewalk work that is only fixing the existing sidewalk to ensure there are no trip hazards.	Agree	<p>Planning staff recommends the following change to Key Action B-1d:</p> <p>B-1d: Require that new and reconstructed sidewalks achieve at least a "somewhat comfortable" rating using the Pedestrian Level of Comfort (PLOC) tool.</p> <p>Currently, 41% of pedestrian pathway mileage in the county is rated as "uncomfortable" or "undesirable," based on Montgomery Planning's PLOC metric. To improve the comfort of walking, this recommendation establishes a minimum comfort standard of "somewhat comfortable" for new and reconstructed sidewalks as part of capital improvement and private development projects. This ensures that future sidewalks and pedestrian pathways are designed and constructed to be navigable and comfortable. <u>Note that sidewalk reconstruction does not include maintainance projects to eliminate tripping hazards.</u></p> <p>Goal: Comfortable/Connected Pedestrian Network Leads: MCDOT, Montgomery Planning</p>	2

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
85	B-1d	117	County Executive	65	<p>Is there an expected process for situations where private development applicants are unable to achieve adequate PLOCs without either...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - (1) violating Code, regulations, or other policies, or - (2) affecting items beyond an applicant's control, such as signal phasing? <p>How will we proceed when such situations arise? Fee-in-lieu? I don't believe Code currently allows for that; it may need to be revised as part of this plan effort.</p> <p>I'll also add that we will not accept development plans that propose changing posted speeds in order to satisfy PLOC, unless there are other efforts in place toward achieving those posted speeds.</p>	Neutral	Private development applicants would be required to achieve adequate Pedestrian Level of Comfort scores to the extent practicable, as they are currently required to do with the county's Growth and Infrastructure Policy.	N/A
86	B-1e	173, 174	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.	N/A
87	B-1e	175	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.	N/A
88	B-1f	176	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.	N/A

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
89	B-1h	86	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	<p>Planning Staff recommends adding the following key action:</p> <p><u>B-1h: Update state curb height standards to 6" in areas with pedestrian activity</u></p> <p><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></p> <p><u>Goals: Equitable and Just Pedestrian Network</u></p> <p><u>Leads: MDOT SHA</u></p>	2
90	B-2	101	County Executive	67	The recommendation should not use the pejorative term "beg button".	Agree	<p>B-2: Eliminate the need to press a button to cross the street. Pedestrians should not need to press a button to safely cross the street, and yet in much of Montgomery County, this is the case. A pedestrian-friendly place avoids the "[beg button]pedestrian push button" wherever possible. The key actions below help the county achieve this recommendation. In urban areas, the default would be to automatically provide pedestrians time to cross the street during every signal cycle; in suburban and country areas where there are often fewer people walking today, the county would use creative technologies to prioritize pedestrians and reduce delay.</p>	2

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
91	B-2a	177	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	<p>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:</p> <p>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</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Uncertainty and unnecessary delay both limit the effectiveness of pedestrian push buttons and make it more likely that pedestrians will not comply.</p>	N/A
92	B-2a	180	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	<p>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.</p>	N/A
93	B-2a	178, 179	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	<p>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."</p>	2
94	B-2b	181	Rich Kuzmyak	69	Without pedestrian recall, the pedestrian push button should be responsive to a press such that the green signal comes sooner.	Agree	<p>No change is needed as this is included in Key Action B-2b.</p>	N/A

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
95	B-2b	100	County Executive	69	<p>These devices come with a significant cost (about \$6,000 per crossing) and are not yet particularly reliable nor effective. While we continue to evaluate these, their benefits have not been found to justify their costs. We suggest removing this recommendation at this time.</p>	Disagree	<p>Planning staff recommends changing Key Action B-2b as follows: B-2b: <u>Continue to evaluate passive detection to eliminate the need for pedestrians to press a button to safely cross the street in areas where pedestrian recall is not desirable.</u> [Target implementation of passive detection (such as sensors) to eliminate the need for pedestrians to press a button to safely cross the street in areas where pedestrian recall is not desirable. If this is not feasible at every appropriate location, consider having the pedestrian push button immediately provide a pedestrian phase.]</p>	2
96	B-2b	121	County Executive	69	<p>This text "consider having the pedestrian push button immediately provide a pedestrian phase" appears to be describing Pedestrian Preemption. While I'm not sure the MUTCD explicitly prohibits pedestrian preemption, both the MD-MUTCD and Federal MUTCD (MUTCD 4D.27) are written in a manner as to imply preemption is limited to vehicles, and requirements for how preemption is operated (MUTCD 4E) could conflict with pedestrian preemption.</p> <p>An example of such a conflict would be if someone is currently crossing one street when a second pedestrian activates the preemption for the other street, truncating the first person's crossing time. Preemption can also disrupt motor vehicle flow, which can notably extend to buses in situations where buses have signal priority (preemption overrides priority), or signals along BRT lines are sequenced to maximize bus flow. Either remove the preemption recommendation or consider what other more viable operations would achieve the intent here.</p>	Agree	<p>Planning staff recommends changing Key Action B-2b as follows: B-2b: <u>Continue to evaluate passive detection to eliminate the need for pedestrians to press a button to safely cross the street in areas where pedestrian recall is not desirable.</u> [Target implementation of passive detection (such as sensors) to eliminate the need for pedestrians to press a button to safely cross the street in areas where pedestrian recall is not desirable. If this is not feasible at every appropriate location, consider having the pedestrian push button immediately provide a pedestrian phase.]</p>	2

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
97	B-2c	182	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.	N/A
98	B-2d	183	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.	N/A
99	B-3a	184	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>	2
100	B-3a	185, 186	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.	N/A
101	B-3a	187	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	N/A

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
102	B-3b	188, 189	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> <u>Leads: MCDOT, MDOT SHA</u></p>	2
103	B-3c	190, 191	Adam Carlesco, Rich Kuzmyak	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.	N/A
104	B-3c	104	County Executive	72	Be mindful that widespread application of raised crosswalks will come with a rather significant cost.	N/A	No change is needed.	N/A
105	B-3d	192, 193, 238	Action Committee for Transit, Rich Kuzmyak, 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.	N/A
106	B-3e	194	Rich Kuzmyak	74	In support of this recommendation, there should be additional advance signage for drivers approaching crosswalks.	Agree	<p>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></p>	2

