

Resolution No.: 20-300

Introduced: October 10, 2023

Adopted: October 10, 2023

**COUNTY COUNCIL FOR MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MARYLAND  
SITTING AS THE DISTRICT COUNCIL FOR THAT PORTION  
OF THE MARYLAND-WASHINGTON REGIONAL DISTRICT  
WITHIN MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MARYLAND**

---

By: County Council

---

**SUBJECT:** Approval of May 2023 Pedestrian Master Plan

1. On May 26, 2023, the Montgomery County Planning Board transmitted to the County Executive and the County Council the May 2023 Planning Board Draft of the Pedestrian Master Plan.
2. The May 2023 Planning Board Draft of the Pedestrian Master Plan contains the text and supporting maps for a comprehensive amendment to the *Master Plan of Highways & Transitways*, the *Bicycle Master Plan* (2018), the *Rustic Roads Functional Master Plan* (2023), the *Preservation of Agricultural and Rural Open Space Functional Master Plan* (1980), the *Purple Line Functional Plan* (2010), the *Countywide Transit Corridors Functional Master Plan* (2013), the *Intercounty Connector Limited Functional Master Plan Amendment: Bikeways and Interchanges* (2009), and *Thrive Montgomery 2050* (2022), as amended. This plan also amends the following area master plans, as amended: the *10 Mile Creek Area Limited Amendment* (2014), the *Ashton Village Center Sector Plan* (2021), the *Aspen Hill Master Plan* (1994), the *Aspen Hill Minor Master Plan Amendment* (2015), the *Bethesda Downtown Sector Plan* (2017), the *Bethesda-Chevy Chase Master Plan* (1990), the *Boyd's Master Plan* (1985), the *Burtonsville Commercial Crossroads Neighborhood Plan* (2012), the *Capitol View and Vicinity Sector Plan* (1982), the *Chevy Chase Lake Sector Plan* (2013), the *Clarksburg Master Plan and Hyattstown Special Study Area* (1994), the *Cloverly Master Plan* (1997), the *Damascus Master Plan* (2006), the *East Silver Spring Master Plan* (2000), the *Fairland Master Plan* (1997), the *Forest Glen/Montgomery Hills Sector Plan* (2020), the *Four Corners Master Plan* (1996), the *Friendship Heights Sector Plan* (1998), the *Gaithersburg and Vicinity Master Plan* (1996), the *Germantown Employment Area Sector Plan* (2009), the *Germantown Master Plan* (1989), the *Glenmont Sector Plan* (2013), the *Great Seneca Science Corridor Master Plan* (2010), the *Greater Lyttonsville Sector Plan* (2017), the *Grosvenor/Strathmore Metro Area Minor Master Plan* (2018), the *Kemp Mill Master Plan* (2001), the *Kensington Sector Plan* (2012), the *Kensington/Wheaton Master Plan* (1989), the *Long Branch Sector Plan* (2013), the *MARC Rail Communities Sector Plan* (2019), the *Montgomery Village Master Plan* (2016), the *North and West Silver Spring Master Plan* (2000), the *North Bethesda/Garrett Park Master Plan* (1992), the *Olney Master Plan* (2005), the *Potomac Subregion Master Plan* (2002), the *Rock Spring Sector Plan* (2017), the *Sandy Spring/Ashton Master Plan* (1998), the *Sandy Spring Rural Village Plan* (2015), the *Shady Grove Minor Master Plan* (2021), the *Shady Grove Sector Plan* (2006), the

*Silver Spring Downtown and Adjacent Communities Plan (2022), the Takoma/Langley Crossroads Sector Plan (2012), the Takoma Park Master Plan (2000), the Twinbrook Sector Plan (2009), the Upper Rock Creek Master Plan (2004), the Veirs Mill Corridor Master Plan (2019), the Westbard Sector Plan (2016), the Wheaton CBD Sector Plan (2012), the White Flint Sector Plan (2010), the White Flint 2 Sector Plan (2018), the White Oak Master Plan (1997), and the White Oak Science Gateway Master Plan (2014).*

3. On July 25, 2023, the County Council held a public hearing on the May 2023 Planning Board Draft of the Pedestrian Master Plan, which was referred to the Council’s Transportation and Environment Committee for review and recommendations.
4. On September 11 and 18, 2023, the Transportation and Environment Committee held worksessions to review the May 2023 Planning Board Draft of the Pedestrian Master Plan.
5. On September 26, 2023, the County Council reviewed the May 2023 Planning Board Draft of the Pedestrian Master Plan and the recommendations of the Transportation and Environment Committee.

**Action**

The County Council for Montgomery County, Maryland, sitting as the District Council for that portion of the Maryland-Washington Regional District in Montgomery County, Maryland, approves the following resolution:

The Planning Board Draft of the Pedestrian Master Plan, dated May 2023, is approved with revisions. County Council revisions to the Planning Board Draft of the Pedestrian Master Plan are identified below. Deletions to the text of the Plan are indicated by [brackets], additions by underscoring. Montgomery County Planning Department staff may make additional, non-substantive revisions to the Master Plan before its adoption by the Maryland-National Capital Park & Planning Commission.

All page references in this section are consistent with the page numbering in the print version of the Planning Board Draft of the Pedestrian Master Plan.

Page 3            Add the following as the second-last paragraph:

Creative funding strategies and dedicated revenue sources may be helpful in implementing the plan’s recommendations.

Page 9            Add a paragraph at the end of the page as follows:

The Montgomery County Planning Department will track progress in implementing the Pedestrian Master Plan’s vision using a biennial monitoring report and interactive website. The two tools will document how the county is

implementing the plan recommendations and striving to achieve the plan’s performance measure targets.

Page 11 Add a sentence after the second sentence in the introductory paragraph as follows:

Improved pedestrian access is also vital to promote economic development in the county.

Page 11 Update the Objective 1.2 data point and source year.

Countywide, 3.0% (30.0% including the use of public transportation)<sup>1</sup> of residents will commute on foot, up from 2.2 1.8% (17 12.8) in [2019] 2021.

Page 12 Update the Objective 1.3 data point and source year.

The percentage of people who commute on foot (including the use of public transportation) to a Montgomery County Transportation Management District (TMD) will be:

- 10.0% (40.0% including the use of public transportation) in the Bethesda TMD, up from 2.6 [4.9]% (11.6 [23.9]%) in [Fiscal Year 2019] Fall 2022
- 10.0% (50.0%) in the Silver Spring TMD, up from 2.4 [4.8]% (11.1 [36.4]%) in [Fiscal Year 2019] Fall 2022
- 4.0% (35.0%) in the Friendship Heights TMD, up from 2.2 [2.3]% (7.9 [27.0]%) in [Fiscal Year 2019] Fall 2022
- 1.5% (7.0%) in the Greater Shady Grove TMD, up from 0.1 [0.9]% (4.5 [5.1]%) in [Fiscal Year 2019] Fall 2022
- 4.0% (25.0%) in the North Bethesda TMD, up from 1.2 [1.3]% (5.6 [14.8]%) in [Fiscal Year 2019] Fall 2022
- 2.0% (10.0%) in the White Oak TMD, up from N/A (N/A) in [Fiscal Year 2019] Fall 2022

Page 15 Update the Objective 2.1 data point and source year.

