

## Item 6 - Correspondence

**From:** [Tettelbaum, Emily](#)  
**To:** [MCP-Chair](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Site Plan Amendment No. 82022022A  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 17, 2024 11:28:03 AM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)  
[image002.png](#)  
[image003.png](#)  
[image004.png](#)  
[image005.png](#)

---



### Emily Tettelbaum

Planner III, Midcounty Planning Division  
Montgomery County Planning Department  
2425 Reedie Drive, Floor 14, Wheaton, MD 20902  
[emily.tettelbaum@montgomeryplanning.org](mailto:emily.tettelbaum@montgomeryplanning.org)  
o: 301-495-4569



---

**From:** michele russell <michelerusselleinhorn@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 17, 2024 11:19 AM  
**To:** Brockmyer, Richard <Richard.Brockmyer@montgomeryplanning.org>  
**Cc:** Tettelbaum, Emily <Emily.Tettelbaum@montgomeryplanning.org>; Nancy Walz <nancywalz@gmail.com>  
**Subject:** Re: Site Plan Amendment No. 82022022A

**[EXTERNAL EMAIL]** Exercise caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding.

Thank you!  
Sent from my iPhone  
Message by Michele  
Autocorrect and typos by i phone

On Jan 17, 2024, at 11:07 AM, Brockmyer, Richard <[Richard.Brockmyer@montgomeryplanning.org](mailto:Richard.Brockmyer@montgomeryplanning.org)> wrote:

Michele,

You can certainly submit a letter/email or sign up to testify at the Planning Board hearing. I believe you need to sign-up by noon today if that is something you'd like to do.

I do want to note a few other things that might address some of your concerns. While, a motor vehicle analysis was not required, MDOT SHA did request additional vehicular analysis to be completed as part of their review approval process. The applicant complied with that request and per the MDOT SHA letter dated November 28, 2022 they concurred with the report that found that the study intersections would operate at acceptable levels of service under future conditions. The applicant will also be providing the following improvements that will help address vehicular traffic.

1. Installation of a new traffic signal at the Center Site Driveway and Strathmore Avenue

2. The addition of a westbound left-turn lane at the Center Site Driveway access.
3. An additional western access to the site aligned with Stillwater Avenue so that there are two ways to access the site.

I also think it's important to again note that the plan was already approved by the Planning Board in December 2022. The proposed amendment modifies the plan, but this amendment results in a lower trip generation than what was already approved.

Again, you can certainly submit a letter/email or [sign up to testify](#) if you'd like to.

Please let me know if you have any further questions.

Thanks,

<image001.png>

**Richard Brockmyer, AICP**  
Transportation Planner III

Montgomery County Planning Department  
2425 Reedie Drive, Floor 13, Wheaton, MD 20902  
[richard.brockmyer@montgomeryplanning.org](mailto:richard.brockmyer@montgomeryplanning.org)  
o: 301-495-4526

<image002.png>

<image003.png>

<image004.png>

<image005.png>

---

**From:** michele russell <[michelerusselleinhorn@gmail.com](mailto:michelerusselleinhorn@gmail.com)>

**Sent:** Wednesday, January 17, 2024 10:12 AM

**To:** Brockmyer, Richard <[Richard.Brockmyer@montgomeryplanning.org](mailto:Richard.Brockmyer@montgomeryplanning.org)>

**Cc:** Tettelbaum, Emily <[Emily.Tettelbaum@montgomeryplanning.org](mailto:Emily.Tettelbaum@montgomeryplanning.org)>; Nancy Walz <[nancywalz@gmail.com](mailto:nancywalz@gmail.com)>

**Subject:** Re: Site Plan Amendment No. 82022022A

**[EXTERNAL EMAIL]** Exercise caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding.

Hi-thank you very much for your email and the information you provided. As I read it, the project will mean 53 more trips in the morning and 64 in the evening?

