

Comment #	Testimony Source	Written Testimony ID	Commenter	Plan Section Reference	Plan Page # (if applicable)	Comment Topic	Comment / Issue	Staff Response / Recommendation
10	Written	D	MDP	Transportation (3.B)	-	Transportation facilities	Transportation Element - MDP is pleased to note that Montgomery County plans to create “a more complete, connected, and sustainable” community (page 19) for the Clarksburg Gateway Sector Plan Area. The Draft Plan supports a complete, connected, and sustainable land use pattern, prioritizing “higher-capacity transit services over single-occupancy vehicle infrastructure” (page 34) and including a planned Complete Streets network, which will promote alternative transportation, e.g., taking transit, walking, biking, and rolling, to travel by single-occupancy vehicle. These policies are consistent with the Maryland Transportation Planning Principle. With the proposed land use and zoning changes to the area east of I-270, from employment/office/industrial oriented uses to mixed commercial and residential uses, the county recommends removing a formally planned interchange with I-270 and replacing it with an east-west Little Seneca Parkway over I-270 to help form a connected local roadway network. MDP supports this recommendation. We recognize that this aligns with the sector plan’s vision and the transportation goals,	Staff supports creating a new map identifying the public transit recommendations of the draft plan. This can be included in the Planning Board Draft transmittal to the County Council. Staff supports adding the Public Hearing Draft’s recommended trail connections to the Planned Bikeways Map (also in response to a comment from MCDOT). The Public Hearing Draft includes recommendations for intersection improvements at Clarksburg HS and Rocky Hill MS. Staff supports adding an additional recommendation to improve the existing pedestrian and bicycle facilities <u>along</u> Frederick Road in the vicinity of these schools, as well.
10 (con't)	Written	D	MDP	Transportation (3.B)	-	Transportation facilities	MDP provides the following suggestions relating to the Draft Plan • If feasible, it would be helpful to provide a map to illustrate the proposed public transportation recommendations (pages 37 and 38). • The Draft Plan promotes “safe routes to school” and includes recommendations for improving pedestrian and bicycle crossing at several intersections near Rocky Hill Middle School and Clarksburg High School. MDP staff suggests the county consider the following to further enhance walking and biking to schools: - o Include an additional illustrative map (see page 49) that depicts a potential publicly accessible trail(s)/connection(s) to Rocky Hill Middle School and Clarksburg High School from the area west of the schools. - o Consider improving the existing pedestrian and bicycle facilities connecting to the high and middle schools along Frederick Road, since Figure 9 (page 36) shows either “Undesirable” or “Uncomfortable” for the pedestrian level of comfort on the segment of Frederick Road.	
12	Written	D	MDP	Transportation (3.B)	-	General	In general, the Plan is consistent with MDOT plans and programs. The MDOT supports the goals of the Plan, including the vision of a multi-modal transportation future for Clarksburg that is characterized by safe streets and human-centered design that serves a Complete and Compact Community and supports environmentally responsible growth. Commuter Choice Maryland is MDOT’s Travel Demand Management (TDM) program, and it could be incorporated into the Plan as a strategy to support the Plan. The program offers an extensive menu of commuter transportation services, such as ridesharing and incentives.	Staff acknowledges this comment.
13	Written	D	MDP	Transportation (3.B)	-	Travel Demand Management	The MDOT supports continued improvements to expand and enhance transit options. Please coordinate with the Maryland Transit Administration (MTA) Office of Statewide Planning for any coordination regarding regional transit and the coordination of MDOT supported locally-operated transit services (LOTS). The MTA also supports park and ride (with SHA), demand response services, paratransit, medical services, and senior-center transportation options.	Staff supports MDOT’s TDM program, Commuter Choice Maryland, however, the Clarksburg Gateway Sector Plan is not located within a designated Transportation Management District, which provide concentrated services to encourage the use of transit and other commuting options in Montgomery County’s major business districts.
14	Written	D	MDP	Transportation (3.B)	-	Transit planning	The MDOT supports continued improvements to expand and enhance transit options. Please coordinate with the Maryland Transit Administration (MTA) Office of Statewide Planning for any coordination regarding regional transit and the coordination of MDOT supported locally-operated transit services (LOTS). The MTA also supports park and ride (with SHA), demand response services, paratransit, medical services, and senior-center transportation options.	The Public Hearing Draft includes recommendations that implement the county’s Corridor Forward: I-270 Transit Plan and planned MD 355 Flash BRT route in the Clarksburg area. These transit services will be coordinated with MDOT and MTA as they progress through their planning and funding phases. The draft plan also recommends establishing public park-and-ride facilities to serve planned transit services (4.B.3).
15	Written	D	Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT)	Plan Framework (2.B) and Transportation (3.B)	19-21	Expand active transportation framework elements	Consider bike-ability for both short- and long-term trips in the concept framework plan. Consider walking, biking, and rolling needs on connectors that prioritize travel through the Plan Area.	The high-level Concept Framework Plan is not well-suited to showing detailed recommendations for different lengths of bike trips. The Public Hearing Draft includes a number of recommendations that will establish new (or enhance existing) infrastructure for walking, biking, and rolling, regardless of the desired trip length. The draft plan’s recommendation to establish a Bike Breezeway along Gateway Center Drive and Observation Drive Extended (Figure 13) would be part of a longer, prioritized bike facility between Clarksburg and Gaithersburg that supports long-distance cycling along a low-stress bike route.