Comfortable pedestrian connectivity will be:

- 70.0% for pathways, up from 62.0 [58.0]% in [2020] 2023
- 55.0% for crossings, up from 43.0 [44.0]% in [2020] 2023

Page 15 Update the Objective 2.2 data point and source year.

Comfortable pedestrian access to schools (pathway/crossing) will be:

- 80.0%/60% for elementary schools, up from 55.1 [40.0]% 43.4 [32.0]% in [2020] 2022

- 65.0%/50% for middle schools, up from 37.9 [21.0]%/23.4 [13.0]% in [2020] 2022
- 30.0%/20% for high schools, up from 27.0 [7.0]%/12.5 [5.0]% in [2020] 2022

Update the Objective 2.3 data point and source year.

Page 16

Comfortable pedestrian access to parks (pathway/crossing) will be:

- 80.0%/40.0% for parks, up from 69.9 [71.0]%/35.1 [34.0]% in [2020] 2023
- 85.0%/70.0% for libraries, up from 79.5 [77.0]%/65.5 [62.0]% in [2020] 2023
- 90.0%/70.0% for recreation centers, up from 78.4 [79.0]%/60.0 [62.0]% in [2020] 2023

Page 16

Update the Objective 2.4 data point and source year.

Comfortable pedestrian access to transit stations (pathway/crossing) will be:

- 100.0%/80.0% for WMATA Metro Red Line stations, up from 88.0 [86.0]%/66.4 [66.0]% in [2020] 2023
- 90.0%/80.0% for MARC Brunswick Line stations, up from 89.5 [84.0]%/72.0% in [2020] 2023
- 95.0%/90.0% for MDOT Purple Line stations, up from 75.7 [79.0]%/69.8 [79.0]% in [2020] 2023

Page 17

Update the Objective 3.1 data point and source year.

Pedestrian fatalities and severe injuries will be reduced to zero, down from [80] 84 in [2019] 2022

Page 18

Update the Objective 4.2 data points.

Title 1/Focus/High FARMS-designated (“designated”) schools will be as comfortable to access as non-designated schools. [Currently, the following disparities exist:]

Destination School Type	Percentage of Trips to Each School Type Along Completely Comfortable Pathways and Crossings			
	Pathways		Crossings	
	Title I/Focus and High FARMS Rate Schools	All Other Schools	Title I/Focus and High FARMS Rate Schools	All Other Schools
Elementary Schools	[43.0] <u>60.5%</u>	[36.0] <u>49.9%</u>	[34.0] <u>47.5%</u>	[30.0] <u>39.4%</u>
Middle Schools	[18.0] <u>34.8%</u>	[20.0] <u>41.6%</u>	[11.0] <u>22.8%</u>	[14.0] <u>24.2%</u>
High Schools	[6.0] <u>26.2%</u>	[7.0] <u>27.6%</u>	[3.0] <u>8.9%</u>	[7.0] <u>16.3%</u>

Page 19

Update the Objective 4.3 data points.

Transit stations will be as comfortable to access from Equity Focus Areas (EFAs) (Figure 2) as from outside EFAs. [Currently, the following disparities exist and are **bolded**:]

- WMATA Metro Red Line stations
  - Pathways ([88.0] 92.3% comfortable EFA/[85.0] 86.5% non-EFA)
  - Crossings ([73.0] 64.8% comfortable EFA/[80.0] 66.8% non-EFA)
- MARC Brunswick Line stations
  - Pathways ([88.0] 94.0% comfortable EFA/[83.0] 87.1% non-EFA)
  - Crossings ([79.0] 80.3% comfortable EFA/[69.0] 69.1% non-EFA)
- MDOT Purple Line stations
  - Pathways ([73.0] 75.4% comfortable EFA/[81.0] 75.9% non-EFA)
  - Crossings ([73.0] 73.4% comfortable EFA/[80.0] 67.3% non-EFA)
- Montgomery County BRT Stations
  - Pathways ([82.0] 85.0% comfortable EFA/[85.0] 82.0% non-EFA)
  - Crossings ([58.0] 63.0% comfortable EFA/[63.0] 58.0% non-EFA)

Page 19

Update the Objective 4.4 data points.

Parks, libraries, and recreation centers will be as comfortable to access from EFAs (Figure 2) as from outside EFAs. [Currently, the following disparities exist and are **bolded**:]

- Parks
  - Pathways ([83.0] 71.0% comfortable EFA/[66.0] 69.0% non-EFA)
  - Crossings ([34.0] 36.0% comfortable EFA/[34.0] 35.0% non-EFA)
- Libraries
  - Pathways ([77.0] 80.0% comfortable EFA[,]/ [77.0] 79.0% non-EFA)
  - Crossings ([55.0] 61.0% comfortable EFA[,]/ [66.0] 67.0% non-EFA)

- Recreation Centers
  - Pathways ([82.0] 83.0% comfortable EFA[,]/ 77.0% non-EFA)
  - Crossings ([49.0] 48.0% comfortable EFA[,]/ [68.0] 65.0% non-EFA)

Page 20 Update the Objective 4.5 data points and source year.

Eliminate the disparity in the rate of pedestrian fatalities and severe injuries between EFAs (Figure 2) and non-EFAs. In [2020] 2022, there were [4.8] 4.2 times more severe pedestrian injuries and fatalities inside EFAs than outside them.

Page 25 Update the second and third paragraph within the Mode Share section.

Overall, 7.5% of weekday trips are made by walking (Table 1) and [2.2] 1.8% of commute trips are made by walking in Montgomery County. Walking rates vary greatly by land use type, with a greater share of trips made by walking in urban areas (11.3%) compared with transit corridors (7.3%) and exurban/rural areas (4.6%). In addition, residents in urban areas make up a greater share of commute trips by walking ([3.7] 3.2%) than those in transit corridors ([1.8] 1.5%) or exurban/rural areas ([1.1] 1.0%).

Walking rates also vary depending on whether an area is an EFA. Residents in EFAs make 9.6% of trips by walking, while residents in non-EFAs make 7.0% of trips by walking. The share of commute trips by walking is only slightly greater in EFAs ([2.4] 1.9%) than in non-EFAs ([2.1] 1.8%).

Page 25 Update Table 1 as follows:

*Table 1. Pedestrian Mode Share by Area Types*

	Total	Land Use Type			Equity Focus Areas	
		Urban	Transit Corridor	Exurban/Rural	EFAs	Non-EFAs
Overall Weekday Trips*	<b>7.5%</b>	11.3%	7.3%	4.6%	9.6%	7.0%
Commute Trips**	[2.2] <u><b>1.8%</b></u>	[3.7] <u>3.2%</u>	[1.8] <u>1.5%</u>	[1.1] <u>1.0%</u>	[2.4] <u>1.9%</u>	[2.1] <u>1.8%</u>

\* Regional Travel Survey, 2017-2018

\*\* American Community Survey, [2019] 2021 Five-Year Estimates

Note: County mode share (the percentage of trips made by different travel modes) includes Rockville and Gaithersburg.