This is a one lane in each direction road and these additional trips will cause a significant problem to the neighborhoods along Strathmore. I understand from your email that based upon a policy no traffic study was required but that doesn't seem logical given the narrowness of the road and the number of schools and churches and assisted living facilities along this route.

Is there a way to raise these concerns?

Thank you,

Michele Russell-Einhorn

On Wed, Jan 17, 2024 at 10:01 AM Brockmyer, Richard

<[Richard.Brockmyer@montgomeryplanning.org](mailto:Richard.Brockmyer@montgomeryplanning.org)> wrote:

Michelle,

Thank you for reaching out. The initial [Transportation Study](#) was completed in May of 2022. However, since the project is in a Red Policy Area, a Motor Vehicle Adequacy test was not required. This determination is based on the [Local Area Transportation Review \(LATR\)](#) and [Growth and Infrastructure Policy \(GPI\)](#). These are county wide policies adopted by both the Planning Board and the County Council.

Per the policy, the applicant was required to complete a Transportation Study that included a Pedestrian System Adequacy Test, Bicycle System Adequacy Test, Bus Transit System Adequacy Test as well as a Vision Zero Statement. As part of the study, they also had to submit trip generation data for the proposed development. This is done for a few reasons, including determining the study area for the analysis. Trip generation is estimated using the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, which is a standard methodology used throughout the country. Some modifications are made per the LATR Guidelines to better reflect local conditions. The study was submitted, reviewed, and approved by MNCPPC, MCDOT, and MDOT SHA staff as part of the initial Preliminary and Site Plan approval.

With the most recent amendment, which is going to the Planning Board for approval this week, a supplemental Transportation Statement was submitted. In this case, the applicant had to demonstrate that the change in the plans did not produce additional person trips beyond what was previously approved. If it did, they would have had to complete a new Transportation Study.

Below is a table that is included in the [staff report](#) for the project that shows the difference between the approved plan trip generation and the proposed amendment trip generation. Per the policy guidance, we look at person trips during AM and PM peak hours. This includes vehicle trips as well as walking, biking, and transit trips. Trip generation is reduced in both peak periods with the proposed amendment.

<image006.png>

I understand your concerns is primarily about vehicle trips, so I have created a separate table that shows the difference between the two plans isolating just vehicle trips (see table below). This information is also included in the applicant's [Transportation Statement](#).

Scenario	AM Vehicle Trips	PM Vehicle Trips
Approved Trip Generation	72	90
Proposed Trip Generation	53	64
Net Trip Generation	-19	-26

So, as proposed, during the AM peak period, the site is estimated to generate 53 new vehicle trips and 64 new vehicle trips during the PM peak period. This is a reduction in trips from the approved plan.

I realize this is a lot of information to take in, so I am happy to jump on a call to discuss this further if that is helpful or continue to answer any questions you may have via email.

Thanks,

**Richard Brockmyer, AICP**  
Transportation Planner III

<image001.png>

Montgomery County Planning Department  
2425 Reedie Drive, Floor 13, Wheaton, MD 20902  
[richard.brockmyer@montgomeryplanning.org](mailto:richard.brockmyer@montgomeryplanning.org)  
o: 301-495-4526

[<image002.png>](#)

[<image003.png>](#)

[<image004.png>](#)

[<image005.png>](#)

---

**From:** michele russell <[michelerusselleinhorn@gmail.com](mailto:michelerusselleinhorn@gmail.com)>

**Sent:** Tuesday, January 16, 2024 4:33 PM

**To:** Tettelbaum, Emily <[Emily.Tettelbaum@montgomeryplanning.org](mailto:Emily.Tettelbaum@montgomeryplanning.org)>; Brockmyer, Richard <[Richard.Brockmyer@montgomeryplanning.org](mailto:Richard.Brockmyer@montgomeryplanning.org)>

**Cc:** Nancy Walz <[nancywalz@gmail.com](mailto:nancywalz@gmail.com)>

**Subject:** Re: Site Plan Amendment No. 82022022A

**[EXTERNAL EMAIL]** Exercise caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding.

Thank you.