Comment #	Testimony Source	Written Testimony ID	Commenter	Plan Section Reference	Plan Page # (if applicable)	Comment Topic	Comment / Issue	Staff Response / Recommendation
16	Written	D	MDOT	Transportation (3.B)	19, 48	Complete Streets	The MDOT supports the County's vision to pursue complete streets design that encourages the efficient use of land and transportation resources. Such planning is in line with MDOT's emphasis on improving connectivity, access, and mobility for all users as emphasized by SHA's Context Driven initiative, which focuses transportation practitioners on implementing context-appropriate improvements to emphasize safety, access, and mobility for all users, especially those more vulnerable such as pedestrians and bicyclists.	Staff acknowledges this comment.
17	Written	D	MDOT	Transportation (3.B)	-	Bike and Pedestrian amenities at bus stops	Consider incorporating bicycle and pedestrian connectivity to and pedestrian-friendly amenities at local bus stops, in addition to major transit stations.	The draft plan's recommended completion of bicycle and pedestrian paths and trails are intended to improve connectivity throughout the Clarksburg community, including to existing and future bus stops. Pedestrian-friendly bus stop amenities, such as furniture, shelter, waste receptables, lighting, etc. are typically managed by MCDOT and Ride On, depending on rider demand, physical feasibility, and funding. However, Staff supports adding a new recommendation to support such improvements and connectivity enhancements at bus stops in the vicinity of the plan area.
18	Written	D	MDOT	Transportation (3.B)	-	Utilize Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress analysis	Use MDOT's Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress typology to support the Plan's data-driven approach to active transportation improvements and complement the County's Pedestrian Level of Comfort analysis.	Staff does consider Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress (BLTS) when considering recommendations for bicycle facilities and connections as part of a master planning process. Including a map of current BLTS in the sector plan may help to illustrate the relationship between existing and planned bicycle facilities and how people experience their travel by bicycle with and without them.
19	Written	D	MDOT	Transportation (3.B)	-	Improving walking conditions on existing roadways	Clarify the County's policy or approach to improving walking conditions on existing roadways. If the County anticipates certain right-of-way needs, MDOT encourages the County to discuss this in the recommendations.	Improving walking comfort levels is a focus for the county. The County's Complete Streets Design Guide (CSDG) identifies the type of sidewalks and sidepaths that should be provided for each roadway classification in the county. This plan identifies roadway classifications consistent with the CSDG. The County also has a countywide functional Pedestrian Master Plan which identifies goals and strategies for improving pedestrian facilities and comfort levels across the county. Additionally, the Travel Monitoring Report, published every 2 years, tracks how the county is achieving these goals. A pedestrian survey to support this effort is also collected on a routine basis. All development applications in the County are required to provide dedication or easements to accommodate these facilities and these are typically required to be constructed as part of the development. Additionally, the Local Area Transportation Review (LATR) Guidelines for projects that generate a certain level of trip generation are required to assess a variety of transportation deficiencies off-site from the project, including pedestrian facilities that are not comfortable. The County CIP also includes pedestrian improvement projects. Staff believes that the draft plan's identification of roadway classifications supports improving walking conditions by establishing what facilities will be required throughout the planning area, including ROW needs.
20	Written	D	MDOT	Transportation (3.B)	-	Applying context-sensitive measures at intersections	Consider future context-sensitive countermeasures, particularly at intersections and crossings, to expand on the Plan's typical sections.	The Public Hearing Draft includes a recommendation to prioritize pedestrian and bicycle safety and comfort at key intersections in the plan area through improvements, in conformance with Complete Streets Design Guide and Vision Zero best practices. These improvements will be context-sensitive and possibly in addition to the plan's recommended typical street sections. (see Recommendation #3.B.12)
21	Written	D	MDOT	Transportation (3.B)	-	Sharing sidewalk and sidepath data	Upon implementation, please share any new sidewalk or shared-use path data with MDOT.	Staff will share any new sidewalk, shared use path, or trail data will MDOT upon implementation of these facilities, including geographic map information, user data, etc., as available.

Comment #	Testimony Source	Written Testimony ID	Commenter	Plan Section Reference	Plan Page # (if applicable)	Comment Topic	Comment / Issue	Staff Response / Recommendation
22	Written	D	MDOT	Transportation (3.B)	-	Bicycle and Pedestrian maintenance needs	Consider the ongoing maintenance needs of bicycle and pedestrian facilities throughout the Plan area. Coordinate maintenance needs with the planned MD 355 Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) corridor.	Staff appreciate the need to anticipate consistent and timely maintenance of bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and their coordination with the MD 355 Flash BRT line, throughout the plan area, yet these considerations are not typically the purview of master plans. Generally, capital project funding, design, construction, and maintenance is the responsibility of other public agencies.
23	Written	D	MDOT	Transportation (3.B)	-	Prioritize SRTS improvements	Continue to prioritize Safe Routes to School (SRTS) engineering improvements to the three schools located in the Plan area in the Plan's implementation and through the County's SRTS program.	Staff acknowledges this comment.