Page 25 Update the paragraph after Table 1:

While the county’s pedestrian commuter mode share is low, it is higher than all other counties in the region, except Arlington County (Table 2). In urban areas such as the City of Rockville and Silver Spring Census Designated Place, commuter mode share is higher. For instance, the [2019] 2021 American

Community Survey reports that the rate of walking is [3.2] 2.3% in [these areas] Rockville and 2.8% in Silver Spring.<sup>7</sup>

Page 26 Update Table 2 as follows:

Table 2. Commute Mode Share of Jurisdictions in the Metropolitan Washington Region

Jurisdiction	Pedestrian Mode Share
Washington, D.C.	[13.4] <u>6.7%</u>
Arlington County, VA	[5.0] <u>4.3%</u>
<b>Montgomery County, MD</b>	<b>[2.2] <u>1.8%</u></b>
<u>Frederick County, MD</u>	<u>1.8%</u>
Prince George’s County, MD	[2.0] <u>1.7%</u>
Fairfax County, VA	[1.9] <u>1.4%</u>
[Frederick County, MD]	[1.8%]
Howard County, MD	[1.0] <u>0.9%</u>

Source: American Community Survey, [2019] 2021 Five-Year Estimates  
 Note: County mode share (the percentage of trips made by different travel modes) includes Rockville and Gaithersburg.

Page 36 Update the last paragraph as follows:

Table 10 summarizes sidewalk mileage by street classification,<sup>13</sup> as well as where there are sidewalk gaps (sections of missing sidewalk). Countywide, there are [nearly 2,200] about 2,500 miles of sidewalks (primarily on local—or residential—streets) and [218] 220 miles of sidewalk gaps on non-local streets. Many of these gaps are located on roads that connect people to destinations, including major highways, arterials, and primary residential streets.

Page 37 Update Table 10 as follows:

Table 3. Sidewalk Mileage by Street Classification

Street Classification	Street Mileage	Existing Sidewalks (miles)	Sidewalk Gaps (miles)
Controlled Major Highway	19	20	1
Major Highway	159	[214] <u>205</u>	[50] <u>49</u>
Parkway	9	3	0
Arterial	243	[202] <u>205</u>	98
Minor Arterial	48	[62] <u>63</u>	[8] <u>7</u>
Business	50	[79] <u>81</u>	2
Primary Residential	215	[227] <u>228</u>	[56] <u>58</u>
Industrial	7	12	1
Country Road	35	2	3
Rustic Road	149	2	0

Street Classification	Street Mileage	Existing Sidewalks (miles)	Sidewalk Gaps (miles)
Exceptional Rustic Road	40	0	1
Local Streets	2,121	[1,367] <u>1,622</u>	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,095</b>	<b>[2,193] <u>2,438</u></b>	<b>220</b>

Page 37

Update Table 11 as follows:

Table 4. Sidewalk Gap Mileage by Street Classification and Land Use

Street Classification	Existing Sidewalks (miles)	Gap Mileage			
		Urban	Transit Corridor	Exurban/Rural	Total
Controlled Major Highway	20	1	0	0	1
Major Highway	[214] <u>205</u>	[5] <u>4</u>	7	38	[50] <u>49</u>
Parkway	3	0	0	0	0
Arterial	[205] <u>202</u>	[7] <u>4</u>	[11] <u>10</u>	[80] <u>84</u>	98
Minor Arterial	[62] <u>63</u>	[1] <u>0</u>	2	5	[8] <u>7</u>
Business	[79] <u>81</u>	2	0	0	2
Primary Residential	[227] <u>228</u>	[4] <u>3</u>	[7] <u>8</u>	[45] <u>47</u>	[56] <u>58</u>
Industrial	12	0	0	1	1
Country Road	2	0	0	3	3
Rustic Road	2	0	0	0	0
Exceptional Rustic Road	0	0	0	1	1
Local Streets	[1,367] <u>1,622</u>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>[2,193] <u>2,438</u></b>	<b>[20] <u>14</u></b>	<b>27</b>	<b>[173] <u>179</u></b>	<b>220</b>

Page 39

Update the first paragraph as follows:

As Table 12 highlights, local streets tend to have narrower sidewalks: [61] 62% of sidewalks along local streets are less than five feet wide. While higher classification streets tend to have wider sidewalks, there are still many sidewalks along major highways (23%), arterials (26%), business streets ([18] 17%) and similar streets that are narrower than five feet.

Page 39

Update Table 12 as follows:

Table 5. Sidewalk Width by Street Classification

Street Classification	Mileage	Sidewalk Width			
		3.5' to < 5'	>= 5' to < 8'	>= 8' to < 10'	>= 10'
Controlled Major Highway	20	17%	40%	38%	5%



Street Classification	Mileage	Sidewalk Width			
		3.5' to < 5'	>= 5' to < 8'	>=8' to < 10'	>=10'
Major Highway	[214] <u>205</u>	23%	54%	[19] <u>18%</u>	5%
Parkway	3	3%	[46] <u>47%</u>	[10] <u>8%</u>	[41] <u>42%</u>
Arterial	[205] <u>202</u>	26%	47%	[25] <u>24%</u>	3%
Minor Arterial	[62] <u>63</u>	[57] <u>56%</u>	[39] <u>40%</u>	3%	1%
Business	[79] <u>81</u>	[18] <u>17%</u>	[57] <u>58%</u>	14%	[11] <u>12%</u>
Primary Residential	[227] <u>228</u>	74%	21%	5%	0%
Industrial	12	14%	68%	12%	6%
Country Road	2	0%	18%	82%	0%
Rustic Road	2	0%	[96] <u>97%</u>	0%	[4] <u>3%</u>
Exceptional Rustic Road	0	48%	52%	0%	0%
Local Street	[1,367] <u>1,622</u>	[61] <u>62%</u>	[32] <u>31%</u>	5%	[3] <u>2%</u>
<b>Total Mileage</b>	<b>[2,193] <u>2,438</u></b>	<b>[1,175] <u>1328</u></b>	<b>[784] <u>851</u></b>	<b>[189] <u>196</u></b>	<b>[67] <u>63</u></b>

Source: Pedestrian Level of Comfort Analysis

Page 39 Update the last paragraph as follows:

As Figure 11 indicates, sidewalks in EFAs tend to be somewhat narrower than sidewalks in other areas of the county. In EFAs, [58] 59% of sidewalks are between three and a half and five feet wide, while [51] 53% of sidewalks outside EFAs are in this category. At the other end of the spectrum, non-EFA sidewalks are more likely to be between eight and 10 feet ([10] 9% vs. 5%) and greater than 10 feet (3% vs. 2%).

Page 39 Update Figure 11 to reflect adjusted data values.

Page 40 Update the second paragraph as follows:

Of the [2,193] 2,438 miles of county sidewalks, most ([58] 51%) have at least a six-foot buffer between the sidewalk and the street. However, nearly half (47%) of sidewalks along major highways like Georgia Avenue are missing buffers. By contrast, [20] 19% of arterial sidewalks, 11% of primary residential sidewalks, and [20] 19% of local street sidewalks are missing buffers (Table 13).

