

Written Testimony Summary

Written Testimony Item	Section	Topic(s)	Plan Section(s)	Plan Page(s)	Commenter	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion/Recommendation
B	Transportation	Street Network Recommendations	3.C.2.4	43	Cicero Salles, Eastern Montgomery RSC	Requests revision of draft plan recommendation to eliminate planned grade-separated interchange at Tech Road and US 29 to instead read: "SHA and/or MCDOT shall conduct a detailed traffic study to assess traffic capacity, accessibility, and safety, prior to any decision regarding the removal of the grade separated interchanges. The study should include the build-out scenario, and urban interchange and BRT alternatives."	Disagree	This plan does not recommend removal of existing interchanges. However, the plan does recommend the removal of several planned interchanges, including the interchange at Tech Road. This is in response to a general re-visioning of US-29 as a transit-focused corridor as opposed to an auto-centric highway. The plan does recommend additional study of the interchange to determine if the US-29/Industrial Parkway interchange can also be removed as a recommendation of the White Oak Science Gateway Plan at a later date (3.C.2.4). However, as Industrial Parkway lies outside the plan area, this plan does not current opt for its removal as a recommended improvement. This plan does not alter the transportation improvements proposed by the White Oak Science Gateway Master Plan.
C	Transportation	Bicycle and Pedestrian Recommendations	Map 21 and Table 6	49, 50	Stephen Ashurst	Requests to support reduced target speed of 25 mph on Greencastle Road by establishing narrower travel lanes (max. 10 feet).	Disagree	Greencastle Road is designated as an Area Connector per the latest update of the Complete Streets Design Guide and Master Plan of Highways & Transitways. The recommended target speed for Area Connectors is 25, although the current posted speed is 30 MPH. Planning Staff can make the recommendation for reducing speed and tapering driving lanes along Greencastle, but the Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) would ultimately have the final say in determining appropriate speed and lane widths.
C	Transportation	Bicycle and Pedestrian Recommendations	Map 21 and Table 6	49, 50	Stephen Ashurst	Requests installing protected bike lanes in both directions from the remaining width.	Disagree	Conventional (but not protected) bike lanes along with a sidepath exists along a fairly substantial portion of Greencastle, extending south to Fairland Recreational Park. Northbound, the bike lane ends 300 feet from the Greencastle/Columbia Pike intersection. Both the Fairland MP and Bicycle MP endorse the extension of the current bike lane (northbound to connect with planned facilities at Old Columbia Pike, and southbound toward the county line).
C	Transportation	Bicycle and Pedestrian Recommendations	Map 21 and Table 6	49, 50	Stephen Ashurst	Requests installation of 'floating bus stops' on Greencastle Road that allow protected bike lanes to continue.	Disagree	The current right-of-way for Greencastle Road is 80-feet, similar to other area/neighborhood connector roads within the plan area. Floating bus island could potentially work in sections where the right-of-way widens, or by narrowing the driving lanes and the median. However, Posted and planned road speeds, ridership counts and bike usage on this corridor are low enough that conflicts between buses, bikers, and transit users are rare. Nevertheless, it should be noted that floating bus stops are a best practice, though this plan defers improvements to bus stops to MCDOT and/or WMATA and on a case
C	Transportation	Bicycle and Pedestrian Recommendations	Map 21 and Table 6	49, 50	Stephen Ashurst	Requests elimination of accel/decel lanes at Fairland Park entrance to improve bike and pedestrian operation and safety.	Disagree	Determination of the need for an acceleration or deceleration lane at the entrance to Fairland Recreational Park was not considered as part of this master plan and we would defer to the Montgomery County Department of Transportation and Montgomery Parks Department for such a recommendation.
C	Transportation	Bicycle and Pedestrian Recommendations	Map 21 and Table 6	49, 50	Stephen Ashurst	Requests a planned extension of the Greencastle Road sidepath west of US 29 to OCP.	Agree	Both the Bicycle Master Plan and Fairland Plan call for an extension of the current sidepath terminus westward to Old Columbia Pike. The current bicycle facility recommendation has a proposed extension of the sidepath along the entirety of Greencastle within the Plan boundary. The Master Plan draft specifically states, "provide sidewalks or sidepaths along all public roads, as required by Montgomery County Code Chapter 49 or the Complete Streets Design Guide" (Section 3.C.3 - Bicycle and Pedestrian Network Recommendations).
C	Transportation	Bicycle and Pedestrian Recommendations	Map 21 and Table 6	49, 50	Stephen Ashurst	Requests priority for vulnerable users (e.g., walkers, bikers) at US 29/Greencastle Rd intersection.	Agree	The current recommendation of the plan is to maximize pedestrian (walking, biking, rolling) comfort at all at-grade intersections within the Plan Area. This intersection is recommended to be improved to protected intersection standards (3.C.3.7). Additionally, per Section 3.C.2(6) under 'Street Network Recommendations', Planning Staff recommend the narrowing of travel lanes, removing left-turn lanes, or providing pedestrian refuge islands within Columbia Pike's expansive median.
C	Transportation	Bicycle and Pedestrian Recommendations	Map 21 and Table 6	49, 50	Stephen Ashurst	Requests continuous shared-use path and protected bike lane along Old Columbia Pike, between MD-198 (Spencerville Road) and East Randolph Road, along with an east-west breezeways along MD-200	Agree, in part	The Master Plan currently proposes both a sidepath and striped bike lane for the entire length of Old Columbia Pike, extending well beyond the limits of the Plan boundary. Due to Old 29's limited right-of-way (80-feet, same as Greencastle Road), conventional bike lanes are more feasible to implement. Furthermore, the inclusion of a breezeway along MD-200 is outlined in both the Bicycle Master Plan and Fairland Plan.
D	General	General	n/a	n/a	Susan Llareus, Maryland Department of Planning	Poses questions and makes suggestions on how various sections of the plan might be improved.	n/a	Staff thanks MDP staff for the suggestions and will consider whether or how they can be incorporated into the plan.
D	Transportation	Street Network Recommendations	3.C.2.4	43	Susan Llareus, Maryland Department of Planning	Requests clarification in the plan between Recommendation 3.C.2.4 and Map 19 regarding the improvement of US 29 and Industrial Boulevard as a grade-separated interchange.	Agree	Staff suggests that Map 19 should be updated to reflect the recommended grade-separated interchange at Industrial Parkway to reflect the text in Recommendation 3.C.2.4. This interchange is identified in the White Oak Science Gateway Master Plan, as well.
D	Environment	Water Infrastructure Capacity	3.F.2	59	Susan Llareus, Maryland Department of Planning	Suggests that Montgomery County Department of Environmental Protection review the 2010 WRP and determine if it accounts for the Draft Plan's revised development capacities. This review should consider stormwater infrastructure, water and sewer capacity analysis, and any necessary upgrades to old systems.	Disagree	Due to time restrictions on the Planning Board's timeline for this plan, staff suggests requesting review by MCDEP as part of the County Council's review
E	Transportation	Roadways	Map 19 and Table 5	45-46	Cynthia Wright	Inquiry about the possibility of acquisition of a vacant property (owned by author and beyond Plan Area boundary) for construction of a new highway interchange at U.S. 29 and Greencastle Road.	Disagree	The property is located outside of the Master Plan area boundary and a highway interchange is not recommended by the draft plan. Therefore, staff does not support recommending the subject property for acquisition as an highway interchange.
F	Land Use	Zoning Recommendation	Map 18, Map 33, Table 10	38, 82, 83	Jey Daniel	Opposes recommended rezoning of a property (2131 E. Randolph Road) and provides letters of opposition to the same rezoning. Draft Plan recommended re-zoning is from R-200 to CRT-1.0 C-0.25 R-1.0 H-75.	Disagree	Staff supports rezoning the property as recommended in the Public Hearing Draft to support future development that complements the planned compact, walkable activity center at Old Columbia Pike and East Randolph Road.