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
107	B-3e	105	County Executive	74	<p>B-3e- Recommend removal of this recommendation. Prior discussions around this piece of code left the code alone as it is impossible for a driver to determine a person standing near a crosswalk is preparing to cross or staying on the sidewalk for other reasons. The current code makes crossing intent clear.</p> <p>Notwithstanding Wade's preceding comment, if this text remains: change "the driver of a vehicle must yield to pedestrians" to "the driver of a vehicle must stop for pedestrians", as per §21-502 Maryland is a "Stop for Ped" jurisdiction.</p>	Agree with Modifications	<p>While these discussions may have failed in Maryland in the past, this is the law in Virginia. There are pedestrian accessibility benefits to changing this law, and we should strive to make this change.</p> <p>Per §21-502 of the state code, Maryland is a "Stop for Ped" jurisdiction. Therefore, Planning staff recommends changing the description in Key Action B-3e as follows:</p> <p>B-3e: Pursue a modification of Maryland Code §21-502 to indicate that the driver of a vehicle must [yield to]stop for pedestrians waiting to cross the street, not just those already in the crosswalk.</p>	2
108	B-4a	195, 196, 197	Coalition for Smarter Growth, Montgomery County Climate Action Plan Coalition, Rich Kuzmyak	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.	N/A
109	B-4a	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 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>	2
110	B-4b/c	198	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.	N/A
111	B-4b/c	199	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.	N/A

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
112	B-4c	238	Patricia Mulready	75	Support for smaller school sites	Agree	No change is needed.	N/A
113	B-4c	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 75, add the following in the description of Key Action B-4c: "<u>Increasing the likelihood of 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>	2
114	B-4d	200, 201	Coalition for Smarter Growth, Rich Kuzmyak	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.	N/A
115	B-4d	107	County Executive	75	<p>This appears to apply this overlay along very long lengths of Boulevards, which somewhat erodes the purpose of Boulevards (which were already envisioned during the development of Complete Streets as being transit corridors). Would it be better to focus only around transit stations?</p> <p>In between stations: these corridors would have lessened effects from the transit corridor such that they function more like typical Boulevards, the design parameters of which were very deliberately established through the development of Complete Streets.</p>	Agree with Modifications	<p>Thrive Montgomery 2050, the county's recently approved general plan, identifies many of Montgomery County's planned bus rapid transit corridors as growth corridors. Growth corridors are intended to be transformed into multimodal corridors, lined with denser residential and commercial development, a tight grid of streets, more frequent safe crossings and slow travel speeds. While a Town Center designation may be appropriate for planned BRT station areas, to effectively implement Thrive Montgomery 2050, a new street type or overlay is needed to apply to the areas between transit stations. Furthermore, the Complete Streets Design Guide, not the BRT Design Guidelines, is the appropriate document to contain guidance on street design, as it is intended to be a "one-stop-shop" for street design guidance. That said, the reference to "a transit corridor overlay" may be misleading.</p> <p>Therefore, Planning staff recommends changing Key Action B-4d as follows in the subsequent cell.</p>	2

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
116	B-4d	108	County Executive	75	<p>(CC) This recommendation may not be necessary in the first place, as BRT Design Guidelines are already in development.</p> <p>(ADB) In lieu of overlays, would a better approach be to carve out Town Center designations around stations? That'd use existing tools and avoid complexity/confusion of new overlays. (or to put it another way: how would an overlay differ from designating Town Centers?) This could be a similar approach to how Red policy areas were applied around Purple Line stations.</p>	Agree with Modifications	<p>B-4d: Update the CSDG to include a [transit c]Growth Corridor overlay or new street type to provide additional context-based guidance on crossings and target speeds.</p> <p>[Montgomery County's rail and bus rapid transit corridors (Figure 25) pass through both Urban and Suburban areas, but existing guidance for the Boulevard street type in the CSDG does not recommend adequate target speeds and protected crossing spacing along existing and planned transitways—features necessary to enhance pedestrian safety, improve pedestrian comfort, and shorten walking trips. As transit corridors such as Georgia Avenue, Veirs Mill Road, and University Boulevard account for 10% of fatalities and severe injuries but only 1.3% of roadway miles, more frequent protected crossings and lower target speeds are needed on these roads to achieve Vision Zero.]Thrive Montgomery 2050 identifies ten Growth Corridors in the county. These Growth Corridors are comprised of “centers” of activity – Large, Medium, Small and Villages & Neighborhoods – as well as “segments” in between the centers. While existing area types and street types in the CSDG are sufficient to achieve the vision of Thrive in the “centers”, they are insufficient to address the “segments” in between the “centers”. A growth corridor overlay or new street type is needed to achieve adequate target speeds to reconnect communities divided by fast and wide roadways, enhance pedestrian safety, improve pedestrian comfort, and shorten walking trips. This overlay or street type would be applied by master plans where substantial growth is recommended along the Growth Corridor.</p>	2
117	B-4d	111	County Executive	75	<p>BRT speeds need to be achieved to maintain reliability and to improve quality of service. How does this recommendation affect BRT operations? These overlays would need to balance additional protected crossings & reduced target speeds focused on getting people *to* transit, with impacts of slowing the same transit they are intended to serve.</p>	N/A	<p>Growth corridors, along with Downtowns and Town Centers, are envisioned to absorb most of the county's growth over the next 30 – 50 years, and therefore, the level of pedestrian and bicycle activity along these corridors will likely grow substantially. Today, these corridors mostly high speed roads, with infrequent safe crossings, that divide communities. To achieve the vision of Thrive, they must have low target speeds and frequent protected crossings to create a safe environment and the speed of motor vehicles, whether they are private vehicles or transit vehicles, must be established to reflect that. This is a standard approach to corridor planning. For example, the US 1 corridor in Alexandria, has signalized intersections spaced every 800 feet on average (with 400 foot block spacing overall) and has a posted speed limit of 25 mph. Exclusive transit lanes, not travel speeds, are the critical element to maintaining reliable travel times. And travel time competitiveness with autos is the main way to attract ridership.</p>	N/A

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
118	B-4e	202	Rich Kuzmyak	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.	N/A
119	B-4g	203, 207	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.	N/A
120	B-4g	204, 205	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. Any adverse impacts, such as spillover traffic onto residential streets, must first be evaluated to determine if there is a problem. If a problem is confirmed, the county should evaluate ways to mitigate the impacts of spillover traffic onto residential streets. To clarify what "permanent" refers to, Planning staff recommends the following change to Key Action B-4g: B-4g: Make the Open Parkways along Beach Drive and Sligo Creek Parkway permanent. Montgomery County should build on the success of the Open Streets program by taking steps to make [it] <u>the current Open Parkway days and times</u> permanent. The Rock Creek and Sligo Creek Parkway trails are some of the most popular in the county. Opening Beach Drive and Sligo Creek Parkway to active transportation permanently will provide more safe, comfortable, and direct spaces for walking and bicycling.	2
121	B-4g	206	Rich Kuzmyak	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.	N/A
122	B-4h	209, 210, 213	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> "	2
123	B-4h	208	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.	N/A