Hi Richard-

My name is Michele Russell-Einhorn and I live at 4711 Waverly AVenue in Garrett Park. I am very concerned about this new development in large part because traffic is already a major problem. Strathmore is a one lane in each direction road that is a cut through between Rockville pike and Connecticut avenue. It has schools and assisted living facilities on Strathmore and at certain times of the day-when school begins and is let out--the cars travel at about 5 mph.

I cannot figure out when the traffic study was conducted but it should be done at peak usage of Strathmore and not during the pandemic.

Can you clarify for me when the study was done and how the increased traffic on Strathmore from the development will increase/impact the current situation?

Thank you.

Michele Russell-Einhorn

[michelerusselleinhorn@gmail.com](mailto:michelerusselleinhorn@gmail.com)

On Tue, Jan 16, 2024 at 8:08 AM Tettelbaum, Emily

<[Emily.Tettelbaum@montgomeryplanning.org](mailto:Emily.Tettelbaum@montgomeryplanning.org)> wrote:

Good Morning Ms. Russell-Einhorn,

Questions about the traffic study are best directed to the transportation planner for this project, Richard Brockmyer, cc'ed on this email. You are welcome to testify at the hearing, but your questions might not be answered; it really depends on the what that Planning Board Commissioners choose to discuss. Information about participating in Planning Board hearings is available [here](#).

Best Regards,  
Emily

<image007.png>

**Emily Tettelbaum**

Planner III, Midcounty Planning Division  
Montgomery County Planning Department  
2425 Reedie Drive, Floor 14, Wheaton, MD 20902  
[emily.tettelbaum@montgomeryplanning.org](mailto:emily.tettelbaum@montgomeryplanning.org)  
o: 301-495-4569

<image008.png>

<image009.png>

<image010.png>

<image011.png>

---

**From:** michele russell <[michelerusselleinhorn@gmail.com](mailto:michelerusselleinhorn@gmail.com)>

**Sent:** Monday, January 15, 2024 9:16 AM

**To:** Tettelbaum, Emily <[Emily.Tettelbaum@montgomeryplanning.org](mailto:Emily.Tettelbaum@montgomeryplanning.org)>

**Subject:** Site Plan Amendment No. 82022022A

**[EXTERNAL EMAIL]** Exercise caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding.

Hello-I live in Garrett Park and am concerned about this development and the impact on traffic and have questions about the traffic study. Do I need to sign up to testify to ask questions?

Thanks

Michele Russell-Einhorn

**From:** [Arthur Ribeiro](#)  
**To:** [MCP-Chair](#)  
**Cc:** [Tettelbaum, Emily](#); [Vanessa Lide](#); [councilmember.Stewart@montgomerycountymd.gov](mailto:councilmember.Stewart@montgomerycountymd.gov);  
[Councilmember.Glass@montgomerycountymd.gov](mailto:Councilmember.Glass@montgomerycountymd.gov)  
**Subject:** Testimony for 4910/4920 STRATHMORE PRELIMINARY PLAN AMENDMENT (January 18, 2024)  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 17, 2024 11:17:30 AM

---

**[EXTERNAL EMAIL]** Exercise caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding.

January 17, 2024

Chairman Artie Harris  
Montgomery County Planning Board  
2425 Reedie Drive 14th floor  
Wheaton, Maryland 20902

Dear Chairman Artie Harris and Members of the Planning Board,

On behalf of the Garrett Park Estates-White Flint Park Citizens Association (“GPE-WFP”), I submit the following testimony to the Planning Board. GPE-WFP represents the families and residents of more than 650 homes. Our single-family homes are adjacent to the proposed development of 4910-4920 Strathmore Avenue.

GPE-WFP supports the testimony of our community resident Vanessa Lide and her neighbors on the reduction of the existing vegetated median, which goes against the promise made at previous Planning Board meetings.

I am a resident and homeowner at 5101 Strathmore Avenue, which is on the corner with Stillwater Avenue and across the street from the proposed development. I have lived here for 16 years with my wife and three children who all attend or attended Garrett Park Elementary School, Tilden Middle School, and Walter Johnson High School.