Written Testimony Item	Section	Topic(s)	Plan Section(s)	Plan Page(s)	Commenter	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion/Recommendation
G	Land Use	Zoning Recommendation	Map 18, Map 33, Table 10	38, 82, 83	Duggirala Moses	Opposes recommended rezoning of a property (2131 E. Randolph Road) and provides letters of opposition to the same rezoning. Draft Plan recommended re-zoning is from R-200 to CRT-1.0 C-0.25 R-1.0 H-75.	Disagree	Staff supports rezoning the property as recommended in the Public Hearing Draft to support future development that complements the planned compact, walkable, mixed-use activity center at Old Columbia Pike and East Randolph Road.
H	Land Use	Zoning Recommendation	4.B.4	92-94	Scott C. Wallace, Attorney for MileOne	Requests that the plan state that, "the recommendations applicable to comprehensive redevelopment at the Auto Park do not apply to targeted development projects," and that, "any requirements for near-term improvements must be commensurate to the scope and size of a proposed development."	Agree	Staff believes the plan supports continued operation, improvement, and expansion of automobile sales and service businesses within the Auto Sales Park and also establishing a long-term vision to allow for a greater diversity of uses on individual properties in conjunction with or as a replacement to automobile sales and services uses, should property owners and the development market support it. Nevertheless, staff would support adding the language as requested by the commenter to clarify the applicability of the short-term vs. long-term land use vision in relation to the size and scope of proposed development.
H	Environment	Tree plantings	3.F	59	Scott C. Wallace, Attorney for MileOne	Requests that tree planting recommendations consider visibility needs for dealerships and allow alternative planting locations and flexibility in species selection to avoid damage to paved areas, sidewalks, and vehicles.	Disagree	Staff does not support special attention in the master plan to visibility of dealership sites for customer exposure from the street or security measures, as these issues can be a concern of any commercial business throughout the county. The benefits of tree plantings should not be limited by measures that can be accomplished by other means, such as appropriate signage, security camera placement, and species selection. These issues should be determined at Site Plan review stage rather than prescribed by the master plan.
H	Land Use	Driveway consolidation and utility undergrounding	4.B.2 and 3.C.2.10	86, 42-44	Scott C. Wallace, Attorney for MileOne	Requests that retrofit recommendations for Briggs Chaney Rd. and Automobile Blvd. recognize need for maintenance of existing driveway curb cuts and that modest improvements and redevelopment on Briggs Chaney Rd. do not trigger utility underground requirements so as to make them infeasible.	Disagree	Determinations on potential consolidation of driveways and utility undergrounding should be guided by plan recommendations, as well as review of individual development projects. Staff believes these recommendations should be considered as part of any project size, but only required if appropriate to its scale and relationship to nearby facilities.
H	Land Use	Zoning Recommendation	4.B.4, Table 12, Map 37, and Map 18	38, 92-94, 96, 97	Scott C. Wallace, Attorney for MileOne	Requests that rezoning recommendations take into account the permitted uses in the GR zone to avoid additional restrictions or approval processes on existing uses.	Disagree	While the allowance of vehicle sales, service, and repair varies among the GR, CR, and IM zones, staff believes their differences would not unduly burden or exclude such uses if the recommended CR zone is approved for properties oriented toward Briggs Chaney Road and the recommended IM zone is applied to properties oriented toward US 29 and the ICC. Furthermore, the recommended zones would permit transformation of the properties within the Auto Sales Park consistent with the master plan's long-term vision. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Heavy Vehicle Sales and Service is a Limited Use in the GR zone, a Use Not Allowed in the CR zone, and a Permitted Use in the IM zone. * Light Vehicle Sales and Rental (Indoor) is a Permitted Use in the GR, CR and IM zone. * Light Vehicle Sales and Rental (Outdoor) is a Limited Use in the GR zone and a Permitted Use in the CR and IM zone. * An Automobile Storage Lot is a Conditional Use in the GR zone and a Use Not Allowed in the CR and IM zone. * A Car Wash is a Limited Use in the GR zone and a Use Not Allowed in the CR and IM zone. * A Filling Station is a Conditional Use in the GR, CR, and IM zone. * Vehicle Repair (Commercial Vehicle) is a Use Not Allowed in the GR and CR zone and a Permitted Use in the IM zone. * Vehicle Repair (Major) is a Limited Use in the GR zone, a Conditional Use in the CR zone, and a Permitted Use in the IM zone. * Vehicle Repair (Minor) is a Limited Use in the GR and CR zone and a Permitted Use in the IM zone.
H	Land Use	Zoning Recommendation	4.B.4, Table 12, Map 37, and Map 18	38, 92-94, 96, 97	Scott C. Wallace, Attorney for MileOne	Concern that rezoning an adjacent County-owned property from GR to R-60 would impose new compatibility requirements that are not currently present.	Disagree	In review of the applicable Zoning Code standards for vehicle sales, service, and repair uses adjacent to a vacant property zoned as Residential Detached, the Code would not unreasonably restrict these uses with the recommended change in zone to the commenter's property (GR to IM). The county-owned property in question (19G on Map 37) is recommended to be re-zoned from GR to R-60 to assign a single zone to a County-owned property on which a second half is currently R-60 and to restrict potential future development on this environmentally sensitive public property that contains a large stormwater detention facility and steep slopes. In fact, if the plan's recommended IM zone is approved for the commenter's property (19E on Map 37), adjacency to the county-owned property (if rezoned as R-60) would be less restrictive than its current GR zone.
I	Land Use	Zoning Recommendation	4.A.6	79-83	Matthew Gordon, Attorney for General Conference of Seventh-Day Adventists	States general support for the vision, goals, and objectives set forth in the Master Plan. While the General Conference has no plans to redevelop or otherwise change their property at 12501 Old Columbia Pike, they support the land use vision and recommended zoning for their property. Also express support for land use vision and recommended zoning for adjacent Tech Road Park and Ride lot area.	Agree	Staff thanks the commenter for their testimony and interest in the master planning process.
J	Transportation	Roadways	Map 19 and Table 5	45-46	Cynthia Wright	Requests the Planning Board consider expanding the northern boundary of the Master Plan area to include a 3.2 acre vacant wooded property located off U.S. 29 that is privately owned and purchase it at a fair market price. The expanded boundary would allow consideration of the use of the subject property as part of a future highway interchange at U.S. 29 and Greencastle Road.	Disagree	Staff does not support expanding the plan boundary to consider a future highway interchange at this intersection.
K	Land Use	Zoning Recommendation	Map 18, Map 33, Table 10	38, 82, 83	Mani Panickar	Welcomes the development and transport improvements envisioned by the master plan, but opposes the commercial component of the recommended rezoning of a property (2131 E. Randolph Road, from R-200 to CRT-1.0 C-0.25 R-1.0 H-75) and that it should only allow residential.	Disagree	Staff supports rezoning the property as recommended in the Public Hearing Draft to support future development that complements the planned compact, walkable, mixed-use activity center at Old Columbia Pike and East Randolph Road.
L	General	General	n/a	n/a	Dan Reed, Regional Policy Director, Greater Greater Washington	Expresses support for the draft plan recommendations, identifying notable engagement activities and plan recommendations.	Agree	Staff thanks the commenter for their testimony and interest in the master planning process.
M	Land Use	Zoning Recommendation	Map 18, Map 33, Table 10	38, 82, 83	Nischel Pedapudi	Opposes recommended rezoning of a property (2131 E. Randolph Road) and provides letters of opposition to the same rezoning. Draft Plan recommended re-zoning is from R-200 to CRT-1.0 C-0.25 R-1.0 H-75.	Disagree	Staff supports rezoning the property as recommended in the Public Hearing Draft to support future development that complements the planned compact, walkable, mixed-use activity center at Old Columbia Pike and East Randolph Road.

Written Testimony Item	Section	Topic(s)	Plan Section(s)	Plan Page(s)	Commenter	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion/Recommendation
N	General	Land Use	4.B	84-97	Gertrude Jones	Expresses support for the attention to planning and improvements in the East County area around Briggs Chaney Road, especially the Briggs Chaney Marketplace.	Agree	Staff thanks the commenter for their testimony and interest in the master planning process.