24	Written	D	MDOT	Transportation (3.B)	-	Coordinate for bicycle and pedestrian improvements	The MDOT recommends coordinating with Luis Gonzalez, Chief of the SHA Active Transportation Division for pedestrian and bicycle accommodations along MD 355 (Frederick Road).	Staff will reach out to Mr. Gonzalez to coordinate pedestrian and bicycle accommodations on MD 355 (Frederick Road)
27	Written	F	CEX - cover letter	Travel Analysis (Appendix K)	-	Ensure that planned growth is accompanied by adequate public facilities	The Department of Transportation concludes that the Draft's transportation recommendations will not support the recommended population growth. "... the Plan will reduce overall job accessibility, increase travel time, and increase vehicle miles traveled (VMT) in an area of the county that already experiences 'some of the longest travel times across all modes and experiences significant job and services accessibility challenges'."	What the travel analysis model does not show is that additional housing in the Clarksburg area will reduce travel times and increase job accessibility for people who will now have housing options that did not exist before. These people may currently live in farther outlying areas or be new entrants to the region. They may also choose to relocate to Clarksburg from another part of the county because they prefer a larger or newer house and don't mind extra commuting time. The reason Clarksburg has "some of the longest travel times across all modes and experiences significant job and services accessibility challenges" is because it is located farther away from the major regional job centers than any other community in the county. The Clarksburg plan cannot move Clarksburg to a more convenient location. Current and future Clarksburg residents make trade-offs between location and other housing characteristics like size, cost, and building age. All recent master plans have emphasized adding housing so that current and future residents have more options to reconcile competing desires for location, accessibility, amenities, and house size and quality. Additionally, Clarksburg residents expressed the desire for more local-serving retail and services. The area currently lacks these amenities because Clarksburg lacks the population to support them. If additional population does spur new businesses, they will provide local jobs for residents and shorten trip times to access these amenities.
30	Written	F	CEX - cover letter	Travel Analysis (Appendix K)	-	Avoid degradation of transportation performance metrics as growth occurs	Based on an analysis of four scenarios provided in Appendix K of the Plan, the Department of Transportation concludes that even with the full buildout of the BRT/Corridor Connector network, areawide connectivity and travel time will degrade significantly and the Draft's transportation recommendations will not support the recommended population growth.	Much of the difference in the metric performance is due primarily to the land use differences between the existing master plan (baseline 2045) and the rest of the scenarios. However, the land use in the baseline 2045 scenario no longer represents the vision for the plan area.
43	Written	F	CEX - Department of Transportation (MCDOT) letter	Transportation (3.B.6.a)	40	Maintain the existing Little Seneca Creek bridge crossing for the Observation Drive alignment	MCDOT recommends that the plan maintain the existing Little Seneca bridge crossing alignment to limit design changes to current bridge plans, to environmental impacts, and to property needs. The remainder of the alignment north of the bridge should respect topography, natural resources, property boundaries, and redevelopment potential while providing a direct path of travel to minimize vehicle-miles-traveled and transit travel time.	This is the intent of the draft plan recommendation. Staff suggests adding language under Recommendation 3.B.6.a indicating that Observation Drive Extended should maintain the existing Little Seneca Creek bridge crossing alignment to limit design changes to current bridge plans, environmental impacts, and property needs.
44	Written	F	CEX - MCDOT letter	Transportation (3.B)	43	Promote parallel north-south street connections along Observation Drive to provide adequate network capacity	Observation Drive Cross Section: The Plan proposes to limit the cross section of Observation Drive to two travel lanes and two dedicated bus lanes (one travel lane and one bus lane in each direction). The prior configuration included four travel lanes (two in each direction). The reduced capacity of Observation Drive may limit its utility as by-pass of MD 355, as prior plans had imagined. MCDOT will await traffic analysis to ensure this lane reduction will not result in a meaningful degradation in area-wide through movement. With this recommended capacity reduction for Observation Drive, MCDOT recommends that the plan include parallel north-south road connectivity through the proposed street grid to provide additional capacity and redundancy for this area. This concept appears to be implicit in the proposed framework, but a secondary corridor is not explicitly identified. We suggest that multiple smaller roads are more effective than one larger road.	In addition to the master planned streets of the draft plan are recommendations for non-master plan streets to contribute to an expanded local street grid. Additionally, the Community Design Concept Illustration (Figure 24, p. 62) will guide the establishment of complementary street grid to the plan's master planned streets. Planning Staff is open to discussing whether any additional master planned streets should be recommended to realize the plan's vision of a connected street grid.

Comment #	Testimony Source	Written Testimony ID	Commenter	Plan Section Reference	Plan Page # (if applicable)	Comment Topic	Comment / Issue	Staff Response / Recommendation
45	Written	F	CEX - MCDOT letter	Transportation (3.B)	43	Support for interim travel lanes prior to dedicated express bus lanes on Observation Drive	As an interim condition, Planning Staff is recommending that the bus lanes be used as parking lanes until BRT/express bus operations are initiated, at which time the lanes could be switched to dedicated bus lanes. MCDOT supports an interim approach that allows either parking or travel lanes based on our experience with lane repurposing elsewhere. A similar approach was implemented in the Crown area of Gaithersburg both on Fields Road (a County road) and Decoverly Drive (a City street). In both cases, development fronts the road and additional width for on-street parking is provided. The resulting sections have worked well for repurposing of the rightmost travel lane as a bus-only lane.	Staff understands the concern about establishing interim road especially with the uncertainty of future transit service and demand. We propose to remove the interim cross section A/B on page 47 and instead add language to Recommendation 3.B.9 as follows: "At the time of design or construction, the outer lanes may be designated as interim parking or drive lanes, as appropriate, in advance of future dedicated bus lanes."