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
124	B-4h	211	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> "	2
125	B-4h	212	Civic Federation	78	Supports expanding Key Action B-4h to include parks and trails.	Agree	Planning Staff recommends changing B-4h to read: "Provide public seating, restrooms and other pedestrian amenities in Downtowns, Town Centers, <u>in parkland, and along Boulevards.</u> "	2
126	B-4h	109	County Executive	78	Who is doing this? Urban Districts? Enhanced street furnishing is beyond the scope of maintenance for DOT	Neutral	Implementing this recommendation would require coordination between multiple entities and may require additional funding.	2
127	B-4h	110	County Executive	78	While some of these facilities might be within MCDOT facilities, there may need to be other Lead Agencies identified. Restrooms, for example, are unlikely to be MCDOT facilities unless they're incorporated into transit centers.	Agree	Planning staff recommend adding Montgomery Parks and the Urban Districts to the Lead Agencies.	2
128	B-4i	214	Rich Kuzmyak	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.	N/A
129	B-4i	123	County Executive	79	The County does not have this authority. Highway curves are a national standard.	N/A	MCDOT staff indicated they misunderstood the recommendation and are now supportive of removing the horizontal alignment provision from the county code, as it is overly prescriptive.	N/A
130	B-5	60	County Executive	79	You may want to mention that SHA does not require sidewalks/bike paths in ROW to be lit as Montgomery County does.	N/A	Planning staff recommends modifying Recommendation B-5 as follows: B-5: Light pathways and crossings. Pedestrians should be able to see where they're going when walking at night, feel secure walking in the dark, and feel confident that drivers will see them when crossing the street. However, only 32% of surveyed residents say they are satisfied with the quality of overhead lighting along pathways and at crossings. <u>While Montgomery County requires sidewalks or sidepaths within the right-of-way to be lit, the State Highway Administration does not have a similar requirement along state roadways.</u>	2

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
131	B-5a	215, 216, 219	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.	N/A
132	B-5a	217	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 " Lighting for Roadways, Intersections, and Pedestrian and Bike Facilities "	2
133	B-5a	218	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.	N/A
134	B-5a	220	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.	N/A
135	B-5b	221	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.	N/A
136	B-5a/b	238	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 maintained by the county and utility companies. Key Action B-5b recommends using the zoning code to improve pedestrian-scale lighting on private property like commercial buildings, particularly in locations that front along pedestrian spaces with the goal of improving the quality of pedestrian lighting.	N/A

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
137	B-5c	222	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.	2
138	B-5c	223	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.	N/A
139	B-5c	106	County Executive	80	(CC) We cannot "ensure" streetlight repair timelines. Outage of single fixtures is usually not a major safety concern if nearby fixtures are operable. (ADB) Perhaps adjust this phrasing to read something like "Reducing this to 24 hours, particularly at locations with greater risk of conflicts, will ensure that..." (ADB) Be mindful that streetlight repairs are almost entirely at the behest of energy companies. Seeking that they complete repairs at a 600% faster rate will likely incur substantially higher costs that will be either passed on to regulatory authorities or to ratepayers, depending on how companies are compelled to comply with this.	Agree with Modifications	Planning staff recommends moving Key Action B-5c to become Recommendation MA-4 as follows: [Key Action B-5c]Recommendation MA-4: [Ensure malfunctioning streetlights are returned to service within 24 hours]Minimize street light repair time." Lighting is an essential element of public safety. Currently, the average repair time for a broken MCDOT streetlight is seven days. Minimizing the amount of time a street light is broken will ensure that Montgomery County pedestrians continue to comfortably travel in their communities at night. Key Action MA-4a: Street lighting owners should publicize response improvement plans and track their progress. MCDOT and the utility companies responsible for maintaining the county's street lighting should be transparent about how long it takes to bring street lights back to service after different types of issues. These entities should endeavor to continue reducing lighting downtime." Goals: Pedestrian Safety, Walking Rates Leads: MCDOT, PEPCO, Potomac Edison, BGE	2
140	B-6a	224, 225, 226, 227, 228	Rich Kuzmyak, 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.	N/A
141	B-6c	113	County Executive	81	Include MCDOT as a Lead if this recommendation is expected to include MCDOT facilities.	Agree	Planning staff recommends adding MCDOT as a lead agency in Key Action B-6c	2

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
142	B-7a	229	Rich Kuzmyak	82	Recent federal funding programs should be used to increase funding for sidewalk construction.	N/A	No change is needed	N/A
143	B-7b	114	County Executive	82	This should be a low priority given the backlog of needed sidewalk connections along existing streets in the near term.	Disagree	If these connections can improve accessibility along the most direct pedestrian routes, they may have more utility than sidewalk connections themselves. This program would be more akin to the Annual Sidewalk Program than a program that builds sidewalks on Boulevards, etc.	N/A
144	B-7c	230	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.	N/A
145	B-7e	231	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.	N/A
146	B-7e	88, 95	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.	N/A

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
147	B-7f	232	Rich Kuzmyak	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: 1) The provision of pedestrian shortcut connections and through-block connections across common areas of Homeowners Association and Condominium Association property—<u>where these connections would improve pedestrian access to local businesses, transit, and community destinations.</u> 2) The reconfiguration of parking lots to be more pedestrian friendly—reducing the number and severity of conflicts between motor vehicles and pedestrians Goals: Comfortable/Connected Pedestrian Network, Walking Rates, Pedestrian Safety Leads: MCDOT, County Executive, County Council</p>	2
148	B-7f	115	County Executive	85	This should be a low priority given the backlog of needed sidewalk connections along existing streets in the near term.	Disagree	<p>If these connections can improve accessibility along the most direct pedestrian routes, they may have more utility than sidewalk connections themselves. This program would be more akin to the Annual Sidewalk Program than a program that builds sidewalks on Boulevards, etc.</p>	N/A
149	B-7g	233, 234, 235, 236	Barbara Sanders, Coalition for Smarter Growth, Purple Line Now, Rich Kuzmyak	85	Support, especially when it comes to the Purple Line stations.	N/A	<p>No change is needed as this comment is addressed by Key Action B-7g.</p>	N/A

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
150	B-7g	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	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: On page 85, add the following in the description of Key Action B-7g: "These investments can provide substantial public benefits, <u>including reduced transportation emissions and increased economic development</u> , but poor pedestrian and bicycle connectivity in the surrounding area makes it difficult for these projects to reach their full potential <u>ridership</u> ."	2
151	B-8b	238	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.	N/A
152	B-8c	116	County Executive	87	Does this require changes to State law to allow accessible pathways through Forest Conservation Areas?	N/A	Planning staff is researching this question.	N/A
153	B-8d	118	County Executive	88	I'm not sure lowering the cap is the answer. I think the issue is the balance of rooftops vs. infrastructure within the cap (B8-e covers this)	Disagree	The impervious surface caps make it difficult for publicly-built sidewalks/bikeways to be constructed without removing imperviousness elsewhere in the Special Protection Area. Lowering the cap (and accounting for these public sidewalks and bikeways) would make it easier for public sidewalk and bikeway projects in Special Protection Areas to proceed.	N/A
154	B-8e	119	County Executive	88	Applicants will build the infrastructure if they don't have to count it towards imperviousness. Planning needs to tell the applicant that infrastructure comes first, and to reduce the footprint of developed units as needed to fit within impervious requirements. (also, be mindful that the limitation to only have driveways for townhomes in the rear creates more imperviousness - two roads.)	N/A	No change is needed.	N/A