O	Land Use	Zoning Recommendation	4.5.A	73-78	Timothy Dugan, Attorney for Verizon Maryland, LLC	Support recommendations for 13100 Columbia Pike (west) and 13101 Columbia Pike (east). Stated that Verizon has no current plans to redevelop either properties, though it is, "important to establish a flexible framework for a possible redevelopment that would fit well within the fabric of the Fairland and Briggs Chaney Master Plan area," and asks the Planning Board to advise the County Council to include such recommendations in the final Master Plan.	Agree	Staff thanks the commenter for their testimony and interest in the master planning process.
P	Land Use	Activity Centers	Map 14, 3.A.2.3, 4.A, 4.B	33, 39, 63-97	Dan Wilhelm, Greater Colesville Citizens Association	Notes that several "Activity Centers" called out in the Fairland and Briggs Chaney Master Plan are not consistent with those identified by Thrive 2050.	Disagree	The Thrive-style activity centers identified in the Master Plan are part of the land use vision for each center rather than a reflection of their existing conditions. A change in designation for any of the plan's activity centers is at the discretion of the Planning Board, though staff suggests that the plan may be revised to make clear that the Activity Center designations are visionary rather than that of existing conditions. Furthermore, staff understands that the Activity Centers identified in the Thrive 2050 Growth Map are exemplary of the character and location of such centers within the hierarchical growth areas, not exclusive of additional Activity Centers that are consistent with their approach.
P	Transportation	BRT service	3.C.4.2	51	Dan Wilhelm, Greater Colesville Citizens Association	In response to a recommendation to study a re-alignment of the Flash BRT Orange Line, testimony states that there is not sufficient demand on Robey Road and Greencastle Road to justify Flash BRT service	Disagree	The draft plan's recommendation for a study to determine the feasibility of re-aligning the Flash BRT Orange Line from an existing out-and-back route on Castle Boulevard to a through connection between the Briggs Chaney Park and Ride and Greencastle Road intersection with US 29 is intended to make the Orange Line more efficient in its service and provide transit access to Fairland Recreational Park and the Greencastle Lakes neighborhood.
P	Transportation	BRT service	3.C.4, Map 22	50-51, 52	Dan Wilhelm, Greater Colesville Citizens Association	States that the master planned BRT service does a 'poor job providing the needed connectivity' and thus must be modified. Recommends the following modifications to the planned BRT system (diagrams are included with original testimony): * Establish dedicated lanes for the Flash BRT Blue Line on US 29, through Burtonsville to Howard County. * Re-align the Flash BRT Orange Line onto Old Columbia Pike between Briggs Chaney Road and Tech Road. * Align the Flash BRT Orange Line through the White Oak/Life Science Activity Center rather than Steward Lane (as today). * Extend the Flash BRT Orange Line south across Paint Branch Stream Valley Park from the future Viva White Oak development to the White Oak Community Recreation Center, via the FDA campus. * Align the future Randolph Road BRT along the re-aligned Flash BRT Orange Line along Old Columbia Pike, south of East Randolph Road and onto Tech Road, into the FDA campus.	Disagree	The master plan makes certain recommendations for the improvement of BRT service along US 29, in particular the addition of dedicated transit lanes and new stations, as well as a future BRT service along East Randolph Road. However, route planning is beyond the scope of the master plan. Such efforts should be undertaken by Montgomery County Department of Transportation, in partnership with Montgomery Planning and other public agencies and community organizations and individuals.
P	Land Use	Park and Ride Lots	3.A.2.6	39	Dan Wilhelm, Greater Colesville Citizens Association	We oppose eliminating park and ride lots.	Disagree	Rather than proposing to eliminate park and ride lots, the plan seeks to promote additive elements for these sites, such as mobility hubs and infill development, to support greater transit ridership and community amenities. The plan does not explicitly recommend removing park and ride parking spaces.
P	Land Use	Drive-throughs	3.A.2.7	39	Dan Wilhelm, Greater Colesville Citizens Association	Most people will continue to drive and the public wants drive-throughs which are needed to allow some businesses to economically survive. Therefore, they must not be discouraged.	Disagree	Public investment in the US 29 Flash BRT and infrastructure that expands the bicycle & pedestrian network gives residents alternative options to solely driving alone. Existing drive-throughs will remain until such time of redevelopment. Encouraging additional drive-throughs contradicts the plan's objectives to support a more robust social network, more compact development, complete communities, and alternative circulation methods.
P	Land Use	Vehicle/equipment sales and service	3.A.2.8	39	Dan Wilhelm, Greater Colesville Citizens Association	We oppose discouraging vehicle or equipment sales, storage rental and service. It is a long drive to obtain these services somewhere other than in this area.	Disagree	Existing businesses that provide these services will remain until such time of large-scale redevelopment or a market shift in the auto service industries. This plan does not recommend removal of these businesses only recognizes an over abundance or heavy concentration of these uses in the Fairland and Briggs Chaney community specifically. Additional auto service businesses could also take away business to an already thriving market.
P	Transportation	BRT service	3.C	41	Dan Wilhelm, Greater Colesville Citizens Association	The proposed BRT structure is key to much of the Plan goals being achieved, including housing, jobs, environment, and equity. The plan must address that dependence on the BRT and connection to the WOSG MP. The plan needs to address BRT on Randolph Rd.	Agree	Staff believes that BRT is an integral part of the plan recommendations and future success of the plan area. The planned BRT service on Randolph Road is acknowledged and supported by the plan.
P	Transportation	Complete Streets Design Guide street types	3.C	42, 45	Dan Wilhelm, Greater Colesville Citizens Association	Downtown street types would apply to downtown areas (i.e., Large Activity Centers), which are not part of this area. Town Center street types would apply only to the Briggs Chaney activity center.	Disagree	The plan does recommend application of the Downtown context area of the Complete Street Design Guide for the area defined as the Old Columbia Pike and Randolph Road Activity Center. In addition to a recommended Town Center context area at Briggs Chaney Road and Castle Boulevard, the plan also recommends a Town Center context area under the Complete Street Design Guide at the Old Columbia Pike and Fairland Activity Center and Columbia Pike and Musgrove Activity Center.
P	Transportation	US 29 interchanges	3.C.2.4	43	Dan Wilhelm, Greater Colesville Citizens Association	Agree with removing additional grade-separated interchanges, including at Industrial Pkwy. The existing ones must be retained.	Agree	With the exception of a potential grade-separated interchange at U.S. 29 and Industrial Boulevard, consistent with the White Oak Science Gateway Master Plan, this plan recommends elimination of the planned, unbuilt interchanges on U.S. 29.
P	Transportation	US 29 intersections	3.C.2.6 and 3.C.2.8	43	Dan Wilhelm, Greater Colesville Citizens Association	The lane width of existing at-grade intersections needs to be retained for safety reasons. Also, the existing number of lanes, including left-turn lanes, must be maintained for safety reason and to avoid increasing congestion.	Disagree	Staff believes that the plan's recommendations to establish safer intersection designs at U.S. 29 and other busy intersections can be accomplished in several ways, some of which may include lane width reduction, elimination of left-turn lanes, and number of travel lanes.
P	Transportation	Transit	3.C.4	50-51	Dan Wilhelm, Greater Colesville Citizens Association	See the above recommendation concerning transit service.	n/a	Staff is unsure exactly which comment is referred to, but assumes it is in regard to the commenter's recommended transit service changes.

Written Testimony Item	Section	Topic(s)	Plan Section(s)	Plan Page(s)	Commenter	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion/Recommendation
P	Land Use and Transportation	Activity Centers and BRT	4.A and 4.B	64, 69, 73, 74, 79, 86, 92, 110, 111	Dan Wilhelm, Greater Colesville Citizens Association	See the above discussions about activity centers and BRT.	n/a	See above for staff's response to the comment on activity centers and BRT.