46	Written	F	CEX - MCDOT letter	Transportation (3.B.5.d)	39	Retain the planned I-270 interchange (Exit 17)	The Plan proposes to remove the interchange between Little Seneca Parkway and I-270. Instead, Little Seneca Parkway is proposed to extend as a two-lane bridge to the Cabin Branch community. MCDOT does not support this recommendation at this time; instead, we suggest that the plan maintain the interchange recommendation and explore a range of interchange options that can work with present and future constrained conditions. Additionally, a connection across I-270 is already possible a short distance to the south using West Old Baltimore Road. The cost of constructing the overpass without an interchange does not appear justified if it does not facilitate connectivity to I-270. Maintaining the interchange is important to support potential commercial use in this plan area. The additional connectivity to I-270 will also reduce traffic pressure on the MD 121 interchange to the north and the Father Hurley Boulevard interchange to the south and will reduce north-south travel on Observation Drive, reinforcing the recommendation to reduce its cross-section. Increased connectivity to I-270 will also reduce vehicle-miles traveled through residential and proposed town center areas both within and outside this plan area, resulting in improved safety and reduced negative impacts from through traffic flow.	The Public Hearing Draft recommends removing the planned Exit 17 I-270 interchange from the Master Plan of Highways and Transitways (MPOHT) as part of the plan's overall vision to establish complete, compact development along the planned Observation Drive corridor. Staff believes a new highway interchange does not support this vision of future development and placemaking. The travel demand model analysis and intersection LOS analysis performed for the plan demonstrated that the value of the interchange was limited in terms of transportation benefits. Additionally, Staff questions whether the costs, environmental impact, and the character of the community's built environment that highway-oriented development would encourage justifies the limited benefits of a new interchange. Further investment in highway infrastructure encourages more highway use and undermines the county's long-range goal of reducing private vehicle dependence and GHG emissions. Furthermore, retaining the planned interchange might lead the Clarksburg community to believe that it will eventually be built. However, the planned interchange is not currently included on any MDOT SHA plans, even financially unconstrained plans.
46 (con't)	Written	F	CEX - MCDOT letter	Transportation (3.B.5.d)	39	Retain the planned I-270 interchange (Exit 17)	The plan should consider a range of configuration options for this interchange that aim to maximize benefit while minimizing impacts and costs. The footprint of the interchange should be minimized to avoid impacts to adjacent streams, forest and developable areas. The reduced-footprint interchange should convey a "local road" character for Little Seneca Parkway to serve the planned new community and existing Cabin Branch community. Options should consider a minor realignment of southbound I-270 within its right-of-way to increase the space available. A compact diamond interchange, possibly with roundabout ramp terminals may be appropriate. A partial example of this type of interchange can be found at Old Columbia Pike and US 29, just to the north of Burtonsville.	
47	Written	F	CEX - MCDOT letter	Transportation (3.B)	34	Consider reducing allowable residential density to reduce imperviousness	The only proposal to reduce imperviousness is to remove travel lanes. The number of residential dwelling units should also be considered to be reduced so that the roads don't become congested. The suggested notion that having transit will make people take it, won't work as you will never achieve the level of congestion and the area is too far out of where people work.	Achieving impervious surface reductions are recommended by the draft plan from more than just from travel lane reductions, though this is one way the plan anticipates reducing impervious surfaces.
48	Written	F	CEX - MCDOT letter	Transportation (3.B.6.d)	39	Retain the planned I-270 interchange (Exit 17)	I-270 interchange should be left in the plan to allow for future development. Without it, all you get are homes with no way to get around due the existing roads being congested. No one wants to build a bridge that doesn't bring additional economic prosperity. The ramps should remain. (HP - Concur and also note that unlike other roadway capacity improvements, this would likely only advance if funded by MD or FHWA as part of the I-270 Phase 2 improvements. Additionally, this interchange would transfer VMT from local roads to the interstate and therefore allow local roads to be safer and more hospitable to transit/walking.)	[See staff's response to testimony comment #46]
49	Written	F	CEX - MCDOT letter	Plan Framework (2.B) and Transportation (3.B)	19-20	Replace reference to "BRT" with "express bus"	The Plan refers to BRT and Enhanced Stations along Observation Drive. This is unlikely to be BRT, but instead some sort of express bus. The term "BRT" should be removed from the text and framework graphic as it not actually going to be Flash BRT. The planned MD 355 Flash service will operate along Stringtown Road.	Staff suggests that all references to Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) along the planned Corridor Connector be revised to say "enhanced bus service", including the Concept Framework Plan language and graphic on page 19-20. The MD 355 Flash BRT will still be so named. 'Express' bus service means something else than a rapid local bus service.