Page 40 Update Table 13 as follows:

Table 6. Street Buffer Width by Street Classification

Street Classification	Buffer Width		
	No Buffer	Less than Six Feet	Six Feet or Greater
Controlled Major Highway	3%	[66] 74%	[31] 23%
Major Highway	47%	[30] 34%	[23] 19%
Parkway	4%	[25] 36%	[70] 61%
Arterial	20%	[29] 35%	[70] 45%
Minor Arterial	21%	[27] 34%	[52] 45%
Business	[29] 28%	[32] 44%	[39] 28%
Primary Residential	11%	[17] 23%	[72] 66%
Industrial	[15] 14%	[25] 27%	[61] 59%
Country Road	0%	4%	96%
Rustic Road	[8] 7%	[18] 33%	[74] 60%
Exceptional Rustic Road	[53] 52%	27%	21%
Local Street	[20] 18%	[16] 26%	[64] 56%

Page 40 Update the third paragraph as follows:

Sidewalks in EFAs are less likely to have buffers than those outside of EFAs. While [28] 27% of sidewalks in EFAs are missing street buffers, only [20] 18% outside are (Figure 12).

Page 40 Update Figure 12 to reflect adjusted data values.

Page 41 Update Table 14 as follows:

Table 7. Sidewalk Buffer by Posted Speed Limit

Posted Speed Limit	No Buffer	Less than Six Feet	Six Feet or Greater
Less than 30 mph	[20] 18%	[17] 26%	[64] 55%
30-40 mph	[28] 27%	[28] 34%	[45] 39%
Greater than 40 mph	[31] 30%	[39] 43%	[30] 27%
<b>Total</b>	<b>[22] 21%</b>	<b>[20] 28%</b>	<b>[58] 51%</b>

Source: Pedestrian Level of Comfort Analysis

Page 41 Update the third paragraph as follows:

There are three different approaches to crosswalks on county roads. Unmarked crossings have no pavement markings to denote the crosswalk. Standard crosswalk markings include stamped concrete, parallel lines, and dashed marking patterns. High-visibility crosswalks have proven pedestrian safety benefits over standard crosswalk markings and include continental, ladder, zebra, and solid

designs. Table 15 summarizes the crosswalk types by street classification. Countywide, [67] 69% of legal crossings are unmarked, while [16] 15% have a standard marked crosswalk and 17% have a high-visibility crosswalk. The highest portion of marked crosswalks (standard or high-visibility) are on high-volume, higher-order roadways, such as controlled major highways, major highways, and parkways.

Page 41-42 Update Table 15 as follows:

Table 8. Crossing Type by Street Classification

Street Classification	Unmarked	Standard	High-Visibility
Controlled Major Highway	[27] <u>28%</u>	[35] <u>34%</u>	38%
Major Highway	33%	28%	39%
Parkway	29%	16%	55%
Arterial	47%	[17] <u>16%</u>	[36] <u>37%</u>
Minor Arterial	[56] <u>57%</u>	[16] <u>15%</u>	28%
Business	28%	24%	[48] <u>47%</u>
Primary Residential	[70] <u>69%</u>	14%	[16] <u>17%</u>
Industrial	[51] <u>50%</u>	19%	[29] <u>31%</u>
Country Arterial	100%	0%	0%
Country Road	100%	0%	0%
Rustic Road	[86] <u>83%</u>	[5] <u>4%</u>	[10] <u>13%</u>
Exceptional Rustic Road	89%	11%	0%
Local	[75] <u>77%</u>	[14] <u>13%</u>	[11] <u>10%</u>
<b>Total</b>	<b>[67] <u>69%</u></b>	<b>[16] <u>15%</u></b>	<b>17%</b>

Source: Pedestrian Level of Comfort Analysis

Page 42 Update Table 16 as follows:

Table 9. Crossing Type by Roadway Speed by Land Use

Posted Speed Limit	Urban			Transit Corridor			Exurban/Rural		
	Unmarked	Standard	High Visibility	Unmarked	Standard	High Visibility	Unmarked	Standard	High Visibility
Less than 30 mph	[67] <u>64%</u>	[15] <u>14%</u>	[18] <u>21%</u>	74%	[16] <u>15%</u>	11%	[76] <u>80%</u>	[13] <u>11%</u>	[10] <u>8%</u>
30-40 mph	33%	[25] <u>23%</u>	[43] <u>44%</u>	[48] <u>50%</u>	[16] <u>14%</u>	36%	[63] <u>67%</u>	[14] <u>11%</u>	22%
Greater than 40 mph	[20] <u>21%</u>	[25] <u>24%</u>	[55] <u>56%</u>	[30] <u>29%</u>	[23] <u>25%</u>	[47] <u>46%</u>	[43] <u>47%</u>	26%	[31] <u>27%</u>

Source: Pedestrian Level of Comfort Analysis

Page 43 Update Figure 13 to reflect adjusted data values.

Page 43 Update the first paragraph as follows:

Montgomery Planning’s PLOC analysis finds that [58] 61% of pathway distance and [44] 42% of crossings crossing distance in the county [are] is comfortable (Table 17). This means they meet either the “very comfortable” or “somewhat comfortable” metrics outlined in the PLOC methodology appendix.

Page 43 Update Table 17 as follows:

*Table 10. Overall Pedestrian Comfort on Streets and at Crossings*

<b>PLOC Score</b>	<b>Pathway Distance</b>	<b>Crossing [Locations] Distance</b>
Very Comfortable	[24] <u>25%</u>	[11] <u>10%</u>
Somewhat Comfortable	[34] <u>36%</u>	[33] <u>32%</u>
Uncomfortable	21%	38%
Undesirable	[20] <u>17%</u>	[17] <u>19%</u>

Source: Pedestrian Level of Comfort Analysis

Page 43 Update the last two paragraphs as follows:

An analysis of pedestrian conditions along all streets and crossings in the county indicates that there are large areas of the county where it is uncomfortable to walk and many locations where it is undesirable to do so. Figure 14 summarizes pedestrian comfort along pathways. Comfort levels in urban ([65] 67%) and transit corridors ([69] 71%) are greater than in exurban/rural ([48] 52%) areas of the county.

Pathway comfort levels are substantially higher in EFAs ([73] 71%) than non-EFAs ([58] 60%), likely due to where these areas are located and when they were developed.

Page 44 Update Figure 14 to reflect adjusted data values.

Page 44 Update the first paragraph as follows:

Figure 15 summarizes pedestrian conditions at crossings. Overall, only [44] 42% of crossings [locations] are [a] comfortable [walking experience] for pedestrians. Crossings in transit corridors tend to be slightly more comfortable ([47] 45%

comfortable) while crossings in urban and exurban/rural areas tend to be somewhat less comfortable ([40] 41% comfortable).

Page 44 Update Figure 15 to reflect adjusted data values.