Q	Transportation	Bicycle and Pedestrian Recommendations	Section 3.C, 3.C.3	41-42, 47	Seth Grimes, Washington Area Bicyclist Association	Endorse several sections of the plan's recommendations, including the creation of a continuous trail and path network with public and HOA connections, creation of sidewalks or sidepaths along public roads, completion of the Breezeway Network along U.S. 29 and MD 200, and expanded Capital Bikeshare infrastructure. Also support several short-term CIP priorities.	Agree	Staff thanks the commenter for their testimony and interest in the master planning process.
R	Land Use	Zoning Recommendation	Map 18, 4.B.4, Map 37, Table 12	36, 92-94, 96, 97	Matthew Gordon, Attorney for DARCARS Automotive Group	Testimony cites DARCARS' intention to proceed with prior approvals for a new auto sales and service facility on the property identified as 19F on Map 37 (p 97) through a Site Plan amendment that is expected to qualify for regulatory review under the (now superseded) C-3 Zone. This intention is cited to support the request that the Master Plan, 'support and enhance continued automobile use at the Property.'	Agree	The recommended zone for the subject property (CR-2.0) to replace the existing zone (GR-1.5) will continue to permit automobile sales and services as an allowable use for as long as the use is desired. The Master Plan's vision for a 'higher-density, mixed-use development' and recommended zoning change would not inhibit automobile sales and services uses.
R	Land Use	Briggs Chaney (South) Activity Center recommendations	4.B.4.1.c	93	Matthew Gordon, Attorney for DARCARS Automotive Group	Regarding the short-term recommendation for new development to apply 'main street' design principles on Briggs Chaney Road, testimony indicates a willingness to add green elements to their property (19F on Map 37) to mitigate urban heat island effects and improve pedestrian and bicycle circulation along the southern frontage on Automobile Boulevard. Also state a need to allow for effective wayfinding and visibility of showrooms and vehicles for sale.	Agree	Recommendation 4.B.4.1.c does not pertain to the subject property, yet supports the intentions for the site to mitigate urban heat island effects and improve bicycle and pedestrian circulation.
R	Land Use	Structured parking	4.B.4.1.d	93	Matthew Gordon, Attorney for DARCARS Automotive Group	Testimony indicates that structured parking in the short-term is not viable in the Montgomery Auto Sales Park due to current construction costs and market conditions. The commenter indicates a willingness to explore the feasibility using of [im]pervious (typo?) surfaces on portions of the subject property as part of the Site Plan amendment.	Disagree	While the current market conditions may not support the cost to develop structured parking for individual automobile sales and services businesses, this plan envisions improvements to parking configurations and existing circulation patterns, a site design that effectively reduces heat island effects, and the consolidation of redundant service / storage needs. The County's similar approach to the collocation of public facilities is an example that could be modeled by individual property owners.
R	Land Use	Briggs Chaney (South) Activity Center recommendations	4.B.4.3, Map 36	93	Matthew Gordon, Attorney for DARCARS Automotive Group	Testimony expresses a willingness to work with staff to accommodate the recommended linear open space feature and green area within the Auto Sales Park (see Map 36) in a manner that is compatible with the plan's long-term vision as well as supportive of the commenter's ability to effectively operate an automobile showroom and vehicle services.	Agree	Staff appreciates the commenter's willingness to consider design solutions that accommodate a relationship between the subject property and the linear open space and green area recommended to extend south from Automobile Boulevard. Any such minimum required or extraordinarily innovative should always be designed to be compatible with business operations and services.
S	Vision	Complete Communities	2.B.4 3.C	5 41-52	Andrew Bossi, MCDOT	Consider how to define, apply, and measure Complete Communities as called for by Thrive Montgomery 2050. I suggest the following metrics: (1) What target land uses are expected to be reachable, (2) within what defined timeframes (3) of traveling by what mode? For example: might the plan establish that high-frequency destinations like rec centers, grocery stores, or elementary schools should be within a 15 min walk/roll? And intermediate-frequency destinations like medical clinics perhaps 15 min by bike, or 30 min by walk/roll? And rarer or high-consolidation destinations perhaps 30 min by bike?	Disagree	This more fine-grained analysis of what makes a Complete Community was not completed as part of this master plan update. Land use and transportation recommendations are intended to increase multi-modal access to a diversity of destinations. The proposed metrics are more appropriate for a case by case level of analysis and does not consider the totality of our recommendations as a whole and the broader vision of the plan.
S	Transportation	Transpo Analysis	2.D.6 3.C 3.C.2.4 3.C.2.7 3.C.2.8 5.A	18-19 41-43 106	Andrew Bossi, MCDOT	There does not appear to be any reference to the transportation analyses, nor does this information appear to be available in an appendix. Ensure the transportation analysis excludes the listed interchanges and includes Industrial along with its resulting impacts (such as losing OCP/Prosperity connectivity with Industrial), considers the reduction of a turn lane along Randolph Rd, and includes the road diets on the Randolph / Cherry Hill and Briggs Chaney (and any other proposed diets).	Agree	Transportation analysis results were inadvertently not included with the Public Hearing Draft, however, staff will provide a draft red-lined addition for the Board's consideration, based on the analysis of three land use and transportation scenarios, 1) existing conditions, 2) future build-out of existing zoning and approved transportation facilities by 2045, and 3) future build-out of proposed zoning and transportation facilities
S	Transportation	Transportation Analysis PHED Metrics	2.D.6 3.C 3.C.2.4 3.C.2.7 3.C.2.8 5.A	18-19 41-43 106	Andrew Bossi, MCDOT	Note that the master plan metrics we're currently operating under (PHED's Dec 2020 memo) require that job access & travel times for autos be improved. I don't particularly agree with those metrics, as it can easily conflict with efforts to more efficiently and equitably move users (such as via dedicated transit lanes), but that's where we are. That said: I hope to address this with the 2024 Growth Policy Update starting this year. If this plan does not meet the current PHED Metrics, I'd suggest using the proposed metrics I sent to Jason Sartori on 24 February 2023 as additional guidance that might help justify the plan's vision if it's found that the plan does not meet the PHED Metrics.	Agree	The plan's transportation forecast analysis indicated conformance to PHED metric performance.
S	Transportation	Ultra Montgomery	3	34-62	Andrew Bossi, MCDOT	Somewhere in the plan should be information relating to Ultra Montgomery. As noted previously: coordinate with Mitsuko Herrera on what-all should be included in the Plan.	Agree	Staff supports including mention to the Ultra Montgomery in the plan
S	Transportation	Freight	3.C.2	42-43	Andrew Bossi, MCDOT	This should include some reference to freight, particularly given the centrality of a federal highway (US 29) to the plan.	Agree	Added 3.C.2.13 for freight as US-29 is a designated federal freight corridor

Written Testimony Item	Section	Topic(s)	Plan Section(s)	Plan Page(s)	Commenter	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion/Recommendation
S	Transportation	Downtown Classification	3.C.2.1 Map 19 4.A.6	42 46 79	Andrew Bossi, MCDOT	<p>The area designated as a Downtown does not reflect what a Downtown is intended to be.</p> <p>The properties where this designation is proposed have max heights of between 45-75' and densities between FAR 1.0 - 2.0; both of which are not remotely close to expected Downtown densities of over FAR 4.0 and heights over 200'.</p> <p>Furthermore, ROWs are not adequate to support the infrastructure proposed by the plan at a quality supportive of a Downtown designation (per a later comment).</p> <p>Change this area to a Town Center as to not erode the intent of Complete Streets.</p> <p>I would be willing to support a Downtown designation if it spans a larger area within the BRT walkshed, and heights + densities are substantially increased to be more representative of what a Downtown is intended to be.</p> <p>This should include, at a minimum, FARs of at least 4.0 and heights over 150', as well as an analysis affirming that the market would support such growth.</p>	Disagree, in part	While the land use may not be completely reflective of the typical context for a downtown, the rationale for the designation is primarily intended to maintain road design continuity on both sides of US 29 leading into the White Oak downtown area. The key differential between the downtown and town center street designs is the size of pedestrian infrastructure; for the crossing of US-29 and the lead up to the interchange, it simply makes more sense to recommend greater pedestrian space for additional comfort.