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
155	B-8e	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 88, add the following in the description of Key Action B-8e: "This makes it more difficult for pedestrians to travel through these communities and encourages driving for walkable trips, <u>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>	2
156	B-9a	239	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	<p>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.</p>	N/A

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
157	B-9a	120	County Executive	89	Complete Streets built on Thrive, which proposed more widespread traffic calming. The Fiscal Impact Statement for Thrive noted the need for substantially increased traffic calming funding, which is critically important to implementing more proactive traffic calming.	Agree	<p>Planning staff recommends rewriting Key Action B-9a as follows to recommend additional funding for traffic calming:</p> <p>B-9a: <u>Increase funding for traffic calming countywide to encourage a more proactive traffic calming installation approach.</u> [Assess existing traffic calming implementation and the impact of CSDG standards and related procedures on new traffic calming implementation.]</p> <p>The CSDG increases the type and location of potential traffic calming infrastructure in Montgomery County, <u>but ensuring additional traffic calming infrastructure is installed, especially in a proactive way in the locations it is most needed, requires additional funding.</u> [Conduct a study to understand where traffic calming has been installed, how long it took to install, how these improvements reduce crash risk, changes to motor vehicle speeds, etc. and determine if changes could be implemented to improve the program.]</p> <p>Goals: Comfortable/Connected Pedestrian Network, Pedestrian Safety Lead: MCDOT</p>	2
158	B-9b	240, 241, 243, 244	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.	N/A
159	B-9b	242	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.	2

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
160	B-9b	122	County Executive	89	Montgomery Planning should not be listed as a Lead Agency	Agree	Planning staff recommend removing "Montgomery Planning" as the lead agency.	2
161	B-9b	125	County Executive	89	<p>Instead of deemphasizing pedestrian volumes completely, change this to using pedestrian *demand* in lieu of existing volumes.</p> <p>I don't expect we'll put in signals to cross Country Connectors if it's for only 2 or 3 single family homes, or if we'll expend resources to build new sidewalk on the 2nd side of a small cul-de-sac street when there are other higher needs. Ignoring current or potential pedestrian volumes can lead to the implementation of the wrong safety countermeasures (e.g. implementing a full traffic signal where a ped beacon would meet the need).</p> <p>We are also legally required to adhere to the MUTCD, which requires volume considerations for many actions. We can potentially use pedestrian "demand" without running afoul of the MUTCD.</p>	Agree	<p>Planning staff recommends modifying Key Action B-9b as follows:</p> <p>[Deemphasize pedestrian volumes as a determining factor in deciding where to install pedestrian or connectively improvements.]<u>Use pedestrian demand instead of observed pedestrian volumes in deciding if or where to install pedestrian connectivity improvements.</u></p>	2
162	B-10a	245, 247, 249, 250, 255, 257, 258	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	N/A

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
163	B-10a	255	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.	2
164	B-10a	102	County Executive	90	<p>B-10a- There are significant financial implications to assuming control of State roads, both for us and the State, including funding for maintenance, operations, capital needs, and liabilities.</p> <p>This recommendation assumes the County can and would have the money and resources to implement changes on state highways quicker than SHA if they were transferred to the County.</p> <p>Yes, SHA has burdensome and at times unhelpful bureaucracy, but more than not the delays are due to funding rather than bureaucratic inertia. Moving the roads from SHA to MCDOT would not solve the funding problem.</p> <p>It's unlikely the State is going to provide the County the resources to properly maintain these roads. This is more likely to add substantial costs to the County and reduce the County's ability to address the other recommendations of this plan & this recommendation should be removed.</p>	Disagree	<p>Planning staff recommends changing Key Action B-10a as follows:</p> <p>B-10a: [Evaluate different approaches to assuming control of state roadways in Downtowns, Town Centers, and along master-planned Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) corridors in Montgomery County.] Develop an approach to achieving increased county control over state highways, beginning in Downtowns, Town Centers, and along Thrive Montgomery 2050 Growth Corridors.</p>	2
165	B-10a	246, 248	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.	2

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
166	B-10a	253, 254, 256	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	N/A
167	B-10a	252	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.	2
168	B-10a	251	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.	N/A
169	MA-1	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.	N/A
170	MA-1a	280	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.	N/A
171	MA-1a	238	Patricia Mulready	91	Support for repairing existing sidewalks	Agree	No change is needed	N/A

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
172	MA-1a	124	County Executive		Maintenance activities are already limited by the availability of resources. Without substantially increased funding this recommendation may not be achievable, especially considering the increased maintenance needs of many of the other recommendations in this Plan.	Agree	Planning staff agree that without substantial increase in funding this recommendation may not be achievable, but the first step in justifying the need for additional funding is to create a plan that identifies how a proactive approach would work and what the funding requirements would be.	N/A
173	MA-2a	279	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 with Modifications	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> "	2
174	MA-2b	281	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.	N/A
175	MA-2d	282, 283, 284, 285, 286	Rich Kuzmyak, 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.	N/A
176	MA-2d	287, 288	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.	N/A

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
177	MA-2d	103	County Executive	93	This recommendation would add hundreds of miles of manual labor. Any expansions of County Gov snow-clearing responsibilities would necessitate major increases to the operating budget for personnel and equipment (or contracting), and potentially capital and right-of-way needs for new or expanded maintenance facilities. These costs are likely to be so substantial as to be infeasible, and this recommendation should be removed from the plan.	Agree with Modifications	Planning staff recommend changing Key Action MA-2d as follows: MA-2d: <u>Study the benefits and costs of assuming county responsibility for snow clearance</u> [Assume county responsibility for snow clearance on sidewalks] along all Downtown Boulevards, Town Center Boulevards, Downtown Streets, Town Center Streets, and Bus Rapid Transit Corridors.	2
178	P-1	289	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> "	2
179	P-1	72	Bruce Schwalm	N/A	Strengthen pedestrian education and enforcement recommendations.	Disagree	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-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.	2

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
180	P-1	88, 89	League of Women Voters, Mike Bailey	N/A	Ensure drivers understand their responsibilities at intersections and elsewhere to improve pedestrian safety.	Agree	Driver education is addressed in the following recommendations: 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.	2
181	P-1	290	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.	N/A
182	P-1a	293	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> "	2
183	P-1b	291	Rich Kuzmyak	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.	N/A