Page 45 Update Table 18 as follows:

Table 11. Comfortable Pedestrian Access to Community Destinations and Transit Stations

	Pathway Distance	Crossing Distance
<b>Community Destinations</b>		
Libraries	[77] <u>79.5%</u>	[62] <u>65.5%</u>
Recreation Centers	[79] <u>78.4%</u>	[62] <u>65.5%</u>
Parks	[71] <u>69.9%</u>	[34] <u>35.1%</u>
<b>Transit Stations</b>		
Red Line	[86] <u>88%</u>	[66] <u>66.4%</u>
Purple Line	[79] <u>75.7%</u>	[79] <u>69.8%</u>
Brunswick Line	[84] <u>89.5%</u>	72%

Source: Pedestrian Level of Comfort Analysis

Page 46 Update Table 19 as follows:

Table 12. Comfortable Access to Community Destinations and Transit Stations by Area Types

		Community Destinations			Transit Stations		
		Libraries	Recreation Centers	Parks	Red Line	Purple Line	Brunswick Line
Urban	Pathways	[79] <u>81%</u>	82%	N/A	87%	[79] <u>76%</u>	83%
	Crossings	[63] <u>71%</u>	[65] <u>66%</u>	N/A	[68] <u>67%</u>	[79] <u>72%</u>	70%
Transit Corridor	Pathways	[64] <u>72%</u>	[86] <u>85%</u>	[61] <u>63%</u>	[74] <u>76%</u>	69%	N/A
	Crossings	[65] <u>45%</u>	[58] <u>51%</u>	[27] <u>30%</u>	[48] <u>51%</u>	82%	N/A
Exurban/Rural	Pathways	[78] <u>81%</u>	[59] <u>62%</u>	[81] <u>76%</u>	N/A	N/A	[92] <u>91%</u>
	Crossings	[34] <u>40%</u>	[53] <u>46%</u>	[42] <u>41%</u>	N/A	N/A	89%

Note: The approach for calculating access to destinations for land use type is based on where the community destination or transit station is located (urban area, transit corridor, etc.).

Source: Pedestrian Level of Comfort Analysis

Page 46 Update the third paragraph as follows:

Comfortable access to community destinations and transit stations also varies by whether the walkshed (the distance around the destination from which people

walk) is within an EFA. Table 20 illustrates that crossing comfort tends to be worse in EFAs, while pathway comfort is better. [While Red Line station connectivity is more comfortable in EFAs, Purple Line station connectivity is worse.]

Page 46 Update Table 20 as follows:

Table 13. Comfortable Access to Community Destinations by EFA Status

		Community Destinations			Transit Stations		
		Libraries	Recreation Centers	Parks	Red Line	Purple Line	Brunswick Line
EFAs	Pathways	[77] 80%	[82] 83%	[83] 71%	[88] 92%	[73] 75%	[88] 94%
	Crossings	[55] 61%	[49] 48%	[34] 36%	[59] 65%	73%	[79] 80%
Non-EFAs	Pathways	[77] 79%	77%	[66] 69%	[85] 87%	[81] 76%	[83] 87%
	Crossings	[66] 67%	[68] 65%	[34] 35%	[68] 67%	[80] 67%	69%

Note: The approach for calculating access to destinations for EFAs is based on where residences within the walksheds for each community destination or transit station within or outside of an EFA.

Source: Pedestrian Level of Comfort Analysis

Page 46-47 Update the fourth paragraph as follows:

Table 21 shows that walking to elementary schools tends to be more comfortable,<sup>17</sup> with [40] 50% comfortable access walking along streets, and [32] 43% comfortable access at crossings. In contrast, walking tends to be the least comfortable to high schools, with only [7] 27% comfortable access along pathways and [5] 13% comfortable access at crossings.

Page 47 Update Table 21 as follows:

Table 14. Comfortable Pedestrian Access to School

School Types	Streets	Crossings
Elementary Schools	[40] 55%	[32] 43%
Middle Schools	[21] 38%	[13] 23%
High Schools	[7] 27%	[5] 13%

Source: Pedestrian Level of Comfort Analysis

Page 48 Update Table 22 as follows:

Table 15. Comfortable Pedestrian Access to School by Area Types and Designation

Public Facility	Land Use Type						Title I/Focus and High FARMS Rate Schools			
	Urban		Transit Corridor		Exurban/Rural		Yes		No	
	Pathways	Crossings	Pathways	Crossings	Pathways	Crossings	Pathways	Crossings	Pathways	Crossings
Elementary Schools	[30] 36%	[24] 28%	[46] 56%	[38] 51%	[36] 50%	[39] 54%	[43] 60%	[34] 47%	[36] 50%	[30] 39%
Middle Schools	[15] 12%	[3] 6%	[16] 28%	[11] 21%	[26] 38%	[19] 33%	[18] 35%	[11] 23%	[20] 42%	[14] 24%
High Schools	[5] 9%	[5] 11%	[14] 23%	[6] 15%	[6] 14%	[5] 11%	[6] 27%	[3] 9%	[7] 28%	[7] 16%

Source: Pedestrian Level of Comfort Analysis

Page 51 Update the third paragraph as follows:

While users of all transportation modes suffer fatalities and severe injuries, pedestrians are particularly vulnerable. Figure 18 shows pedestrians were only involved in 4% of total crashes between 2015 and [2020] 2022, but they accounted for 27% of severe injuries and fatalities. Pedestrian crashes disproportionately result in severe injuries and fatalities because while motor vehicles provide drivers and passengers protection from crashes, pedestrians do not have similar protection. A collision between vehicles may result in minor injuries to passengers, but a crash involving a pedestrian is more likely to result in a severe injury or a fatality.

Page 52 Update the third paragraph as follows:

Figure 20 depicts roadway mileage, pedestrian crashes, and pedestrian fatalities and severe injuries by land use type. While over half (54%) of the roadway miles in the county are in exurban/rural areas, these areas only comprise 11% of pedestrian crashes and [13] 12% of pedestrian severe injuries or fatalities. In contrast, urban areas only comprise 21% of roadway miles, while making up about two thirds of pedestrian crashes (68%) and pedestrian severe injuries and fatalities ([65] 62%).

Page 53 Update Figure 20 to reflect adjusted data values.

Page 53 Update the first paragraph as follows:

While data are not available to indicate whether low-income residents of color are disproportionately impacted by pedestrian crashes, Figure 21 shows that streets in EFAs have higher crash rates. While EFAs contain only 14% of roadway miles in the county, they account for [40] 41% of all pedestrian crashes and [44] 45% of pedestrian crashes that result in a fatality or severe injury. Additionally, Black Montgomery County residents had an emergency room admission rate for motor vehicle crashes 136% higher than Asian/Pacific Islander residents and 104% higher than white, non-Hispanic residents.

Page 53 Update Figure 21 to reflect adjusted data values.

Page 53 Update the second paragraph as follows:

Beyond land use types, the safety analysis zooms into the specific locations and street types where crashes occur. Table 24 shows that pedestrian crashes along a street (rather than at an intersection) are disproportionately likely to result in a severe injury or fatality. At the same time, while [21] 19% of pedestrian crashes happen in parking lots, they are less likely to be severe or fatal. The difference between these two crash types may be due to motor-vehicle speed, as motor vehicles are likely traveling faster when they collide with pedestrians along street segments than in parking lots.

Page 54 Update Table 24 as follows:

*Table 16. Pedestrian Crashes by Location*

<b>Location</b>	<b>Percent of Pedestrian Crashes</b>	<b>Percent of Pedestrian Severe Injuries and Fatalities (KSI)</b>
Signalized Intersection	[26] <u>21%</u>	[26] <u>21%</u>
Stop-Controlled Intersection	[6] <u>5%</u>	[5] <u>4%</u>
Uncontrolled Intersection	[13] <u>20%</u>	[16] <u>21%</u>
Along a Street	27%	[37] <u>38%</u>
Off-road	[4] <u>5%</u>	2%
Parking Lot	[21] <u>19%</u>	10%
Driveway	4%	[4] <u>3%</u>
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

Note: Data include crashes in Rockville and Gaithersburg.