S	Transportation	Road Diets, Bus Lanes	3.C.2.8	43	Andrew Bossi, MCDOT	Why wouldn't we consider road diets to create dedicated bus lanes? Briggs Chaney is currently served by US 29 Flash. Randolph Road is a future BRT corridor.	Agree	Added language to support transit lanes.
S	Transportation	Industrial Grade Separation Property Impacts (West Side)	3.C.2.4	43	Andrew Bossi, MCDOT	<p>Tech & Industrial had long been planned as a single joint interchange, with southbound US 29 served by ramps at Tech Rd (which would bridge over US 29), and northbound US 29 served by ramps at Industrial Pkwy (which would still terminate at US 29 as it does today).</p> <p>By shifting the full interchange only to Industrial Pkwy: this will substantively increase impacts on properties that had not previously been considered at-risk.</p> <p>12301 Old Columbia Pike would almost certainly be a total-take. The townhomes along Old Columbia Pike by Featherwood Ct, as well as the single-family homes by Priscilla Dr, would all likely be significantly impacted; potentially also total takes.</p> <p>It is unclear if these property owners are aware of these potential impacts.</p> <p>If Industrial Pkwy is presumed to cross above US 29, properties on the east side will likely be substantively impacted by the change in the road's grade.</p> <p>This notably includes White Oak Town Center (currently in development), as well as the 12201 Old Columbia Pike and 2121 Industrial Pkwy properties.</p> <p>Access for the 12201 property may be difficult to maintain without either substantially regrading their property, or accessing Old Columbia Pike through the linear park.</p> <p>Old Columbia Pike / Prosperity Dr would likely lose direct access to Industrial, running instead beneath Industrial. This isn't as substantial an impact, but one which property owners on the east side should be mindful of.</p>	Agree, in part	This plan does not alter the transportation improvements proposed by the White Oak Science Gateway Plan. However, this plan simply removes one piece (the Tech Road component) of the overall interchange. It is likely that proceeding only with the Industrial Rd. interchange would encumber certain impacts, which would need to be studied in greater detail as part of a facility plan. It is likely that a smaller-scale needs study to determine if this too is even needed and desired given current policies, and possibly amending the WOSG plan and corresponding LATIP payments schedule. This recommendation for additional study has been included in the plan. This unfortunately was beyond the scope of this plan.
S	Transportation	Industrial Grade Separation Property Impacts (East Side)	3.C.2.4	43	Andrew Bossi, MCDOT	<p>If Industrial Pkwy is presumed to cross above US 29, properties on the east side will likely be substantively impacted by the change in the road's grade.</p> <p>This notably includes White Oak Town Center (currently in development), as well as the 12201 Old Columbia Pike and 2121 Industrial Pkwy properties.</p> <p>Access for the 12201 property may be difficult to maintain without either substantially regrading their property, or accessing Old Columbia Pike through the linear park.</p> <p>Old Columbia Pike / Prosperity Dr would likely lose direct access to Industrial, running instead beneath Industrial. This isn't as substantial an impact, but one which property owners on the east side should be mindful of.</p>	Agree, in part	Additional study is needed to determine the larger purpose and needs for this interchange. This recommendation has been amended to support additional study (3.C.2.4).
S	Transportation	Roundabouts	3.C.2.9	43	Andrew Bossi, MCDOT	<p>(JMC) The recommendation to implement roundabouts in place of signalized intersections seems in conflict with the plan's goal of improving the environment for pedestrians and cyclists. Roundabouts are not particularly safe for either of these users.</p> <p>(CP) I would caution against implementing roundabouts along corridors with proposed or active BRT.</p>	Agree, in part	The Plan does not outright recommend roundabout construction, only to study their use. Given area traffic volumes and the size and complexity of area intersections, particularly the Briggs Chaney Rd. / Castle Blvd. intersection, this may be a useful tool to achieve the multiple (and often competing) mobility, safety, and impervious surface goals for these intersections.
S	Transportation	EV & Carsharing w/ New Development	3.C.2.11	44	Andrew Bossi, MCDOT	<p>EV requirements for new developments are likely far fewer than they should be (and carshare requirements are likely higher than they need to be). Do you expect a ZTA to adjust the EV requirements, in particular, for this area?</p> <p>(addressing Countywide EV/carsharing requirements is on my personal to-do list, but admittedly very low behind a number of other priorities)</p>	Disagree, in part	This is true, though it is a county-wide prerogative. At this point, we have not explored local EV targets in anticipation of needed larger-scale county-wide action as it is beyond the scope of this plan.
S	Transportation	Electrification Impacts	3.C.2.11	44	Andrew Bossi, MCDOT	<p>Consider the forecast electrical use versus capacity for the area, particularly as we shift toward greater shares of electric vehicles, and whether this necessitates additional investments in area electrical infrastructure or power generation.</p> <p>While ensuring adequate power is at the behest of the utility companies and not explicitly within the scope of a master plan, the environmental impacts associated with this should be included in the narrative either with this recommendation or in the Environment section (3F).</p>	Disagree	While it is important to forecast long-term electric demand from electric vehicles, this is beyond the scope of this plan.

Written Testimony Item	Section	Topic(s)	Plan Section(s)	Plan Page(s)	Commenter	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion/Recommendation
S	Transportation	ROW Impacts	Table 5 Table 6 Table 15	45, 50, 110-111	Andrew Bossi, MCDOT	Identify any segments that have new ROWs proposed or that have new infrastructure demands placed upon them since the 1997 Fairland Master Plan (such as changes from this plan, the MPOHT, or the Bike Plan). Include any such changes as projects in the CIP Table. This will be needed for estimating costs for the Fiscal Impact Statement.	Disagree	Changes from the existing ROW recommendations of the Master Plan of Highways and Transitways are very few and minor, apart from E. Randolph Rd. where this plan expands the ROW from 80 ft. to 120 ft. in width to accommodate BRT. This plan does not recommend any standalone CIP for ROW acquisition. ROW acquisition may be required for individual CIP applications, though on a case by case basis; land acquisition costs should be factored into account for these CIP projects. Additional ROW will be required through the subdivision process.
S	Transportation	Randolph ROW - Part I	Table 5 Table 6 4.A.3.2	45 50 65	Andrew Bossi, MCDOT	Randolph Rd between Columbia Pike and Serpentine Way has a 90' ROW for a 4-lane undivided roadway with Conventional Bike Lanes and Sidepath on both sides. See a cross-section showing what this facility would look like at: https://streetmix.net/thisisbossi/307/ While these facilities can physically fit within a 90' if we disregard operational, safety, and comfort needs, I would strongly assert that 90' is not adequate for what is proposed given the plan's goals of improving ped/bike safety and comfort. Sidepaths are 9' on each side through what is proposed to be a Downtown area. While above the 8' minimum for a Sidepath, Sidepaths are discouraged in Downtowns and Town Centers. Bike lanes are 5' on each side, which is the minimum width allowed, noting also that Conventional bike lanes are discouraged along streets of this size. This segment is today designated as a Breezeway. These narrow Sidepaths and bike lanes do not reflect Breezeway quality. [continued...] [...continued]	Agree	The plan has been amended to change the ROW to 120 ft., consistent with other sections of Randolph Rd. This would accommodate dual-running dedicated BRT lanes, 4 vehicular travel lanes, separated bike lanes on both sides, street tree buffers and sidewalk.
S	Transportation	Randolph ROW - Part II	Table 5 Table 6 4.A.3.2	45 50 65	Andrew Bossi, MCDOT	As this segment is 5 lanes today, with the 5th lane functioning as a median / center turn lane (the plan incorrectly states this segment is 4 lanes), removing this lane will require left-turns to occur from one of the travel lanes. It is unclear whether the transportation models accounted for this, and this will likely negatively impact the Randolph Rd BRT if buses are delayed by turning vehicles. As this turn lane would be necessary as a continuous feature: it is not reasonable to assume this falls under the Table 5's Footnote 2 about Min ROWs not including turn lanes. This does account for dedicated BRT lanes, per 3.C.4.1.c on p50. Table 5 does not appear to recommend bus lanes along Randolph Rd. These bikeways do not appear to meet the intent of 4.A.3.2 on p65 in serving Paint Branch HS students. Either reaffirm that these facilities are adequate for the vision, or reconsider the facilities planned for this corridor, or consider requiring additional ROW.	Agree	ROW has been adjusted to 120 ft., consistent with other sections of Randolph Rd. The classification now includes planned BRT.