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
184	P-1b	292	Montgomery Square Citizens Association	95	There should be a tax credit or requirement for people to get pedestrian detection systems for their cars.	Agree	<p>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.</p> <p>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></p> <p><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></p> <p><u>Lead: County Executive, County Council</u> <u>Goals: Pedestrian Safety</u></p>	2
185	P-1b	126	County Executive	95	This recommendation is OK but would need to include an override for emergency response activities.	Agree	<p>Planning staff recommend the following change to Key Action P-1b:</p> <p>P-1b: Install speed governors or intelligent speed control devices in county and public agency vehicles to ensure their drivers adhere to the speed limit.</p> <p>The county and public agencies should set an example when it comes to driving safely by setting an upper limit for how fast vehicles can go using speed governor technologies. <u>Implementation should include an override for emergency vehicles responding to emergencies.</u></p> <p>Goal: Pedestrian Safety Leads: County Executive, Montgomery Parks, MCPS, MCDGS</p>	2

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
186	P-1c	126	County Executive	96	Even with purchasing smaller fire engines and ladder trucks, the integrated Fire/Rescue model Montgomery County uses does not guarantee the engine in the first due area is the one responding to the call. Therefore, you would still need to design for larger MCFRS vehicles that may arrive from outside the first due area. In addition, having multiple fire engine models also increases fleet maintenance costs. It is unclear if MCFRS has weighed in on this recommendation. Should prioritize implementation in facilities serving Downtowns first, then Town Centers.	Neutral	No change is needed because the key action calls for implementing a strategy, not abruptly making the change to smaller vehicles.	N/A
187	P-1e	294	Cathie Cooper	98	Support for improved driver education.	N/A	No change is needed as this comment is addressed by Key Action P-1e.	N/A
188	P-1e	295	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.	N/A
189	P-1e	296	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> "	2
190	P-2a	297	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.	N/A

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
191	P-2a	298, 299, 300, 238	Rich Kuzmyak, 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.	N/A
192	P-2b	301, 302, 303, 238	Larry Cole, Jane Lyons-Raeder, Rich Kuzmyak, 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.	N/A
193	P-2b	304	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.	N/A
194	P-2c	305, 306	Larry Cole, Rich Kuzmyak	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.	N/A
195	P-2d	307, 308	Rich Kuzmyak, 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.	N/A

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
196	P-2e	310, 312, 311	Larry Cole, Larry Cole, Larry Cole	102	<p>The Plan’s recommendations for more pedestrian crossing time but not increasing traffic signal cycle lengths need to be reconciled.</p> <p>'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.</p> <p>Consider creating a database of the pedestrian timings at each intersection including what walking speed the crossing time was based on.</p>	Agree	<p>. In some locations, the pedestrian crossing time should be increased (Key Action EA-3a, Page 117) In other locations, it may be more appropriate to shorten the traffic signal cycles to allow pedestrians more frequent opportunities to cross (Key Action P-2e, Page 102).</p> <p>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. There may not be an opportunity to implement both key actions at the same intersection.</u>"</p>	2
197	P-2e	309	Greater Colesville Citizens Association	102	<p>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.</p>	Disagree	<p>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.</p>	N/A
198	P-2e	313	Rich Kuzmyak	102	<p>Supports reducing pedestrian wait times by developing a policy on target and maximum traffic signal cycle lengths by street type.</p>	N/A	<p>No change is needed as this comment is addressed by Key Action P-2e.</p>	N/A

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
199	P-2f	314	Rich Kuzmyak	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.	N/A
200	P-2g	315, 316	Rich Kuzmyak, 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.	N/A
201	P-3a	317, 318	Civic Federation, Rich Kuzmyak	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.	N/A
202	P-4a	319, 320	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.	2
203	P-4c	321	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."	N/A

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
204	P-4c	128	County Executive	104	Remove recommendation. The education component of SRTS goes beyond what occurs directly on school grounds, which is why DOTs are typically the home of SRTS programs. The County's SRTS program also integrates the engineering and education sides of SRTS which would be removed under this recommendation.	Agree with Modifications	Planning staff recommends the following change to Key Action P-4c: 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.] <u>Integrate Safe Routes to School into the MCPS curriculum and day-to-day activities.</u>	2
205	P-5	322	Rich Kuzmyak	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."	N/A
206	P-5a	129	County Executive	105	The lead agency is MCPD (Police), not MCPS (Public Schools).	Agree	Planning staff recommends changing the lead agency to MCPD.	2
207	P-5b	130	County Executive	106	Rephrase recommendation. Walking and biking school buses are intended to improve walking/biking rates within the school walkshed and not to replace students being bussed. Consider deleting the text "and the reduction in conventional school buses needed to transport kids to school."	Agree	Planning staff recommends changing Key Action P-5b as follows: P-5b: Fund Walking School Buses to reduce the [need for motorized school buses.] <u>number of students being driven to school.</u> A walking school bus is a group of students walking to/from school with the guidance of adults. They help students get to school in the same way that school buses do, but in a more active, independent, and healthful way. Funding could be used to incentivize participation, provide promotional materials, and other general support. The success of this effort would be measured by the number of students walking to school as part of Walking School Buses[and the reduction in conventional school buses needed to transport kids to school]. Goal: Walking Rates Lead: MCPS	2
208	P-5c	323	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.	N/A
209	P-5d	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	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: 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> "	2

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
210	P-5d	325	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.	N/A
211	P-7a	326	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."	N/A
212	P-7a	131	County Executive	109	The last sentence references the illustration "to the right", but it's currently located below. Verify directionality when ready for final copy.	Agree	Planning staff will make this technical correction.	2
213	P-7b	327	Rich Kuzmyak	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> "	2
214	P-7c	328	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.	N/A
215	P-7d	329	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	After review of the relevant section of the AASHTO Roadside Design Guide, Planning staff recommends amending Key Action P-7d to read: Eliminate breakaway traffic signal and other poles in [locations with pedestrian activity] <u>the immediate vicinity of transit stops and other areas of significant pedestrian activity.</u>	2

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
216	P-7d	112	County Executive	111	Remove recommendation. Is there any case where the breakaway pole has injured a pedestrian or bicyclist? Removing breakaway poles increases the crash severity and goes against Vision Zero, and can run afoul of other State and Federal requirements.	Disagree	After review of the relevant section of the AASHTO Roadside Design Guide, Planning staff recommends amending Key Action P-7d to read: Eliminate breakaway traffic signal and other poles in [locations with pedestrian activity] <u>the immediate vicinity of transit stops and other areas of significant pedestrian activity.</u>	2
217	P-8	330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335	Larry Cole, Larry Cole, Larry Cole, Larry Cole, Rich Kuzmyak, 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	<p>Planning Staff recommends changing Recommendation P-8 to read: "<u>Increase traffic enforcement activities</u>"</p> <p>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>"</p> <p>Planning Staff recommends changing Key Action P-8a to read: "<u>Increase the number of Automated Traffic Enforcement (ATE) locations.</u>"</p>	2