Comment #	Testimony Source	Written Testimony ID	Commenter	Plan Section Reference	Plan Page # (if applicable)	Comment Topic	Comment / Issue	Staff Response / Recommendation
50	Written	F	CEX - MCDOT letter	Travel Analysis (Appendix K)	K 18	Request for interim development travel model analysis	Planning notes that Scenarios 1-3 perform very similarly, and "land use changes alone generally drive the direction of metric differences between the baseline 2045 and the scenarios." The magnitude of land use changes makes it difficult to compare between the scenarios. MCDOT would like to see how the scenarios perform in an interim or reduced growth outlook. We'd be interested in understanding how the various scenarios perform in the event of 25% or 50% of buildout.	Planning will run a scenario that tests a partial build-out of the draft plan's projected land use development with the Scenario 1 transportation network. This analysis is expected to highlight how sensitive the travel analysis is to land use variables compared to the difference in the transportation network between the Baseline and Test Scenarios. Additionally another scenario was modeled to look at the baseline network with the S1-S3 land use which shows that most metrics are tied to land use changes.
51	Written	F	CEX - MCDOT letter	Travel Analysis (Appendix K)	K 16-17	Concern over regional travel model performance metrics	Overall, all metrics move significantly in the wrong direction. The number of jobs accessible goes down by 20K-40K from baseline. Transit travel time increases, even with significant additional transit service assumed, meaning buses are stuck in traffic. MCDOT is concerned that there is not transportation capacity to accommodate the proposed land use changes. Given the distance of Clarksburg from other destinations in the region and the jobs/housing imbalance in the Clarksburg area, we are concerned that the level of population growth proposed will lead to unacceptable levels of congestion for many key routes. Even with growth focused on transit corridors, transit cannot reasonably accommodate the growth due to limited capacity of buses and large distances between O/D. The only metric that appears to be driven by transportation infrastructure assumptions is the auto accessibility, which performs significantly better under Scenario 2, likely due to the added interchange.	All scenarios generally performed worse than the baseline scenario. However, the land use assumed in the baseline scenario is no longer consistent with the vision for the plan area. As noted, the only metric that appears to be drive by the transportation infrastructure assumptions is auto accessibility. Scenario 2 did perform better from an auto accessibility standpoint. However, we would not agree that this is likely due to the added interchange, as there are other transportation network differences that likely also had an impact, for example more lanes on MD 355 were assumed under this scenario.
52	Written	F	CEX - MCDOT letter	Travel Analysis (Appendix K)	K 16-17 24	Negative estimated travel impacts from removing I-270 / Little Seneca Parkway Interchange	Compared to the Baseline all scenarios: - Worsen auto job accessibility - Worsen transit job accessibility - Worsen auto travel times - Worsen transit travel times - Worsen VMT per capita The only metric that appears to improve is NADMS, which is somewhat moot alongside the increases in VMT. Furthermore, Scenario 1 (the Recommended Scenario) appears to fare the worst of all the scenarios. This implies that this current plan does not meet the transportation adequacy goals established by COMSAT.	Most the metric performance is due primarily to the land use differences between the existing master plan (baseline 2045) and the rest of the scenarios. However, the land use in the baseline 2045 scenario no longer represents the vision for the plan area. Planning can provide some additional analysis to try and better isolate the land use impact.
53	Written	F	CEX - MCDOT letter	Transportation (3.B)	42	Skepticism over curbless and shared street recommendation	While curbless and shared streets are an interesting concept we want to advance, it seems unlikely Street A would work as such. Being the continuation of a significant street and providing access to the commercial core, this is likely to be quite heavily trafficked. Without dedicated bike facilities, it will likely be a very high stress environment.	Downgrading the classification of Shawnee Lane (Boulevard to Neighborhood Connector) may limit the traffic volume on Street A that MCDOT is concerned about as a Shared Street. However, in response to their concern, staff suggests that either the Shared Street concept be recommended on a short street section wherever a commercial retail center is established on the COMSAT property, without a definite location or, if a third north-south master planned street is recommended per MCDOT comment #2, perhaps it makes sense for one of the streets to be a shared street, instead.
54	Written	F	CEX - MCDOT letter	Transportation (3.B)	43	Provide additional width for on-street parking and loading where development is proposed on Observation Drive	We recommend that additional width for on-street parking and loading be provided where development is proposed to front Observation Drive. The parking lane reduces loading/drop-off and bus lane obstructions and the bus lane reduces conflicts with parking and stopping maneuvers. In other areas, where this additional space for parking and loading is not provided, we have observed greater conflicts with the repurposed bus lanes. A parking lane is not needed in areas where this interaction with adjacent land use does not occur.	See Response to MCDOT comment #45.
55	Written	F	CEX - MCDOT letter	Transportation (3.B)	34	Existing streets are unlikely to be rebuilt to master plan recommendations	Most of this area is newly built. MCDOT or any other developer will not rebuild any of these streets and most already meet complete streets. New roads should be constructed to enhance people's mobility until more transit options are funded and operational.	Staff is unsure how to respond to this comment in the draft plan.
56	Written	F	CEX - MCDOT letter	Transportation (3.B)	37	Observation Drive should be designed as an alternative to MD 355	Observation Drive should be considered an alternative to MD 355 and should be designed to be economical where it does not represent something that is infeasible to be built due to environment or construction costs.	Staff is unsure how to respond to this comment in the draft plan.