S	Transportation	Fairland Town Ctr Connectivity	Map 19 3.C.3 4.A.4 4.A.5	46 47 69 73	Andrew Bossi, MCDOT	The proposed Fairland Town Center would be rather strange in that it'd be bisected by a generally inaccessible Controlled Major Highway, and each side of the Town Center isn't really interacting with the other. Consider requiring redevelopment of these sites to provide some form of grade-separated connectivity across US 29 which at least serves peds/bikes, intended to knit these two sides together. In the event only one side redevelops: they should at least establish the location for such a crossing, or provide flexibility for such a future crossing, with access easements as applicable, and possibly some form of funding participation.	Agree, in part	The plan recognizes this division and intends to address it through an improved crossing of US 29 at Briggs Chaney Rd. (recommendation 3.C.3.2). This would expand the existing bridge to accommodate greater bike and pedestrian access and ideally provide additional public amenity space, with the idea of transforming the bridge into a community focal point.
S	Transportation	Briggs Chaney Town Ctr	Map 19 4.B.2.5	46-47 86	Andrew Bossi, MCDOT	Limit the Briggs Chaney Town Center area only to the CR- and CRT-zoned properties. Town Center designations are not intended for residential-only areas, such as those further north away from Briggs Chaney Rd.	Disagree	The high density residential neighborhoods to the north are more akin to a typical downtown area than typical residential areas; e.g., they are more Bethesda like than the typical single family home neighborhoods found elsewhere. This results in streets that are expected to carry significant bike, pedestrian, and transit volumes.

Written Testimony Item	Section	Topic(s)	Plan Section(s)	Plan Page(s)	Commenter	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion/Recommendation
S	Transportation	Ped/Bike Needs	3.C.3	47	Andrew Bossi, MCDOT	<p>This section is surprisingly light on information considering the plan's stated vision of a more ped/bike focused area. As has been noted in prior reviews, this should include narrative and maps identifying:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Segments with inadequate Bicycle Levels of Traffic Stress - Segment with inadequate Pedestrian Levels of Comfort - Where additional Protected Crossings are necessary per Complete Streets guidance - BIPPA scores based on draft Ped Master Plan methodology - Where new bike/ped connections could link together... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Neighborhoods - Bike/walksheds around BRT stations - Bike/walksheds around schools, libraries, and other community facilities <p>Each of these needs should then be reflected in the CIP Table (p110-111, Table 15).</p> <p>I'd be especially interested in whether any new crossings are desired across US 29 and the ICC, especially in the vicinity of Paint Branch HS.</p>	Agree, in part	Some specific improvements will be included in the revised CIP table to include protected intersection improvements. Considering that the majority of the Master Plan streets and roads are inadequate by PLOC and LTS measures, the Plan proposes area-wide improvements, in particular the BiPPA area, designated Downtowns and Town Center areas, along with some specific high-priority improvements.
S	Transportation	Breezeways	3.C.3.5 Map 21 Table 6	47-50	Andrew Bossi, MCDOT	<p>While 3.C.3.5 references completing the Breezeways along US 29 and the ICC, neither Map 21 nor Table 6 reference any. The Map and Table need to include these.</p>	Agree	Breezeways will be added to Map 21
S	Transportation	Randolph Breezeway	3.C.3.5 Map 21 Table 6	47-50	Andrew Bossi, MCDOT	<p>3.C.3.5 references two of the three Breezeways currently within the plan area. As the existing Randolph Rd Breezeway is not referenced, and the ROW given in Table 5 (p45) is not very wide: does this imply that the Breezeway designation will be removed from Randolph Rd? If so: this should be clearly stated.</p> <p>I would not support removing the Breezeway designation, unless Dave Anspacher can convince me otherwise. I think the Breezeway designations will be tremendously important & not including them in the plan will be a massive setback for bikeway mobility, especially considering the expected growth at Viva White Oak.</p>	Agree	The proposed ROW for Randolph Road has been upgraded to approximately 120 feet
S	Transportation	Micromobility	3.C.3.6	47	Andrew Bossi, MCDOT	<p>Replace 3.C.3.6 with this text, adapted from the 2022 Silver Spring Plan, which should be generic enough that it can be applied to any plan with micromobility services expected:</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Micromobility is expected to grow within the Plan area. More micromobility corrals should be provided so they are widely and conveniently available and riders learn to see them as an easy way to park the devices safely, conveniently, and in a way that does not hinder pedestrian access. Corrals should be built in accordance with MCDOT location and design specifications, including concrete pads, u-racks, scooter racks, lighting, and charging capability for both e-scooters and e-bikes.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>This helps address a few issues we have previously raised, such as the vagueness of what it means to "enhance" Bikeshare infrastructure, or how we haven't expanded Bikeshare in years given funding constraints & the rise of dockless options.</p>	Agree	Revised the text as proposed.
S	Transportation	Multiple Options	Table 6	50	Andrew Bossi, MCDOT	<p>There are multiple segments with what appears to be two options labelled (1) and (2). For each case: are both intended to be built? Or are these options where only one is expected to be built?</p> <p>For example: Briggs Chaney Road has each row showing a Sidepath on a different side.</p> <p>If both are intended to be built: consolidate into a single row and label the bikeway as "Sidepath (both sides)"</p> <p>If it's a choice of either side, then consolidate into a single row and label the bikeway as "Sidepath (side TBD)"</p>	Agree	Table 6 is being revised as recommended
S	Transportation	Sidepath Sides	Table 6	50	Andrew Bossi, MCDOT	<p>Many of these label Sidepath as just "Sidepath", though some others also include which side the path would be on.</p> <p>Clarify each "Sidepath" with either "Sidepath (both sides)" or "Sidepath (side TBD)"</p>	Agree	Table 6 is being revised as recommended
S	Transportation	Transit	3.C.4	50-51	Andrew Bossi, MCDOT	<p>There is no information establishing existing conditions for Local, Regional, Commuter, and Private Buses/Shuttles, or how these might either be supported, improved, expanded, etc.</p>	Disagree	While the plan does encourage and expect greater transit usage, local bus and shuttle service operations are beyond the scope of the plan. The plan primarily supports local bus service by recommending street improvements to make existing transit safer and more accessible for riders walking and rolling to bus stops.
S	Transportation	Randolph Dedicated Transit Lanes ROW	3.C.4.1.c	50	Andrew Bossi, MCDOT	<p>Per an earlier comment, there appears to be inadequate ROW along E Randolph Rd / Cherry Hill for dedicated BRT lanes, among multiple other limitations with that ROW given.</p>	Agree	ROW has been adjusted to 120 ft., consistent with other sections of Randolph Rd.

Written Testimony Item	Section	Topic(s)	Plan Section(s)	Plan Page(s)	Commenter	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion/Recommendation
S	Transportation	Tech, Randolph BRT Stations	3.C.4.1.c 3.C.4.1.e	50-51	Andrew Bossi, MCDOT	(CP) We have envisioned that the Randolph / Cherry Hill access would likely happen at the Tech Road intersection, as the two locations are very close together and activity is mostly focused on Tech Rd. There is not demand currently via Randolph/Cherry Hill, negating the need for another station or suggesting a second alignment. (CP) Having two stations in short succession along US 29 would erode the purpose of BRT. (ADB) Constructing stations at both locations would be expensive and perhaps also confusing for riders, as each would provide transfers between the same lines, but at different locations. (ADB) It might make some sense to pick a single alignment for the Randolph BRT. Choosing only the Tech Rd route might slow trips to/from Viva and any potential extensions to Greenbelt Metro, but would pickup the growing Tech/Industrial area.	Agree	Staff agrees with the statement that two routes and stations for the future Randolph Road BRT are inefficient, and there are trade-offs between an alignment on East Randolph Road/Cherry Hill Road vs. Tech Road. Since there is no clear answer, staff suggests that the plan's recommendation should be stated in terms of a study of both potential alignments at the time of planning and design of the East Randolph Road BRT service.