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
218	P-8	330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335	Larry Cole, Larry Cole, Larry Cole, Rich Kuzmyak, Sligo Park Hills Community Association	112	<p>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.</p>	Agree	<p>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></p> <p><u>Equity should be a significant consideration in ATE implementation. Many of the county's Equity Focus Areas are where the larger, faster roadways are located. These roadways would be strong candidates for ATE to improve safety within EFAs. At the same time, ATE installation would likely lead to more fines for people living in EFAs, those who may be least able to afford these costs. Implementation should take this tradeoff into account and consider approaches to mitigating it.</u></p>	2

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
219	P-8	330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335	Larry Cole, Larry Cole, Larry Cole, Larry Cole, Rich Kuzmyak, Sligo Park Hills Community Association	112	<p>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.</p>	Agree	<p>Planning Staff recommends adding Key Action P-8b to read: <u>Increase in-person traffic enforcement activities</u></p> <p><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></p> <p><u>Lead: County Executive, County Council, MCPD, Montgomery Parks</u> <u>Goals: Pedestrian Safety</u></p>	2
220	P-8	133	County Executive	112	<p>Consider adding some narrative to P-8a. It might recognize the need to consider Equity in ATE implementation, minding that some communities have had historic underinvestment &/or have over-designed facilities conducive toward higher speeds, and both of these -by design- can induce higher rates of violations in communities least able to afford these costs.</p> <p>Enforcement in Equity areas should be done concurrently with efforts to reduce violation rates by design.</p>	Agree	<p>Planning staff recommends the following change to Key Action P-8</p> <p>P-8: Develop a plan to increase the number of ATE devices countywide.</p> <p><u>Equity should be a significant consideration in ATE implementation. Many of the county's Equity Focus Areas are where the larger, faster roadways are located. These roadways would be strong candidates for ATE to improve safety within EFAs. At the same time, ATE installation would likely lead to more fines for people living in EFAs, those who may be least able to afford these costs. Implementation should take this tradeoff into account and consider approaches to mitigating it.</u></p> <p>Goal: Pedestrian Safety Leads: County Executive, MCPD, County Council, State Delegation</p>	2

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
221	P-9	69, 96	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: <u>P-9: Comprehensively lower speed limits countywide</u> <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.</u></p> <p><u>Key Actions:</u> <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.</u> <u>Precedent: Washington, D.C. lowered speed limits on residential streets across the city to 20 mph.</u> <u>Goal: Pedestrian Safety</u> <u>Lead: State Delegation</u></p>	2
222	P-9	69, 96	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: <u>P-9b: Ensure speed limits and observed speeds along county roads are in line with target speeds identified in the Complete Streets Design Guide.</u> <u>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.</u></p> <p><u>Goal: Pedestrian Safety</u> <u>Lead: MCDOT, MDOT SHA</u></p>	2

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
222	EA	259, 260, 262, 263	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	N/A
223	EA	78	Commission on People with Disabilities	N/A	Tactile crosswalks should be installed so a blind person can easily figure out where they are.	Agree	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.	N/A
224	EA	261	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	<p>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.</p> <p>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. Part of Vision Zero Action Plan Item T-5 addresses Maintenance of Travel during Sidewalk and Road Closures.</u> <u>Goals: Equitable and Just Pedestrian Network</u> <u>Leads: MCDOT, MCDPS</u></p>	2

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
225	EA	79	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.	N/A
226	EA	91	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.	2
227	EA	80	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.	N/A
228	EA	85	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.	N/A
229	EA	87	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.	N/A

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
230	EA	138	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.	N/A
231	EA	88	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.	2
232	EA-1a	134	County Executive	113	(WH) Given the maintenance and safety issues with brick sidewalks, these should not be recommended materials for future community design standards. (CC, ADB) This is an issue for Urban Districts, which are scoped to maintain these sorts of facilities. MCDOT is not scoped nor funded for these facilities.	Agree with Modifications	Planning staff recommend adding "Urban Districts" as main lead.	2
233	EA-2a/b	264, 265	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.	N/A
234	EA-2c	266, 273	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 all types of disabilities traveling down a sidewalk.	N/A	No change is needed as this comment is addressed by Key Action EA-2c.	N/A
235	EA-3	267, 268	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.	N/A
236	EA-4	269	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.	N/A

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
237	EA-4b	270	Game Changers	120	Support for passive detection	N/A	No change is needed as this comment is addressed by Key Action EA-4b.	N/A
238	EA-4c	132	County Executive	120	We want more uniform devices with uniform response. Do not recommend differentiating APS buttons from Ped Call buttons.	Agree	In the interest of uniformity and ease of maintenance, Planning staff recommends removing this key action.	2
239	EA-5b	135	County Executive	122	What is the context for when Orientation & Mobility Specialists would be sought? New capital projects? New development construction? Public input? What else? Who would be providing or managing these services? (I'll need this info for the Fiscal Impact Statement)	N/A	Generally, Orientation and Mobility services are sought when a person is not able to travel safely due to disability. The state Department of Rehabilitation Services often pays for the expense, but not everyone qualifies. Insurance does not cover this service.	N/A
240	EA-6	271	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.	N/A	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.	N/A
241	EA-7a	30	Larry Cole	30	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."	N/A

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
242	EA-8a	272	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.	N/A
243	EA-8b	273	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.	N/A
244	EA-9a	274	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>	2

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
245	EA-9a	136	County Executive	125	Do any such ADA certifications exist at a national level which would be available and applicable locally? Or is this something that MCDOT (or perhaps DPS?) would have to define, develop, and manage in more detail? (this info is needed for the Fiscal Impact Statement) Clarification needed: Is "anyone who works" the company or the individuals working for the company?	N/A	MnDOT has a class schedule: https://www.dot.state.mn.us/ada/training-accessible-design-public-row-certification.html They've also recorded the 2019 class.	N/A
246	F-1	275	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.	N/A
247	F-1	276	Rich Kuzmyak	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.	N/A
248	F-1a	277	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.	N/A
249	F-1a	137	County Executive	126	(BHM) Parking has implemented a form of dynamic pricing (i.e. on-street higher rates than garages; high-demand garages higher rates than low-demand garages). Rates are set by County Council and can be a contentious issue. (BHM) PLDs are an enterprise fund wherein revenues first and foremost cover operating and internal expenses. PLDs do assist in funding the Urban Districts, but revenues have been decreasing due to the pandemic. (CC) There are many unmet needs within Parking and the Urban Districts long before Parking can fund other items.	N/A	No change is needed.	N/A

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
250	F-1b	278	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.	N/A
251	F-1b	238	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.	N/A
Bicycle and Pedestrian Priority Area Designations								
252	Prioritization	346	Greater Colesville Citizens Association	129	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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Areas around BRT and Purple Line stations, constructed when the transit service starts • Downtown areas • Town Centers, in order of geographic size • 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. • Neighborhoods 	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.	N/A