Comment #	Testimony Source	Written Testimony ID	Commenter	Plan Section Reference	Plan Page # (if applicable)	Comment Topic	Comment / Issue	Staff Response / Recommendation
57	Written	F	CEX - MCDOT letter	Transportation (3.B.2.d)	38	Caveat recommended circulator bus route for feasibility	A Circulator type route may infeasible to operate unless there is clear demand from Clarksburg residents. This simply may not connect enough residents to destinations. There should be a caveat, such as "if further study warrants this service".	Staff believes that the draft plan recommendation already considers the question of feasibility and further study for this sort of transit service: "Explore the feasibility of a circulator bus loop throughout Clarksburg that focuses on local needs and connects with the planned enhanced bus service routes." (p. 38)
58	Written	F	CEX - MCDOT letter	Transportation (3.B)	39	Add a street network goal for efficient vehicle travel	Consider adding a goal to street network "Efficiently and safely direct vehicles traveling outside of Clarksburg to I-270 and major arterials to reduce traffic volumes on local roads."	This comment would be an operational recommendation, which master plans typically seek to avoid.
59	Written	F	CEX - MCDOT letter	Transportation (3.B.29)	52	Consider viability of expanding dockless service area	We can expand a dockless service area but it's not clear there's a viable business model for dockless in Clarksburg, given the distance for vendors to maintain. The County may prefer to prioritize location incentives to areas with greater equity needs.	Staff suggests modifying the recommendation to say: " <u>Consider</u> expanding the West County Dockless Vehicle Service Area boundary to include the Clarksburg community to complement the planned Maryland 355 Flash BRT and enhanced bus Corridor Connector routes, and provide the opportunity for dockless vehicles to service the community." (p. 52)
60	Written	F	CEX - MCDOT letter	Travel Analysis (Appendix K)	K 25	Question about travel modeling assumptions and results	MCDOT questions some of the O/D assumptions, in that we believe that Scenario 2 should pull traffic off of local roads and onto 270. The Gateway Center/Stringtown intersection shows much better performance under Scenario 2 (we don't know what the mitigation is for Scenario 1).	Staff can provide the outputs to MCDOT from the travel model that were referenced when developing the metrics and LOS analysis. Please provide further information on what data you'd like to review from the travel demand model.
61	Written	F	CEX - MCDOT letter	Travel Analysis (Appendix K)	K 27	Question about travel modeling assumptions and results	MCDOT believes that the Cabin Branch area (and potentially other TAZ) would have travel time savings from the interchange.	This was not the result demonstrated in the travel model results. The Cabin Branch TAZ (Traffic Analysis Zone) may be too large to capture fine-grained variations for travel time savings for a portion of Cabin Branch closest to the interchange.
62	Written	F	CEX - MCDOT letter	Travel Analysis (Appendix K)	K 20	Question about travel modeling assumptions and results	We assume that the NADMS goals are driven by greater pedestrian and bike connectivity, as well as increased transit? It would be interesting to learn more about how this changes from current.	Staff believes that travel analysis performance metrics on Non-Auto Driver Mode Share (NADMS) are driven more by the draft plan's land use assumptions than any other factor. The travel model doesn't have pedestrian and bike connectivity as an input and transit was relatively stable across all scenarios.
64	Written	F	CEX - MCDOT letter	Transportation (3.B)	40	Clarify letter references in Planned Roadways map	It's not really clear what the bold letters on the Master Planned Roadways Network Map refer to	Staff suggests that the plan could make it more clear that the letters refer to cross-section title letters for the typical sections on pages 43 - 47.
65	Written	F	CEX - MCDOT letter	Transportation (3.B.7)	39	Growth Corridor Limits	Consider providing a map to show how exactly this would work. Does this imply that the MD 355 Growth Corridor ends abruptly at MD 118, where it shifts over to continue on Observation?	The draft plan recommends maintaining the existing Boulevard classification for Frederick Road (MD 355) between Dowden's Station Way and Little Seneca Parkway, and designating Observation Drive Extended as a Town Center Boulevard street classification. However, Staff suggests that the plan could also clarify that it does envision that the Thrive designated growth corridor would shift to Observation Drive, instead of along Frederick Road as is the case south of the plan area at Ridge Road (MD 118). This policy designation is more due to the expected land use character on Observation Dr. Extended vs. Frederick Rd. rather than direction functional design of the roadways.
66	Written	F	CEX - MCDOT letter	Transportation (3.B.7)	39	Growth Corridor Classification	Just to confirm: is this only a "Growth Corridor" insofar as a Thrive designation, and now a street classification? The map on p40 shows Observation as a Town Center Boulevard.	The draft plan recommends maintaining the existing Boulevard classification for Frederick Road (MD 355) between Dowden's Station Way and Little Seneca Parkway, and designating Observation Drive Extended as a Town Center Boulevard street classification. However, Staff suggests that the plan could also clarify that it does envision that the Thrive designated growth corridor would shift to Observation Drive, instead of along Frederick Road as is the case south of the plan area at Ridge Road (MD 118). This policy designation is more due to the expected land use character on Observation Dr. Extended vs. Frederick Rd. rather than direction functional design of the roadways.