S	Transportation	BRT to Howard County	3.C.4.1.d	51	Andrew Bossi, MCDOT	MCDOT will not build the Flash BRT into Howard County. It will be up to Howard County and SHA to construct any improvements north of the county line (and, in fact, Howard County is already working on design and construction of three BRT stations). MCDOT may operate the service, but we will not construct the infrastructure for another county.	Agree	Clarification of the responsibilities for this recommendation should be added, per the comment.
S	Transportation	29/Briggs Chaney BRT Station	3.C.4.1.e 4.B.2.2	51 86	Andrew Bossi, MCDOT	(CP) Is the new station for people along Briggs Chaney to access BRT or people traveling 29 to access Briggs Chaney? We have the existing route that travels Briggs Chaney. It would be helpful to understand the travel pattern being served by this given the expense and complication of this station. (ADB) Does this suggest keeping the BRT within the median of US 29 under Briggs Chaney, and the widened Briggs Chaney bridge would provide connections down to the US 29 platforms? If that is the intent: it should be more clearly stated. While I personally like it operationally, note that that is not what we are currently proceeding with in design; such a suggestion would likely be a separate project at some point in the rather distant future & would likely be very expensive.	Agree, in part	Staff supports adding clarification for the intent of the recommended new BRT station at Briggs Chaney Road bridge over and U.S. 29, which was to allow the Flash "Blue" line to provide service to the Briggs Chaney Road corridor without deviating from dedicated transit lanes on U.S. 29.
S	Transportation	Enhance BRT Stations	3.C.4.1.f	51	Andrew Bossi, MCDOT	This is not a comment that should be in the master plan - it is too detailed and is a matter of personal preference. The stations on US 29 have already been constructed and are consistent with those planned for the rest of the network. The design of the stations was developed through a working group, which included staff from Planning. We do have plans to improve pedestrian facilities connecting to the stations, so the part of the recommendation regarding comfortable access is OK.	Disagree	Enhanced weather protection at existing BRT station shelters was a comment many community members heard by the planning team. In response to the commenters' opposition to this recommendation, staff suggests it could be clarified to refer to future station designs or modifications.
S	Transportation	Castle/Greencastle vs Robey BRT	3.C.4.2	51	Andrew Bossi, MCDOT	Since this bullet only references a study, it may be fine, but we should note that the Castle Blvd station is already constructed so we have no plans to remove it. The BRT is meant to be a direct service, so the recommendation to have the Flash deviate from primary routes to more neighborhood-type service is in direct conflict with the purpose of BRT.	Disagree	While staff supports stating that the Castle Boulevard station is constructed, the purpose of the recommendation is to consider an alternative alignment that would provide more direct service to a more significant portion of the plan area, essentially extending the reach of the 'Orange' line north to the Greencastle Lakes community. If such a study determines this alternative as impractical, it should not be pursued further.
S	Transportation	BRT stop enhancements	3.C.4.3	51	Andrew Bossi, MCDOT	(JMC) This bullet is a little confusing because the types of improvements you would make at BRT stations (which largely do not serve cars) are very different from what you might do at park-and-ride lots (which do serve cars). For example, charging stations are appropriate at park-and-rides, but not at BRT stations. Maybe separate these things out or be more clear. (ADB) I think most of these are probably fine for both types of stations, but this should clarify what "charging stations" are: is that EV charging or is it power ports for laptops, phones, etc.? The only other reference to "charging stations" in the plan is regarding EV stations, in which case Joana's comment applies.	Agree	Staff suggests that the recommendation be revised to refer to "BRT stations", rather than "BRT stops and park-and-ride facilities" to reference all types of BRT facilities. Additionally, staff suggests that "charging stations" be changed to "electric vehicle charging stations at park-and-ride lots" to add clarity to the intent of the recommendation.
S	Transportation	Active Transportation Loops	Map 23	56	Andrew Bossi, MCDOT	The only other reference to these Loops that I see is a brief mention on p41 (3.C.1), but there does not appear to be any further elaboration on what these are. They're not mentioned at all in the section that Map 23 is located within. Are these just standard ped/bike facilities that are also branded as Active Transportation? Or are they intended to also serve more park-like uses beyond the scope of MCDOT? If the latter: I'm not saying No, but it does complicate implementation as multiple stakeholders can become involved in the capital, operating, and maintenance aspects of such a facility.	Agree	While the elements of Map 23 (Inner and Outer Active Transportation Loops) are discussed primarily in the Transportation section, staff agrees that a reference to these facilities would be helpful to improve clarity and readability. Cross references with the Transportation section's bicycle and pedestrian recommendations related to this map would be beneficial. Regarding the several implementing agencies and responsibilities, staff notes this is a function of the varied locations and alignments that would make their continuous connections possible. For example, those connections within the public right-of-way would be the responsibility of MCDOT, while those connections within public parks would be the responsibility of Montgomery Parks.
S	Environment	Climate Action Plan	3.F	59	Andrew Bossi, MCDOT	While the Climate Action Plan is referenced elsewhere in the Plan, consider referencing it in the Environment section and identifying any goals / metrics which should be included in this section. Even if there aren't any which really fit into the scale of this plan, consider at least referencing it in the opening narrative of 3.F.1	Agree	Staff supports adding a mention of the Climate Action Plan in section 3.F.1

Written Testimony Item	Section	Topic(s)	Plan Section(s)	Plan Page(s)	Commenter	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion/Recommendation
S	Transportation	Frontage Roads	4.A.5.5.b Figure 5	74 75	Andrew Bossi, MCDOT	<p>This recommendation appears to suggest the creation of frontage roads, much like Old Columbia Pike and Prosperity south of Randolph/Cherry Hill.</p> <p>I'd note that these roads, immediately adjacent to US 29, will essentially combine to form a 360' ROW of nothing but roads. I'm not necessarily saying No to these frontage roads if that is what is desired, but they do feel contradictory to the plan's vision.</p> <p>And these frontage roads are unlikely to function as intended by the plan (to relieve traffic on US 29), as again evidenced by existing examples south of Randolph/Cherry Hill.</p> <p>However, I *do* object to these frontage roads being shown in Figure 5 as intersecting with Fairland and Musgrove *immediately* adjacent to US 29. As can be seen at similar intersections south of Randolph/Cherry Hill: such designs create a host of safety and operating problems. Any such frontage roads <i>shall</i> adhere to intersection spacing requirements.</p> <p>I'd strongly urge staff to reconsider how this recommendation is applied & what issues it is trying to resolve, lest we recreate existing problems elsewhere in the area.</p>	Agree, in part	<p>The plan recommends establishing frontage roads along a portion of U.S. 29 where properties owned and occupied by Verizon Maryland concern full-scale redevelopment of one or both Verizon properties. The frontage roads are intended to relieve traffic impacts to Musgrove and Old Columbia Pike, where existing residential neighborhoods confront the Verizon properties.</p> <p>Staff would like to clarify that the conceptual illustration in Figure 5 shows an existing driveway on the west side of U.S. 29 and a proposed shared-use path on the east side of U.S. 29, not two frontage roads as recommended for major redevelopment for this section of U.S. 29.</p> <p>Staff supports adding the modifier that "any such frontage roads shall adhere to intersection spacing requirements."</p>