Page 54 Update the first paragraph as follows:

Higher classification roads such as controlled major highways and major highways, as well as business streets, disproportionately account for pedestrian crashes resulting in severe injuries or fatalities. Table 25 shows that while controlled major highways, major highways, and business streets make up 8% of roadway mileage, they account for [58] 57% of pedestrian crashes and [64] 63% of pedestrian severe injuries and fatalities.



Page 54

Update Table 25 as follows:

Table 17. Pedestrian Crashes by Roadway Type

Street Classification	Percent of Roadway Miles	Percent of Pedestrian Crashes	Percent of Pedestrian Severe Injuries and Fatalities (KSI)
Controlled Major Highway	1%	3%	5%
Major Highway	5%	33%	[39] <u>40%</u>
Parkway	0%	0%	0%
Arterial	8%	11%	[9] <u>11%</u>
Minor Arterial	2%	5%	3%
Business	2%	[22] <u>21%</u>	[20] <u>18%</u>
Primary Residential	7%	16%	15%
Industrial	0%	1%	0%
Country Arterial	2%	0%	0%
Country Road	1%	0%	0%
Rustic & Exceptionally Rustic	6%	0%	[1] <u>0%</u>
Local	67%	10%	[7] <u>8%</u>
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

Page 55

Update Table 26 as follows:

Table 18. Pedestrian KSI by Area Type by Roadway Type

Street Classification	Urban		Transit Corridor		Rural		Total	
	% Roadway Mileage	% KSI	% Roadway Mileage	% KSI	% Roadway Mileage	% KSI	% Roadway Mileage	% KSI
Controlled Major Highway	0.4%	[4] <u>3%</u>	0.2%	1%	0.1%	0%	0.6%	5%
Major Highway	2.0%	[25] <u>27%</u>	1.3%	[10] <u>9%</u>	1.8%	4%	5.0%	[39] <u>40%</u>
Arterial	1.8%	6%	1.2%	[2] <u>3%</u>	4.7%	[1] <u>2%</u>	7.7%	[9] <u>11%</u>
Country Arterial	0.0%	0%	0.0%	0%	1.8%	0%	1.8%	0%
Minor Arterial	0.5%	[1] <u>2%</u>	0.6%	1%	0.5%	0%	1.5%	3%
Business	1.6%	[20] <u>18%</u>	0.0%	0%	0.0%	0%	1.6%	[20] <u>18%</u>
Country Road	0.0%	0%	0.0%	0%	1.1%	0%	1.1%	0%
Industrial	0.0%	0%	0.1%	0%	0.1%	0%	0.2%	0%
Parkway	0.0%	0%	0.1%	0%	0.2%	0%	0.3%	0%

Local	13.6%	[3] 4%	19.4%	2%	34.3%	1%	67.4%	[7] 8%
Primary Residential	1.3%	7%	1.9%	5%	3.7%	3%	6.8%	15%
Exceptional Rustic Road	0.0%	0%	0.0%	0%	1.3%	0%	1.3%	0%
Rustic Road	0.1%	0%	0.1%	0%	4.6%	1%	4.7%	1%

Page 56 Update Figure 22 to reflect adjusted data values.

Page 56 Update the first paragraph as follows:

While fewer pedestrian crashes occur in the overnight hours, those crashes are more likely to result in severe or fatal injuries (Figure 23). For instance, while 13% of pedestrian crashes between 6:00 a.m. and 9:59 p.m. are severe or fatal, that percentage jumps to [28] 29% between 10:00 p.m. and 5:59 a.m. In addition to increased vehicle speeds common at night due to reduced congestion and lighting-related visibility issues, impairment may also play a role in the increased likelihood of fatal and severe crashes during these time periods.

Page 56 Update Figure 23 to reflect adjusted data values.

Page 57 Update Figure 24 to reflect adjusted data values.

Page 59 Update the first bullet under Walking Rates and Satisfaction as follows:

- **Overall and commute walking rates are higher in EFAs:** Residents in EFAs make 9.6% of trips by walking compared with 7.0% of trips by walking in non-EFAs. The share of commute trips by walking is only slightly greater in EFAs ([2.4] 1.9%) than non-EFAs ([2.1] 1.8%).

Page 59 Update the first two bullets under A Comfortable, Connected, Convenient Pedestrian Network as follows:

- Crossing comfort accessing community destinations tends to be worse in EFAs, while pathway comfort is better. [While Red Line station connectivity is more comfortable in EFAs, Purple Line station connectivity is worse.]
- Title I/Focus elementary schools have more comfortable access than their more affluent counterparts. Pathway comfort for Title I/Focus Schools is [7] 10% greater than it is for other elementary schools ([43] 60% vs. [36] 60%). Crossing comfort is [4] 8% greater ([34] 47% vs. [30] 39%).

Page 60 Update the first bullet under Pedestrian Safety as follows:

- Crashes and injuries are overrepresented in EFAs. While EFAs contain only 14% of roadway miles in the county, they account for [40] 41% of all

pedestrian-involved vehicular crashes and [44] 45% of such crashes that result in a fatality or severe injury.

Page 61 Update the first paragraph as follows:

The Existing Conditions chapter of the Pedestrian Master Plan described deficiencies in the pedestrian experience in great detail using data sources developed specifically for this plan. This chapter provides recommendations to address the county’s current shortcomings identified in the Existing Conditions chapter. The recommendations should be considered in further detail by multiagency partnerships such as the Vision Zero Action Plan and the Climate Action Plan for further refinement and consideration. New and expanded programs will be considered by this and future councils in the context of the County’s overall capital and operating funds. Recommendations are in the following five categories:

Page 64-67 Update Table 28 to reflect changes on Pages 69-130.

Page 69 Update the first paragraph under Recommendation B-1 as follows:

The CSDG recommends sidewalks on both sides of the street with adequate buffers from traffic. However, the county’s busiest roads lack about [220] 225 miles of sidewalk (on one or both sides of the road), about 54% of sidewalks do not meet the minimum widths (five feet), and about [22] 21% lack a buffer from traffic. With the need for new and reconstructed sidewalks far exceeding the county’s capacity to build them, the following key actions help build more sidewalks faster.

Page 70 Update the first paragraph under Key Action B-1d as follows:

Currently, [41] 39% 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. Note that sidewalk reconstruction does not include maintenance projects to eliminate tripping hazards.

Page 71 Remove Key Action B-1f and associated text.

Page 72 Remove Key Action B-1g and associated text.

Page 72 Change the title of Key Action B-1h as follows:

**B-1[h]f: Document deviations from Complete Streets Design Guide streetscape default widths where applicable.**

Page 73 Change the title of Key Action B-1i as follows:

**B-1[i]g: Update state curb height standards to 6” in areas with pedestrian activity.**

Page 74 Update the first paragraph under Key Action B-2b as follows:

In Suburban and Country areas of the county where providing a pedestrian crossing phase via pedestrian recall in every signal cycle may have detrimental effects on traffic flow, passive detection provides an option that eliminates the need to push a button while minimizing impacts to traffic. Using sensors, the signal detects an approaching pedestrian and adds a phase to the signal cycle so that pedestrian can safely cross the street. Pushbuttons may still be provided to assist visually impaired users with navigating crossings.