Comment #	Testimony Source	Written Testimony ID	Commenter	Plan Section Reference	Plan Page # (if applicable)	Comment Topic	Comment / Issue	Staff Response / Recommendation
67	Written	F	CEX - MCDOT letter	Transportation (3.B)	42, 46	Commercial Shared Street	While the Code does use Residential & Commercial Shared Street as placeholders, since the publication of the Curbless & Shared Streets Design Guide (and also in the pending Ch.49 Regs about to be published in the Register) we are going to be using "Curbless Street" and "Shared Street" into the future. Consider changing all references of "Commercial Shared Street" to "Curbless Street", which appears to correspond to the size, alignment, traffic loading, and target speed of the roadway.	Staff can replace any reference to "Commercial Shared Street" to the current terminology, "Shared Street", where such street recommendations apply.
68	Written	F	CEX - MCDOT letter	Transportation (3.B)	44	Cross-Sections	RE: Cross-Section D, Little Seneca Pkwy Ext Consider whether a median is necessary. If it is: the 4' median should be shown as monolithic concrete, as that is what would be constructed in such a narrow width. If greenery is desired within the median it needs to be at least 6' wide.	Staff suggests that a 4-foot median is not necessary for Little Seneca Extended. Instead removing the median and reallocating the remaining right-of-way width to 8-foot total tree buffer areas and new 2-foot building frontage zones on both sides of the street is recommended, as well as narrowing traffic lanes from 12 to 11 feet.
69	Written	F	CEX - MCDOT letter	Transportation (3.B)	45	Cross-Sections	RE: Cross-Section F, W Old Baltimore Rd 7' parking lanes are substandard and not acceptable for a master plan facility such as this. Either identify a means of widening to 8', or consider the need for the parking lanes in the first place.	Staff recommends removing on-street parking from the master-planned typical street section for WOB, adding a 2-foot building frontage zone next to the 11-foot sidepath on the south side of the road, increasing both tree buffers to a total of 9-feet in width, and narrowing the overall recommended right-of-way by 10 feet, or a total of 70 feet.
70	Written	F	CEX - MCDOT letter	Transportation (3.B)	45	Cross-Sections	RE: Cross-Section G, New Street A The Bike Master Plan (and reaffirmed by Complete Streets and the Ch.49 regs about to be published in the Register) specify that bikeways should be within the Active Zone; not the Street. As this is essentially a greenfield site we should not be planning for substandard facilities.	Staff suggests that the typical street cross-section be revised to recommend a 3-foot buffer between the sidewalk and bike lane to separate variable speed modes of walking and biking, with the 6-foot tree buffer moved toward the centerline, between the bike lane and parking lane.
71	Written	F	CEX - MCDOT letter	Transportation (3.B)	47	Cross-Sections	RE: Cross-Section A/B, Observation Dr Interim The text notes on p46 constructing the Active Zone facilities along Observation Dr in their ultimate location, but the interim cross-section does not reflect this. The interim has an 8' Street Buffer on the west side, and a 7' Street Buffer on the east side. The 105' Typical has an 8.5' Street Buffer on the west, and a 6.5' Street Buffer on the east. It's an easy fix: just move 0.5' from one side to the other. I suggest moving it in the Interim from the east side to the west side.	Per staff's response to Comment #45, staff recommends removing any cross-section for the recommended interim treatment of Observation Drive and instead adding language allowing flexibility for any interim bus lanes for either driving or parking lanes.
72	Written	F	CEX - MCDOT letter	Transportation (3.B.20)	48	Street Names	RE: #20, renaming portions of the old Observation alignment Consider at some point also, for consistency, renaming Gateway Center Dr to Observation Dr.	If Observation Drive Extended is realigned as recommended by the draft plan, Staff intends Gateway Center Drive to be renamed to Observation Drive. If this is not clear in the plan, it should be recommended in the plan. Renaming the existing sections of Observation Drive north of Shawnee Lane is also recommended (see Rec. #20, p. 48) to avoid confusion with new segments of Observation Drive Extended.
73	Written	F	CEX - MCDOT letter	Transportation (3.B.24)	49-50	Additional Trail Connections	Consider extending Roberts Tavern Dr as a trail to Gateway Center Dr (approx 750').	Staff suggests adding this trail connection to the list of potential trails to be established on private property, under recommendation #24 (p. 49), as well as the Planned Bikeways Network Map (Figure 13) with the caveat that they be designed to minimize environmental impacts, are sensitive to the context of the property through which they pass, and may be either paved or natural surface as conditions recommend.

Comment #	Testimony Source	Written Testimony ID	Commenter	Plan Section Reference	Plan Page # (if applicable)	Comment Topic	Comment / Issue	Staff Response / Recommendation
73	Written	F	CEX - MCDOT letter	Transportation (3.B.24)	49-50	Additional Trail Connections		[image row for Comment #73]
74	Written	F	CEX - MCDOT letter	Transportation (3.B.24)	49-50	Additional Trail Connections	Consider extending the existing north section of Observation Dr as a trail southeastward from the Clarksburg Square community to Brick Haven Way, linking the area to the schools -- something frequently requested during community meetings. This may also double as a recreational trail within the forested area. This might be implemented by MCDOT or by Parks. This detail does not need to be in the plan, but for impact & cost estimating: This would be a length of approx 2450' and include one bridge across the Coolbrook Stream, likely spanning from the steep west bank directly to the top of the east bank by the high school's athletic fields (a 400' long gap).	The draft plan recommends exploring the feasibility of a trail connection across the Cool Brook Tributary, should the stream valley become public parkland, between the former COMSAT Laboratories property, Clarksburg HS, Rocky Hill MS, Clarksburg Neighborhood Park, and the Meadows at Hurley Ridge neighborhood, but does not mention a potential connection to Shawnee Lane. Staff suggests revising Recommendation 3.F.14 (p. 76) to indicate that a potential future trail could include a connection to Shawnee Lane, as well. Parks Staff does not recommend that a potential trail crossing Cool Brook Tributary be shown on any map in the draft plan due to the uncertainty of the feasibility of any specific alignment.