Our community has two concerns with the existing development plan: traffic management and stormwater management.

I testified here before the Planning Board during previous Public Hearings for this site. My neighbors and I highlighted many concerns with this development, most of which this Planning Board ignored, but the main one had to do with traffic. Strathmore Avenue (which is MD State Route 547) is a key east-west connection between Rockville Pike and Connecticut Avenue despite being only a 2-lane state road. It sees particularly heavy traffic during AM and PM peak hours given the presence of four schools in the half-mile stretch of this road that coincides with this development. And that’s in addition to the normal rush hour traffic, which has become heavier as fewer people take public transit. In fact, the Maryland SHA agreed with our conclusion that

there were issues with the traffic analysis commissioned by the developers, and requested additional studies. They rightly concluded that this development, as currently planned, would result in “unacceptable delay and queuing” on Strathmore Avenue.

To mitigate this traffic problem, I suggest two solutions: 1) to build a separate entrance to the Academy of the Holy Cross from Tuckerman La. and 2) to install a traffic light at the intersection of Strathmore Ave., Stillwater Ave., and Chamber Street.

The first and best solution for relieving traffic on Strathmore Avenue during these peak periods would be to divert all traffic associated with the Academy of the Holy Cross away from Strathmore Avenue, by building a road connection to the Academy from Tuckerman Lane. Tuckerman Lane is a 4-lane road with very little traffic, and is much better suited to handle peak school-time traffic. It's a win-win for everyone involved. The Academy wouldn't have to fund the crossing guard every day on Strathmore Avenue, and would have a private entrance to their school which they could secure, unlike the current one going through this new residential community. The residents of this new development would also benefit by not having school traffic going through their neighborhood during peak hours every day. And the county would benefit by having less congestion and traffic on an important east-west artery during rush hour. The developers are against this solution since it would be costly to them. They have hidden behind the excuse that it would have an environmental impact, an excuse that the Planning Department has facilitated. Since the Stoneybrook community has already built a bridge over this same creek at Cloister Drive, I don't see any issues with building another bridge over it.

The second solution would be to install a new traffic light. The Maryland SHA stated that adding a stop light at the center entrance of the development with a west-bound left-turn lane into the development from Strathmore Avenue is a requirement for this development to address the “unacceptable delay and queuing”. The concern I and my neighbors have with this solution is that it would prevent residents in Garrett Park Estates (and its more than 650 homes) from exiting our neighborhood to go east on Strathmore Avenue during peak traffic. We already have great difficulty to make a left turn onto Strathmore Ave. from Stillwater Ave. or Flanders Ave. to go east during peak traffic periods, and the added congestion caused by the traffic light could make it impossible to exit our neighborhood. Stillwater and Flanders Avenues are the only roads we can use to exit our neighborhood to go East. Our preferred placement for the traffic light is at Stillwater Avenue and the planned west entrance of the development, Chamber Street. I urge the Planning Board to consider this configuration.

Another advantage to placing the stoplight at the intersection of Strathmore and Stillwater Avenues is that it would improve pedestrian safety at this intersection. This is a very dangerous crossing for pedestrians, since there is no pedestrian crossing light. It's especially dangerous at night since it's a very poorly lit intersection. I've almost been hit by a car at that intersection myself. The pedestrian crossing sign has been run over several times. I have witnessed multiple car crashes at this intersection

in the years I have lived here. Therefore, I again urge the planning Board to place the stoplight at the intersection of Strathmore and Stillwater Avenues and the new western entrance of the development (Chamber Street) instead of at Strathmore Ave. and the center entrance of the development (Academy Park Drive)

My second main concern with this development is stormwater management. The intersection of Strathmore and Stillwater Avenues is a topographic low point for this area, and because the creek that crosses under Strathmore Avenue is clogged, water frequently puddles and floods on the access road at this intersection in front of my house, even after light rains. In reviewing the plans for this new development, I noticed that where the undeveloped land is currently flat and below the height of Strathmore Ave., the new development will be raised up to a height above Strathmore Ave. and the western entrance road (Chamber Street) will slope down to Strathmore Avenue. This means that a huge new amount of water will flow towards Strathmore Avenue at this low point that already frequently floods. Flooding of Strathmore Avenue would close traffic on this vital east-west artery not just to cars, but to emergency vehicles, with life-threatening consequences. I urge the county to ensure that stormwater from this development doesn't drain towards Strathmore Avenue, but instead drains downstream, south of Strathmore Avenue.