Page 75 Update the first paragraph under Recommendation B-3 as follows:

High-quality street crossings connect communities and make it easier to access local destinations like schools, parks, and transit stops. The county PLOC analysis found that while the majority of the pathways in the county are comfortable ([58] 61%), only [44] 42% of street crossings are comfortable. Coupled with 46% satisfaction with the number of marked crosswalks and 42% satisfaction with the number of places to safely cross the street in the Countywide Pedestrian Survey, it is clear that street crossings countywide need to be improved. The key actions below achieve the recommendation by encouraging more intuitive curb ramp and crosswalk design, enhancing pedestrian right-of-way while crossing, and supporting the installation of more direct pedestrian crossing locations.

Page 78 Update Key Action B-3e and associated text as follows:

[Pursue] Consider a modification of Maryland Code §21-502 to indicate that the driver of a vehicle must stop for pedestrians waiting to cross the street, not just those already in the crosswalk.

Currently, state law requires pedestrians to enter the street at a crosswalk at an uncontrolled intersection to gain the right-of-way and cause drivers to stop. In practice, this creates situations where drivers maintain elevated speeds through marked and unmarked crosswalks, frightening pedestrians into waiting until there is a gap in traffic before taking the opportunity to cross the street. To support improved driver yielding, additional signage in advance of crosswalks should be installed across the county, particularly at locations where there may be sight distance issues.

Precedent: [Virginia law] Ann Arbor, Michigan and Boulder, Colorado both require[s] drivers to yield to pedestrians “at” a crosswalk, not “in” a crosswalk.

Goals: Equitable and Just Pedestrian Network, Comfortable/Connected Pedestrian Network, Pedestrian Safety

Lead: State Delegation

Page 80 Update the first paragraph under Key Action B-4d as follows:

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] 9% 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.

Page 80 Update Key Action B-4e as follows:

**Promote redevelopment to [C] create a grid of streets and alleys along transit corridors with block sizes based on the protected crossing standards of the Complete Streets Design Guide.**

Page 83 Update the first paragraph under Key Action B-4f as follows:

A comprehensive pedestrian wayfinding system—a network of signs providing distance and direction to destinations—will increase walking by helping residents, employees, and visitors understand what is accessible nearby on foot. A similar effort to develop bikeway wayfinding is under development jointly by the Planning Department and MCDOT.

Page 83 Remove Key Action B-4g and the associated text.

Page 83 Change the title of Key Action B-4h as follows:

**B-4[h]g: Provide public seating, restrooms, and other pedestrian amenities in Downtowns, Town Centers, and priority park locations and along Boulevards.**

Page 84 Change the title of Key Action B-4i as follows:

**B-4[i]h: Update horizontal alignment standards in Chapter 50 of the County Code.**

Page 86 Update the first paragraph beneath Key Action B-6b as follows:

Tree canopy is lacking along many sidewalks in Montgomery County. While programs like Tree Montgomery and Reforest Montgomery exist to plant trees on private property, it can be a challenge to plant, maintain, and replace necessary shade trees within the public right-of-way along sidewalks. Consolidating funding sources and investing more in street tree preservation, maintenance, and planting within the right-of-way—while eliminating barriers to replacing [trees that have been removed] street trees, such as stump removal—will be a significant investment in future pedestrian comfort along the county’s sidewalks.

Page 90 Update Key Action B-7f and the associated text as follows:

**[Offer monetary] Consider a program of monetary and technical support to Homeowners Associations, Condominium Associations, and commercial properties for providing pedestrian connections through their property and reconfiguring existing parking lots to be more pedestrian friendly.**

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—where these connections would improve pedestrian access to local businesses, transit, and community destinations.
- 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: DHCA, CCOC [MCDOT], County Executive, County Council

Support: MCDOT

Page 90 Update Key Action B-7g and the associated text as follows:

**B-7g: [Fund] Include off-site pedestrian and bicycle access improvements to transit stations as part of the main capital project or through a parallel effort.**

Non-motorized access to transit stations should be an essential component of their construction. These investments can provide substantial public benefits, including reduced transportation emissions and increased economic development, but poor pedestrian and bicycle connectivity in the surrounding area makes it difficult for these projects to reach their full potential ridership. Non-motorized access should be a higher priority than motorized access. "Off-site" is defined as improvements that are not directly connected to the transit station, but fill a gap within the transit station walkshed. The transit station walkshed should be defined as part of the initial planning and design process for the capital project.

Related Effort: Vision Zero Action Plan

Goals: Comfortable/Connected Pedestrian Network, Walking Rates

Leads: MCDOT, MDOT SHA, County Council

Page 94-95 Replace the entirety of Recommendation B-10 and associated text with the following text:

*B-10: Facilitate the transformation of state highways to support Montgomery County's transportation and land use priorities as articulated in adopted plans, guidelines, and policies.*

Thrive Montgomery 2050, the county's General Plan, envisions transforming activity centers and growth corridors into safe, comfortable, and irresistible multimodal environments. Although serious injury and fatal pedestrian collisions are more frequent in suburban areas, Montgomery Planning's Predictive Safety Analysis study found that Downtown Boulevards and Town Center Boulevards have the highest rate of crashes involving pedestrians.

Improving the safety, attractiveness, and walkability in these locations is critical to the success of these centers. State highways account for about 45 miles of road in Downtowns and Town Centers, as well as about 55 miles along master-planned BRT corridors (review Table 33 and associated maps of Downtown and Town Center areas). Along these roadways and all other state highways countywide, it is recommended that the State Highway Administration:

- 1) Incorporate local master plan recommendations, local design standards, and local policies into SHA's funding allocations as well as planning and design for roadway maintenance, reconstruction, new construction, and operations; and
- 2) Expedite review and facilitate implementation of infrastructure changes to state highways being implemented through county and municipal projects and/or implemented as part of land development or redevelopment projects.

Key Actions:

**B-10a: Explore ways to formalize State Highway Administration incorporation of local master plans, policies, and standards for the design and operation of state highways in Montgomery County.**

Differing design standards, policies, and priorities at the State Highway Administration are a potential obstacle to achieving the goals for Montgomery County articulated in *Thrive Montgomery 2050*, area and functional master plans, the adopted Montgomery County Complete Streets Design Guide, the *Vision Zero Action Plan* and the *Climate Action Plan*. These documents express local priorities for the design and function of state highways, particularly for bus rapid transit corridors and in Downtowns and Town Centers.

Aligning SHA's design standards, policies and priorities for activities within Montgomery County with these County-adopted local plans, policies, and standards, will support the implementation of *Thrive Montgomery 2050* and facilitate implementation of the Pedestrian Master Plan. There are many avenues through which this can be achieved, including updates to SHA program, policies and standards, changes to the state code to bring state and local practices into alignment, or establishing a written agreement about relevant plans, policies and design standards between the county and the state.

Goals: Comfortable/Connected Pedestrian Network, Walking Rates, Pedestrian Safety, Equitable and Just Pedestrian Network

Leads: State Delegation, County Executive

**B-10b: Find opportunities to expedite the State Highway Administration's review of public and private projects.**

The State Highway Administration reviews design plans for public and private projects that affect the state rights of way. For these projects to proceed to construction, SHA comments must be addressed, the design drawings must be approved, and an SHA Access Permit provided. However, the current SHA review process has no time limits within which SHA must approve or reject a permit application. Uncertain review timelines can lead to project delays, slowing the construction of important pedestrian, bicycle and transit improvements.