S	Transportation	Randolph BRT Implementation Timeframe	Table 15	111	Andrew Bossi, MCDOT	<p>In the CIP projects table, long-term says "Randolph Road BRT lanes". I assume means implementation, but shouldn't study of these lanes be shown in either the short or medium-term?</p>	Agree	<p>While the Randolph Road BRT is largely independent of this master plan, staff agrees that its alignment and design study could be listed as a short- or medium-term project, while its completion could be listed as a long-term implementation item.</p>
S	Implementation	CIP Table (I)	Table 15	110-115	Andrew Bossi, MCDOT	<p>In the CIP table consider adding a column that includes page references, listing each page where the project is substantially referenced. That will help lay-readers of the plan and will massively help me when I'm doing the fiscal analysis.</p> <p>Also make sure the CIP table includes all CIP projects. I haven't seen a single plan since I started at MCDOT in 2011 that has had a complete CIP table, which means lay-readers lose what could be a helpful resource, and my fiscal analyses risk being incomplete.</p> <p>Here's my tally of projects (some of which are indeed listed):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Castle Blvd ext to Ballinger Dr (p42, 3.C.2.2) (p99, 4.C.2.4) - Aston Manor Dr ext to Robey Rd (p42, 3.C.2.2) (p99, 4.C.2.7) - Sheffield Manor Dr ext to Greencastle Rd (p42, 3.C.2.2) - Robey Rd ext to Automobile Blvd (p42, 3.C.2.2) (p93, 4.B.4.2.b) - Gateshead Manor Way ext to southernmost pt of Automobile Blvd (p42, 3.C.2.2) (p93, 4.B.4.2.c) - 29/Industrial full interchange & property impacts on both sides (per my earlier comments) (p43, 3.C.2.4) - US 29 non-auto safety & comfort treatments (p43, 3.C.2.6) - Randolph / Cherry Hill Bridge lane repurposing (p43, 3.C.2.7) - Briggs Chaney bridge lane repurposings (p43, 3.C.2.7) <p>[continued...]</p>	Agree	<p>Staff agrees with this comment and will work to include page and section references as part of the CIP Table in the next version of the master plan for the Planning Board's review. Staff will also strive to ensure that all CIP-relevant projects are included in the CIP table.</p>
S	Implementation	CIP Table (II)	Table 15	110-115	Andrew Bossi, MCDOT	<p>[...continued]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Road diet studies (p43, 3.C.2.8) - Roundabout studies (p43, 3.C.2.9) - Any changes to street design from Existing Conditions (p45, Table 5) (p50, Table 6) - New ped/bike connections (p47, 3.C.3.1, 3.C.3.4, 3.C.3.5) (p55, 3.E.2.3) (p60, 3.G.1.4) - Briggs Chaney Bridge ultimate condition (p47, 3.C.3.b) - Expand Micromobility (p47, 3.C.3.6) - Build median lane US 29 BRT (p50, 3.C.4.1.b) - Build Randolph/Cherry Hill BRT (p50-51, 3.C.4.1.c) - Build US 29 BRT to Howard C (p51, 3.C.4.1.d) - Build additional US 29 BRT stations (p51, 3.C.4.1.e) - Enhance BRT stations with all-weather protection, access, comfort (p51, 3.C.4.1.f) - Enhance BRT stations as mobility hubs (p51, 3.C.4.3) - Reducing SOV Travel options (p51, 3.C.4.1.g) - Cool Streets (p60, 3.F.2.7) <p>[continued...]</p>	Agree	<p>Staff agrees with this comment and will work to include page and section references as part of the CIP Table in the next version of the master plan for the Planning Board's review. Staff will also strive to ensure that all CIP-relevant projects are included in the CIP table.</p>

Written Testimony Item	Section	Topic(s)	Plan Section(s)	Plan Page(s)	Commenter	Comment/Issue	Response	Discussion/Recommendation
S	Implementation	CIP Table (III)	Table 15	110-115	Andrew Bossi, MCDOT	[...continued] - Rerouting US 29 along Robey+Greencastle instead of Castle, with new stations (p51, 3.C.4.2) - Art & design features on street projects (p64, 4.A.2.2) (p86, 4.B.2.3) - Utility undergrounding at intersections (p64, 4.A.2.3) - Redevelop Tech Rd P&R (p79-80, 4.A.6.5) - Redevelop Briggs Chaney P&R (p88, 4.B.3.5) - Redevelop Greencastle P&R (p99, 4.C.2.5) - Utility undergrounding at intersections (p86, 4.B.2.4) - Retrofit to retain & infiltrate water, porous pavements, shade & ornamental trees for shade, noise, aesthetics, and separation between peds/roads. (p86, 4.B.2.8) - Neighborhood Connector paths (p99, 4.C.2.3)	Agree	Staff agrees with this comment and will work to include page and section references as part of the CIP Table in the next version of the master plan for the Planning Board's review. Staff will also strive to ensure that all CIP-relevant projects are included in the CIP table.
T	Land Use	Zoning Recommendation	Map 18, Map 31, Table 9	38, 77-78	Timothy Dugan, Attorney for Verizon Maryland, LLC	Request changing the plan's recommended zoning density for the properties at 13100 and 13101 Columbia Pike from R-0.5 to R-1.5, with analysis and justification to accompany the request included with the testimony.	Agree	Staff supports the requested change in zoning density for the subject properties as it is consistent with their envisioned future transformation from single-tenant office and utility uses to a mixed-use development with a 'significant housing component' that is integrated with the surrounding community and supportive of high-frequency transit on U.S. 29.
U	Introduction	Land Use and Transportation Vision	2.B	4-5	Bernadine Karns, President, Calverton Citizens Association	Testimony comments on the history of land use development and transportation infrastructure experienced in the plan area and surroundings through the years, since 1995, and questions the vision of the draft master plan in seeking to concentrate additional growth along the US 29 highway and BRT corridor and that travel patterns will shift away from single-occupancy vehicles.	Disagree	While the plan does not envision a future within its planning horizon where all or most trips are taken by transit, walking, or biking, its transportation recommendations (and land use recommendations to support them) are intended to provide a greater level of choice and balance between all travel modes.
U	Land Use	Zoning Recommendation	May 18, Map 33, Table 10	38, 82-83	Bernadine Karns, President, Calverton Citizens Association	Testimony questions zoning recommendations that would allow development to proceed that is consistent with recommended zoning, rather than requiring approval by the Hearing Examiner for individual rezoning requests, particularly with regard to the property at 2131 E. Randolph Road	Disagree	Staff supports rezoning the subject property as recommended in the Public Hearing Draft to support future development that complements the planned compact, walkable, mixed-use activity center at Old Columbia Pike and East Randolph Road.
U	Environment	Watershed protection	3.F.2	59-60	Bernadine Karns, President, Calverton Citizens Association	Supports attention in the plan to modern environmental guidelines to protect stream tributaries	Agree	Staff thanks the commenter for their testimony and interest in the master planning process.
U	General	Community investment	n/a	n/a	Bernadine Karns, President, Calverton Citizens Association	Testimony states that the county needs to invest equally in all areas of the county and distribute affordable housing, density transfers, school investments, and community amenities equitably.	Agree	Staff thanks the commenter for their testimony and interest in the master planning process. These issues are of primary concern for many of the recommendations contained in the plan.
V	Community Health and Culture	Food systems and production	3.D.2	53-54	Christina Bostick (Montgomery Countryside Alliance)	Testimony supports the plan's attention to a more sustainable food system, community health, and equity, particularly opportunities for community food production and an Agriculture Technical Hub.	Agree	Staff thanks the commenter for their testimony and interest in the master planning process.
W	General	Housing, transportation, land use	n/a	n/a	Brandi Panback, Resident	Testimony strongly supports the master plan as proposed, particularly its focus on allowing more market rate and affordable housing for families and seniors and an increase in service and quality of BRT service and pedestrian and bike connections.	Agree	Staff thanks the commenter for their testimony and interest in the master planning process.
X	Community Health and Culture	Food systems and production	3.D.2, 3.E.2.7	53-54, 55	Michelle Caruso, Montgomery County Food Council	Organization strongly endorses the draft master plan, "specifically its focus on infrastructure and opportunity that increase food equity in East County and the county as a whole." Calls out support for particular recommendations focused on enhancing the local area food system. Requests that the recommended food system study (3.D.2.1) be listed as a short-term implementation item in Table 15 (CIP Priorities) as part of, or in addition to, the recommended Fairland Recreational Park Study.	Agree	Staff thanks the commenter for their testimony and interest in the master planning process. Staff supports including the recommended food system study (3.D.2.1) in the Implementation section Table 15 (CIP Priorities)