In summary, I urge you to address the traffic and stormwater issues as follows:

1. Require the developers and the Academy of the Holy Cross to build an entrance to the school from Tuckerman Lane, relieving Strathmore Avenue of school traffic during peak AM and PM rush hour.
2. Require the developers to install the traffic light at the intersection of Stillwater Avenue, Strathmore Avenues, and Chamber Street (a 4-way intersection) instead of at the central entrance to the development (a 3-way intersection).
3. Require the developers to ensure that the stormwater from this development doesn't drain towards Strathmore Avenue, but instead drains downstream south of Strathmore Avenue.

Thank you for your consideration.

Best Regards,

Arthur Ribeiro  
5101 Strathmore Avenue



**From:** [Vanessa Lide](#)  
**To:** [MCP-Chair; councilmember.stewart@montgomerycountymd.gov;](#)  
[emily.tettelbaum@montgomeryplanningboard.org;](#) [Graham, Tamika;](#)  
[Councilmember.Glass@montgomerycountymd.gov](#)  
**Cc:** [Vanessa Lide](#)  
**Subject:** 1-18-2024, Item 6: 4910/4920 Strathmore: Preliminary Plan Amendment No. 12022016A, Site Plan Amendment No. 82022022A, Forest Conservation Plan No. F20240120 (Public Hearing)  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 17, 2024 10:50:59 AM

---

**[EXTERNAL EMAIL]** Exercise caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding.

Dear Planning Board members,

The latest set of drawings for the 4910/4920 Strathmore Avenue development appear to shift westbound traffic almost a full lane closer to the homes on the north side of Strathmore Avenue. I'd like to request full details and further discussion on several points:

- 1) Exactly how much of the existing green center buffer zone on the north side of Strathmore Avenue will be cut away and turned into roadway, in the new design? It now appears to be considerably more than the "cleaning up uneven margins, by 1-2 feet" discussed at length in the last public hearings. Earlier still in the planning process, neighbors along the north side were promised "no changes to the green buffer strip" -- we take a keen interest in preserving the green center buffer zone that separates our homes from the main Strathmore Avenue traffic artery.
- 2) Why does the proposed green strip/path along the south side actually bump northwards into the street, apparently to accommodate new plantings along the proposed path on the south side of Strathmore Avenue? The development site is for property on the south side of Strathmore Avenue -- why is the developer allowed to shift the impact and activity north, and propose changes that affect the safety and comfort of the residents who have long lived on the north side of Strathmore Avenue?
- 3) Have there been Noise Attenuation surveys to gauge the impact of road noise on the existing homes along the north side of Strathmore Avenue, given the proposal to shift the westbound lane of traffic to the north by cutting into the existing green buffer strip? Pages 9-10 of the preliminary site template note extensive Noise Attenuation requirements related to traffic noise that may affect the proposed new homes on the south side of Strathmore Avenue. But the new site design now places an unfair burden on the people living in older homes along the north side of Strathmore Avenue -- by pushing road noise and car exhaust closer to our living rooms and bedrooms. These are not modern, soundproofed homes.
- 4) What are the proposals to visually shield homes along the north side of Strathmore Avenue by restoring the plantings/trees/shrubs? The earlier Forest Conservation Plans showed all the existing trees/shrubs being removed in this green buffer zone along the north side of Strathmore Avenue. People who walk along the green buffer strip would lose this visual and sound buffer, along with the safety of the trees/shrubs that help separate people/children/dogs from oncoming traffic on the main roadway.