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
253	Prioritization	354	County Executive	127	<p>If I understand correctly: funded BiPPAs show up in the top list and none of the others. This could be a bit confusing if lower tiers become funded, or especially if currently funded BiPPAs lose their funding & we're not sure to what tier that BiPPA ends up.</p> <p>Consider assigning a numerical Tier to *every* BiPPA, and compiling a complementary list of which among those are currently funded.</p>	Neutral	The plan mimics the approach taken with the Bicycle Master Plan in which the Programmed Projects are identified as the top tier and Planning staff recommends maintaining this approach for consistency. As far as we are aware, the shifting of funding priorities for bikeways has not created an issue with the tier recommendations in the Bicycle Master Plan.	N/A
254	Prioritization	355	County Executive	127	<p>If this proposes to shift from the "explicitly designated BiPPA" approach to, instead, an approach where everywhere has a BiPPA rating: the Appendix should include Code/Regs/Policy changes that will be needed to reflect this shift. And this narrative should reference that section of the Appendix.</p>	Neutral	A search of the County code and the Code of Montgomery County Regulations revealed no use of the term "Bicycle and Pedestrian Priority Area". Minor changes may be needed to the Local Area Transportation Review (LATR) Guidelines and the Complete Streets Design Guide. Between the transmittal of the plan to the County Council and Executive and the approval of the plan by the Council, Planning staff and MCDOT staff can work together to identify policy documents that may need to be modified and determine if a change to the appendix is necessary.	N/A
255	Prioritization	356	County Executive	127	<p>Do the Tiers have any function? Or are they just to make a large amount of information a bit more digestible?</p> <p>(granted, over time Tiers might get some functionality if we end up with programs like "Fund all Tier 1 BiPPAs" or if we implement policies applying to all Tier 1 BiPPAs)</p>	Neutral	The tiers represent priorities. Those project that are identified as "Funded in Capital Budget" are the highest tier, as the Council has designated this with funding decisions. Tier 1 is the next highest priority, followed by Tier 2 and so forth.	N/A

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
256	Prioritization	357	County Executive	127	<p>It'd be useful to include the full list of areas and their BiPPA ratings, perhaps in the Prioritization Methodology, so that users can see how they were grouped into the various Tiers.</p> <p>It'd also be useful to have the area ratings included as a layer on MCAtlas/PedPlan, allowing PLOC to be toggled on/off. And consider also including this as a layer on MCAtlas/BikePlan.</p>	Neutral	Planning staff will add a map and table for all lower priority BiPPA areas not identified in the "Bicycle and Pedestrian Priority Area Prioritization" section to the appendix.	2
257	Prioritization	358	County Executive	127	There appear to be a lot of areas and corridors not included in any of these Tiers. Is there a presumed Tier 4 of unranked areas?	Neutral	Planning staff will add a map and table for all lower priority BiPPA areas not identified in the "Bicycle and Pedestrian Priority Area Prioritization" section to the appendix.	2
258	Prioritization	347	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.	2

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
259	Prioritization	348	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	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Geographies with more transit, more schools, and/or more residential units will score more favorably using this prioritization approach.</p>	N/A
260	Prioritization	349	Lee Keiser	129	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	Agree	<p>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</p> <p>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.</p>	2
261	Prioritization	350	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	<p>Planning Staff recommends adding CIP project numbers to the relevant geographies.</p> <p>"Currently-funded" should be defined as mostly funded through construction in the six-year CIP.</p>	2

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
262	Prioritization	351, 360	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.	N/A
263	Prioritization	352	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.	N/A
264	Prioritization	353	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	N/A
265	Prioritization	359	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	N/A

Complete Streets Design Guide Areas

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number	
266	CSDG	336	County Executive	150	Downtown Life Sciences Center FARs here tend to only be between 1.0 to 1.5, and the development we've been seeing has been extremely suburban in nature.	Disagree	While Planning staff agrees that changes are needed to the CSDG area designation for the Life Sciences Center, it is appropriate to defer decisions about the area type designation to the ongoing Great Seneca Plan: Connecting Life and Science, which is anticipated to be approved by the County Council in 2024.	2	
267	CSDG	337	County Executive	151	Downtown Life Sciences / FDA Village With FARs only in the range of 0.75 to 1.0; far from the 3.0 to 5.0 in more clearly Downtown areas but very in-line with densities in other Town Centers.	Disagree	The Council designated the Life Sciences / FDA Village area as a Downtown in 2022 as part of Bill 24-22 as the request of the Planning Board and Planning staff sees no reason to reconsider this decision. That is because the area is a major planned employment center with a consolidated area of commercial-residential zoning designations and planned transit service. The plan envisions a potential of 25.4 million square feet of commercial development, as well as 15,000 dwelling units. As shown in the map below, buildings can be as high as 220 feet in Zone 9, which is the heart of the area.	2	
268	CSDG	338	County Executive	152	Downtown Rock Spring FARs here are mostly between 0.75 to 1.5; far from the 3.0 to 5.0 in more clearly Downtown areas but very in-line with densities in other Town Centers.	Disagree	The Council designated the Rock Spring area as a Downtown in 2022 as part of Bill 24-22 as the request of the Planning Board and Planning staff sees no reason to reconsider this decision. This area a major employment center with consolidated area of commercial-residential and employment zoning designations, high levels of anticipated pedestrian and bicyclist activity and Non-Auto Driver Mode Share (NADMS) goals, as well as planned transit service. The plan envisions a potential of 10 million square feet of commercial development, as well as 4,600 dwelling units, with building heights up to 275 feet.	2	
269	CSDG	339	County Executive	156	16th Street Station Town Center I think it's probably good as Town Center for now, but it'll be worth seeing if the upcoming Adjacent Communities plan ups any densities around the high-rises such that that plan might move this to Downtown.	N/A			No change is needed.
270	CSDG	340	County Executive	159	Briggs Chaney Town Center Either this plan or the Fairland / Briggs Chaney plan should consider a larger area. I'd suggest including Greencastle ES, the RSC and Community Center, and the Woodvale + Centre apartments in between. Maybe include Automotive Blvd if the master plan thinks we may see/want redevelopment there (currently proposed as Briggs Chaney Industrial Area).	Agree			