Expediting SHA's review process by establishing reasonable deadlines, similar to those required of Montgomery County agencies for regulatory review, will likely reduce delay and more quickly advance needed safety and accessibility improvements faster.

Goals: Comfortable/Connected Pedestrian Network, Walking Rates, Pedestrian Safety, Equitable and Just Pedestrian Network

Leads: State Delegation, County Executive



Page 101 Update Key Action P-1c as follows:

**P-1c: [Develop] Consider developing legislation to create a new class of commercial driver's license required to operate vehicles with identified pedestrian safety and visibility issues.**

Page 102 Update the first paragraph below Key Action P-1d as follows:

Over time, rules and regulations governing the transportation system change, and new roadway striping, signage, facilities, and signalization approaches are implemented. However, unless a Maryland driver's license has expired for a year or more, there is no requirement to retake either the driving skills or knowledge tests upon license renewal. A knowledge testing requirement, with the option to retake as many times as necessary to pass, would provide an opportunity to bring drivers up to date on changes to the transportation system and relevant laws and regulations since their last license renewal between five and eight years earlier. This would result in better driving and increased safety for all road users. Efforts should be taken to ensure this new requirement does not place an undue burden on the Motor Vehicle Administration. [Additionally, each year the county should notify all county households identifying changes to traffic rules and regulations that have taken effect over the past year.]

Page 102 Change the title of Key Action P-1e as follows:

**P-1[e]f: Study requiring or incentivizing the use of pedestrian detection systems in vehicles registered in Montgomery County.**

Page 102 Add Key Action P-1e and associated text as follows:

**P-1e: Annually notify all county households of changes to traffic rules and regulations that have taken effect over the past year.**

Over time, rules and regulations governing the transportation system change, and new roadway striping, signage, facilities, and signalization approaches are implemented. To help ensure county residents are aware of these changes, and to improve safety for everyone using the transportation system, annual notice of these changes should be provided.

Goal: Pedestrian Safety

Lead: County Executive

Page 114 Remove Key Action P-7d and the associated text.

Page 115 Replace the entirety of Key Action P-8b and associated text as follows:

**P-8b: Consider developing strategies for equitable in-person traffic enforcement activities.**

While there are many benefits to automated enforcement, it is not present everywhere traffic infractions take place and cannot detect certain types of infractions. Of particular relevance to this master plan are violations of the pedestrian right-of-way, stop sign compliance, and other pedestrian-vehicle conflicts. Strategies should be developed to ensure this life-saving enforcement activity takes place and occurs in a fair and equitable fashion.

Goal: Pedestrian Safety

Leads: County Executive, MCPD, County Council, Montgomery Parks

Page 118-119 Update Key Action EA-1d and the associated text as follows:

**EA-1d: Construct the pedestrian clear zone using [Portland cement concrete, in line with] materials approved by MCDOT's Design Standards and Specifications.**

Brick sidewalks present more tripping and slippage hazards than Portland cement concrete, pavers, and some other materials. [Portland cement concrete is a superior sidewalk material, as it is more durable and results in fewer tripping hazards and slippage than bricks, pavers, and other materials.] All future sidewalks should use [this material] MCDOT-approved materials in the pedestrian clear zone, which is a portion of the area within the streetscape's active zone between the street buffer and the frontage zone. The pedestrian clear zone should be free of obstructions of any kind. Other paving materials may be used outside the pedestrian clear zone and in historic districts, as appropriate.

Goals: Equitable and Just Pedestrian Network, Comfortable/Connected Pedestrian Network

Leads: MCDOT, MCDPS, Montgomery Planning

Page 128 Update Key Action EA-9a as follows:

**EA-9a: [Require] Consider requiring [anyone] any construction worker who works in the public right-of-way to take ADA training and maintain ADA certification. [Implement] Consider implementing penalties for observed ADA non-compliance during construction or maintenance that deviates from what was approved on right-of-way permits. Approved right-of-way permits should be easily accessible so members of the public can understand what has been approved.**

Page 129 Remove Key Action F-1a and associated text.

Page 129 Remove Key Action F-1b and associated text.

Page 130 Change the title of Key Action F-1c as follows:

**F-1[c]a: Consider potential legislation to tie vehicle registration fees to safe vehicle design.**

Page 148      Revise the paragraph prior to Table 33 as follows:

As part of the Phase 2 transition, the following table and maps identify the county’s Downtowns, Town Center, Suburban, Industrial and Country areas. Future master plans, sector plans and functional plans are encouraged to modify these boundaries based on the definitions in the CSDG. The Area Type Designations govern the location, relative priority, and dimension of the streetscape elements identified in the Complete Streets Design Guide. The designation of these areas through the Pedestrian Master Plan does not supersede land use or site design requirements identified through existing area master and sector plans or existing county policies.

Page 148-149    Add text as a note at the bottom of Table 33 as follows:

The Downtown interim designation and boundary for the Life Sciences (Great Seneca) area and the designation and boundary for the Traville/USG Town Center will be reviewed when the County Council takes up the *Great Seneca Plan: Connecting Life and Science*. The designation and area boundary for Briggs Chaney Town Center and Briggs Chaney Industrial Area will be reviewed when the County Council takes up the *Fairland and Briggs Chaney Master Plan*. The designation and area boundary for Four Corners Town Center will be reviewed when the County Council takes up the *University Boulevard Corridor Plan*.

Page 152      Add text as a note at the bottom of the map as follows:

The Downtown interim designation and boundary for the Life Sciences (Great Seneca) area and the designation and boundary for the Traville/USG Town Center will be reviewed when the County Council takes up the *Great Seneca Plan: Connecting Life and Science*.

Page 161      Add text as a note at the bottom of the map as follows:

The designation and area boundary for Briggs Chaney Town Center will be reviewed when the County Council takes up the *Fairland and Briggs Chaney Master Plan*.

Page 172      Add text as a note at the bottom of the map as follows:

The designation and area boundary for Four Corners Town Center will be reviewed when the County Council takes up the *University Boulevard Corridor Plan*.

Page 199      Add text as a note at the bottom of the map as follows:

The Downtown interim designation and boundary for the Life Sciences (Great Seneca) area and the designation and boundary for the Traville/USG Town Center

will be reviewed when the County Council takes up the *Great Seneca Plan: Connecting Life and Science*.

Page 207 Add text as a note at the bottom of the map as follows:

The designation and area boundary for Briggs Chaney Industrial Area will be reviewed when the County Council takes up the *Fairland and Briggs Chaney Master Plan*.

Page 278-282 Update the Example Monitoring Report to reflect changes made on Pages 11-20.

### **General**

All illustrations and tables included in the Plan will be revised to reflect the District Council changes to the Planning Board Draft of the Pedestrian Master Plan (May 2023). The text and graphics will be revised as necessary to achieve and improve clarity and consistency, to update factual information, and to convey the actions of the District Council. Graphics and tables will be revised and re-numbered, where necessary, to be consistent with the text and titles.

This is a correct copy of Council action.



---

Sara R. Tenenbaum  
Clerk of the Council