And several families, mine included, now face the prospect of our living spaces lit up by

constant oncoming headlights from the new road, flashing lights from the new traffic lights and walk signals, not to mention noise from the audible pedestrian alerts. Given the extensive plans to beautify the south side of Strathmore Avenue, where are the plans to preserve the existing green buffer zone strip on the north side of Strathmore Avenue -- and the plans and commitment to restore the trees/shrubs that have long created a visual and sound barrier to road traffic along the main roadway? The proposed plans and planning process seem to give the developer every right to dig up and change this existing green buffer zone strip, but no duty to restore these plantings, or preserve the existing separation between the main roadway and the existing homes.

In addition, I echo the concerns of other neighbors about the increase in traffic along this busy road, increase in stormwater run-off, the placement of the traffic light, and the likelihood that realigning the western entrance of the project with Stillwater Avenue would make it more difficult and dangerous for people living along the north side of Strathmore Avenue to exit our neighborhoods safely.

Thank you,

Vanessa Lide  
5013 Strathmore Avenue  
Kensington, MD 20895

**From:** [Patricia Taylor](#)  
**To:** [MCP-Chair](#)  
**Cc:** [Graham Taylor](#); [Patricia Taylor](#)  
**Subject:** 4910/4920 Strathmore Preliminary Plan Amendment  
**Date:** Monday, January 15, 2024 3:35:57 PM

---

**[EXTERNAL EMAIL]** Exercise caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding.

Good Afternoon,

I am writing to you in regards to the upcoming hearing for 4910/4920 Strathmore Preliminary Plan Amendment scheduled for January 18, 2024. As a resident of the Stoneybrook community, I am concerned with the ongoing changes to developments in our immediate area that will impact the capacity of our schools. We purchased our home in part because of the good local schools and I am concerned about overcrowding, particularly at Garrett Park Elementary School, which appears to have limited capacity for expansion given that it is adjacent to a county park. The development by the Grosvenor metro had age restrictions in place to help with school crowding concerns, but that was lifted by the county. Now this Strathmore development wants to change the plans for having a residential care facility to having residential homes. **This change is not insignificant and can overcrowd our schools. I ask the Montgomery County Planning Board to reject Preliminary Plan Amendment No. 12022016A and Site Plan Amendment No. 82022022A.**

If you have any questions, please contact me at 301-792-0222 or [triciak7@gmail.com](mailto:triciak7@gmail.com).

Thank you,  
Patricia Taylor

---

January 16, 2024

Ms. Katie Wagner  
Gorove/ Slade Associates, Inc.  
1140 Connecticut Avenue NW, Suite 600  
Washington, DC, 20036

Dear Ms. Wagner:

Thank you for the opportunity to review the Local Area Transportation Review (LATR) prepared by Gorove/ Slade Associates, Inc, for the (St. Angela Hall– SHA Tracking #21-AP-MO-011-xx) in Montgomery County, Maryland. The Supplemental Analysis dated November 7, 2022 was also reviewed for purposes associated with the State Highway Administration (SHA) access review. The State Highway Administration (SHA) review is complete, and we are pleased to respond.

- Proposed access to the 17 single-family detached homes and 108 townhomes is via three (3) existing curb cuts along Strathmore Avenue (MD 547).
- The following intersections were analyzed under existing, background and future conditions:
  - MD 355 (Rockville Pike) and MD 547 (Strathmore Avenue)
  - MD 547 (Strathmore Avenue) and Stillwater Avenue/ School Driveway
  - MD 547 (Strathmore Avenue) and Center Site Driveway
  - MD 547 (Strathmore Avenue) and East Side Driveway
  - MD 547 (Strathmore Avenue) and Kenilworth Avenue
  - MD 355 (Rockville Pike) and Flanders Avenue/ Wickshire Way
- The report concludes that the study intersections will continue to operate at acceptable levels of service under future conditions.