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
271	CSDG	341	County Executive	161	Burtonsville Town Center Consider including the Elementary School. Since that'd technically be a driveway I'm not sure it makes a massive difference, other than sending a message of what'd be expected of design at/around the school.	Agree	Designating schools to be part of Downtown or Town Center areas should be based on whether the school's siting and design creates a unified area with the Downtown or Town Center. In the case of Burtonsville Elementary School, the location of the elementary school is such that it can be a cohesive part of the Town Center, even though designating the elementary school as part of the Town Center is unlikely to impact street design. Planning staff recommends adding Burtonsville Elementary School to the Town Center boundaries.	2
272	CSDG	342	County Executive	165	Cloverly Town Center Consider including the RE-2 lot on the west leg of the NH/Briggs Chaney intersection. If that ever redeveloped, this would help ensure that we can condition the Town Center design along that frontage & we don't end up a couple hundred feet short on that side.	Agree	As this change will not impact street design, we do not believe a change is needed to the Town Center area, for the following reasons: 1) the frontage of this property is already designated by the Pedestrian Master Plan as a Town Center (see map X), and 2) that this property has a recent preliminary plan approval (Mar Thoma Church of Washington, 120200080) that largely meets Town Center standards.	2
273	CSDG	343	County Executive	170	Four Corners Town Center Consider including the high school.	Agree	As the University Boulevard Corridor Master Plan is currently underway and the boundary includes Blair High School, Planning staff recommend deferring any modifications to the area type boundary to that plan.	2
274	CSDG	344	County Executive	174	Grosvenor Town Center Just to verify: what would we advocate out of SHA if they did work on Rockville Pike along this area? Would we advocate for it as a Town Center Blvd, or as a Boulevard? In general I'd err toward the more-urban-like application when on a border, but with the rail tracks this is one case where a Boulevard might be the more applicable design.	N/A	While no change to the plan is requested, Planning staff believes that MD 355 would be designated as a Boulevard.	N/A
275	CSDG	345	County Executive	205	Briggs Chaney Industrial Area Per my remarks on Briggs Chaney Town Center, check in with the planners for the Fairland/BC Plan on whether they envisioned this remaining industrial, or if this should all be Town Center. Based on their Preliminary Recommendations it seems like they envision a Town Center here.	Agree	The Fairland and Briggs Chaney Master Plan has recommended changes to the CSDG area designations. Therefore, it is appropriate to defer decisions about the area type designation to the upcoming Planning Board work sessions on the Fairland and Briggs Chaney Master Plan.	2

Pedestrian Shortcuts

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
276	Pedestrian Shortcuts	361, 362	Jordan Day, Montgomery County Climate Action Plan Coalition	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.	N/A
277	Pedestrian Shortcuts	364	County Executive	215	Add these shortcuts as a layer onto MCAtlas/PedPlan, allowing PLOC to be toggled on/off. Also consider whether these might be included as a layer on MCAtlas/BikePlan	Agree	Planning staff agrees that an interactive map can be created after the plan is adopted.	N/A
278	Pedestrian Shortcuts	363	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.	2

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
279	Pedestrian Shortcuts	365, 366	Joseph Elbaum, Mona and Sol Freishtat	216	<p>Opposes pedestrian shortcut #186 on page 216 (Kersey Road to Auth Lane) for several reasons:</p> <p>-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.</p> <p>-The shortcut in question is used only by local pedestrians to cross from one neighborhood street to another.</p> <p>-I do not believe that building a convenient neighborhood shortcut is a sufficient justification for further deforestation of our beautiful woods.</p> <p>- 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.</p> <p>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 directed toward other more equitable and just projects.</p>	Disagree	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	2
280	Pedestrian Shortcuts	367	Elliott Klonsky	216	<p>Potential support for a bridge connecting Kersey Road to Auth Lane, but not a path because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	2

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
281	Pedestrian Shortcuts	368	Esther Curry	241	From Dennis Avenue round to the Safeway on University an obvious pedestrian route would be along Gilmore 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	Gilmore 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 Gilmore Drive alternative viable.	N/A
Monitoring								
282	Monitoring	369	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.	N/A
283	Monitoring	371	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.	N/A
284	Monitoring	370	County Executive	267	(WH) While we believe it is appropriate for the Planning Board to assess the progress being made on the Plan, the Plan needs to be careful as to not exceed the Planning Board's authority insofar as seeming to create new oversight authority over the Executive Branch. (ADB) We suggest a partnership between the Executive Branch and the Planning Department on developing the recurring monitoring reports, either through the processes otherwise identified by this Plan or through existing partnerships such as the Vision Zero Action Plan or the Climate Action Plan	N/A	The Bicycle Master Plan Biennial Monitoring Report partnership provides the foundation for collaboratively developing the Pedestrian Master Plan Biennial Monitoring Report.	N/A
Appendices								
285	Appendix	372	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 that 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 adopted by the County Council.	N/A

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
286	Appendix	377	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.	2
287	Appendix	377	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.	N/A
288	Appendix	374	County Executive	N/A	(GO) - Should this consider whether the street is open or closed section? (ADB) - I'm wonder if an open section of 35+ or 40+ MPH might maybe subtract 7 feet from the measured width for purposes of estimating PLOC. So it starts requiring 15' buffers to be the highest tier.	N/A	An open section buffer provides similar benefits to a closed section one, so no change is needed.	N/A
289	Appendix	375	County Executive	N/A	(GO) - Some streets without enclosed parking nonetheless have reliable parking, such as along Neighborhood Connectors. (ADB) - Where this defines what Designated Parking Lanes include, perhaps amend this list to include something like " , or where engineering judgement finds a high rate of parking continuously throughout the day and night."	N/A	Planning staff will continue to discuss opportunities to improve the PLOC calculation in advance of the biennial monitoring report.	N/A
290	Appendix	376	County Executive	N/A	Unclear what slopes of less than 0% are	N/A	Planning staff will modify the appendix to say: "Cross Slope (2% or less)"	N/A
291	Appendix	373	County Executive	N/A	Does the "Pathway Comfortable Connectivity" metric deliberately exclude crossings? Could using this metric give a false impression if two neighborhoods with excellent PLOC are bisected by a major highway crossing with a poor PLOC?	N/A	Yes. Pathway PLOC and Crossing PLOC are identified separately for this exact reason. Pathway PLOC is typically better than Crossing PLOC.	N/A

General Support

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
292	General	378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 402	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, Saniida	N/A	Plan Support	N/A	No change is needed as this comment is supportive of the plan's intent.	N/A
General Opposition								
293	General	409	David Lechner	N/A	Plan Opposition	N/A	No change is needed	N/A
Non-Master Plan Issues								

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
294	Specific Locational Pedestrian Issues	414, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 439, 438	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.	N/A
295	Kenwood Park	415, 416, 417, 418, 420, 421, 422, 419	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.	N/A
296	Biking Concerns	410, 413	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.	N/A
297	Biking Concerns	412	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.	N/A
298	Biking Concerns	411	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.	N/A

Attachment A: Updated Summarized Public Testimony Comment Matrix

ID #	Section	Related Comment #s	Commenter	Plan Page #	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion / Recommendation	Include in Work Session Number
299	Biking Concerns	411	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.	N/A
300	Biking Concerns	411, 413	Cathie Cooper, Sally Amero	N/A	Interest in bicycle safety education.	N/A	This is not relevant to the Pedestrian Master Plan.	N/A
301	Other Transportation Concerns	423, 424, 425, 426	Sally Amero, Sally Amero, Sally Amero, 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.	N/A