Based on the information provided, please address the following comments in a point-by-point response:

**Regional and Intermodal Planning Division (RIPD) Comments (By: Darren Bean):**

No comments.

**Travel Forecasting and Analysis Division (TFAD) Comments (By: Scott Holcomb):**

- TFAD is in agreement with the statement that forecasted site traffic is reduced from the previous proposal that included the residential care facility due to the modification in the land use.
- The MUTCD Traffic Signal Warrants 2 and 3 appear to be met, and we defer to the District and OOTS for the approval of the signal. March 2022 data was used for the warrant analysis.

**District Traffic Comments (By: Alvin Powell):**

We have completed a review of the preliminary/site plan amendment for the St. Angela Hall project in Montgomery County. The preliminary site plan amendment involves removing the residential care facility land use that was approved in a previous site plan application, increasing the proposed number of single family detached units from 10 to 17 units and decreasing the number of townhomes proposed from 115 to 108 units. We offer the following comments:

1. Based on the trip generation comparison presented, SHA agrees that the proposed land use amendments to the approved preliminary site plan have a net overall impact of decreasing the projected trips to and from the proposed development.
2. We concur with the findings of the traffic signal warrant analysis that the projected total future volumes at MD 564 and Street A meet traffic signal Warrants 2, Four Hour Vehicular Volume and 3, Peak Hour. However, the major and minor street volume thresholds provided for Warrant 1 in Table 6 are inconsistent with the lane configurations shown at MD 564 and Street A in the Proposed Off-site Improvements Concept Plans. For the lane configuration presented, the major and minor street thresholds shall be as follows based MDMUTCD Section 4C.02 “Warrant 1, Eight-Hour Vehicular Volumes:”
  - a. Condition A – Minimum Vehicular Volume  
(Major/Minor) – (600/150)
  - b. Condition B – Interruption of Continuous Traffic  
(Major/Minor) – (900/75)
  - c. Condition A & B
    - i. Condition A - Minimum Vehicular Volume  
(Major/Minor) – (480/120)
    - ii. Condition B - Interruption of Continuous Traffic  
(Major/Minor) – (720/60)

Ms. Wagner  
SHA Tracking No.: 21-AP-MO-011-xx  
Page 3 of 3  
January 16, 2024

**Traffic Development & Support Division (TDSD) Comments (By: Yeshitla Argaw):**

- We agree that the generated traffic volume in the updated project is less than the approved project proposal.
- We have reviewed the TSWA, it met warrant 2 and warrant 3. We agree that the signal provision is required at the intersection of Access A and Strathmore Avenue. As previously agreed, the signal will operate only during school admission and dismissal hours. When the development is constructed, and the forecasted volume is realized the developer need to submit TSWA and need to demonstrate the need for signal.

Please submit a CD containing the traffic impact study, all supporting documentation, and a point-by-point response addressing the comments noted above to Mr. Kwesi Woodroffe. Please reference the SHA tracking number on any future submissions. Please keep in mind that you can view the reviewer and project status via SHA Access Management Division web page at <http://www.roads.maryland.gov/pages/amd.aspx>. If you have any questions, or require additional information, please contact Mr. Kwesi Woodroffe at 301-513-7347, by using our toll free number in Maryland only at 1-800-876-4742 (x7347) or via email at [KWoodroffe@mdot.maryland.gov](mailto:KWoodroffe@mdot.maryland.gov).

Sincerely,



1/17/2024

for Derek Gunn,  
District Engineer, District 3, SHA

DG/ts

cc: Yeshitla Argaw, SHA – TDSD  
Darren Bean, SHA – RIPD  
Scott Holcomb, SHA – TFAD  
Alvin Powell, SHA – District 3 Traffic  
Tamika Graham, Montgomery Planning ([tamika.graham@montgomeryplanning.org](mailto:tamika.graham@montgomeryplanning.org))  
Matt Folden, Montgomery Planning ([matthew.folden@montgomeryplanning.org](mailto:matthew.folden@montgomeryplanning.org))