74	Written	F	CEX - MCDOT letter	Transportation (3.B.24)	49-50	Additional Trail Connections		[image row for Comment #74]
75	Written	F	CEX - MCDOT letter	Transportation (3.B.24)	49-50	Additional Trail Connections	Consider extending Wims Rd as a trail westward from Brick Haven Way to the new Observation Dr alignment to link the schools and the new activity center -- something frequently requested during community meetings. This may also double as a recreational trail within the forested area. This might be implemented by MCDOT or by Parks. This detail does not need to be in the plan, but for impact & cost estimating: This would be a length of approx 1800' and include one or two bridges across the Coolbrook Stream. It might generally follow existing grades on the east bank, either crossing with a bridge of about 380' to the west bank or using a shorter bridge over the stream and using switchbacks on the west bank.	The draft plan recommends exploring the feasibility of a trail connection across the Cool Brook Tributary, should the stream valley become public parkland, between the former COMSAT Laboratories property, Clarksburg HS, Rocky Hill MS, Clarksburg Neighborhood Park, and the Meadows at Hurley Ridge neighborhood, but does not mention a potential connection to Shawnee Lane. Staff suggests revising Recommendation 3.F.14 (p. 76) to indicate that a potential future trail could include a connection to Shawnee Lane, as well. Parks Staff does not recommend that a potential trail crossing Cool Brook Tributary be shown on any map in the draft plan due to the uncertainty of the feasibility of any specific alignment.
75	Written	F	CEX - MCDOT letter	Transportation (3.B.24)	49-50	Additional Trail Connections		[image row for Comment #75]

Comment #	Testimony Source	Written Testimony ID	Commenter	Plan Section Reference	Plan Page # (if applicable)	Comment Topic	Comment / Issue	Staff Response / Recommendation
76	Written	F	CEX - MCDOT letter	Transportation (3.B.24)	49-50	Additional Trail Connections	Consider extending Shawnee Ln as a trail westward across I-270 to Petrel St &/or the Outlets parking lots, more directly linking this plan area with Cabin Branch. This would be implemented by a mixture of new development (the east side) and MCDOT/SHA (structures & west side) This detail does not need to be in the plan, but for impact & cost estimating: This would be a length of approx 1850'-2500' and include between 1 to 3 structures across I-270, Cabin Branch, and Little Seneca Creek. The above image shows three segments (the lower segment with two different potential alignments), of which only 1 or 2 segments would be necessary for connectivity.	Staff suggests adding this trail connection to the list of potential trails to be established under recommendation #24 (p. 49), as well as the Planned Bikeways Network Map (Figure 13) with the caveat that they be designed to minimize environmental impacts, are sensitive to the context of the property through which they pass, and may be either paved or natural surface as conditions recommend.
76	Written	F	CEX - MCDOT letter	Transportation (3.B.24)	49-50	Additional Trail Connections		[image row for Comment #76]
77	Written	F	CEX - MCDOT letter	Transportation (3.B.24)	50	Show Trail Connections	Show the trail connections from p49 also on the map on p50.	Staff suggests adding suggested trail connections from Comment #73 and 76 to the Planned Bikeways Network Map (Figure 13) with the caveat that they be designed to minimize environmental impacts, are sensitive to the context of the property through which they pass, and may be either paved or natural surface as conditions recommend.
87	Written	F	CEX - MCDOT letter	Travel Analysis (Appendix K)	K 23, 33-95	Observation & Ridge	How is traffic being distributed without the interchange? What are is heading south toward Observation/Ridge as compared to north toward Clarksburg/Stringtown? It's a surprise that Observation/Ridge is functioning at D/D. Confirm the traffic distribution doesn't disproportionately weight toward the Clarksburg/Stringtown, minding that travelers may be pre-disposed to go south toward Ridge if their ultimate destination is southward.	The intersection analysis utilized the travel model results to develop future turning movement volumes used in the intersection LOS analysis. Based on the model volume differences between Scenario 1 and Scenario 2, it appears that volumes just north of West Old Baltimore are actually higher in Scenario 2. The volumes on the link just south of Clarksburg Road decrease in Scenario 2 compared to Scenario 1, suggesting that without the interchange there is a higher demand to access to the interchange at Clarksburg Road versus the intersections to the south.
88	Written	F	CEX - MCDOT letter	Travel Analysis (Appendix K)	K 27-29	Cabin Branch Travel Time Deltas	In the figures showing the change in travel times with/without and interchange: why doesn't Cabin Branch benefit? Given their proximity it is a surprise that they show no changes. Is it due to the Transportation Analysis Zone being too large & encompassing all of Cabin Branch?	The shortest path under both scenarios uses the interchange at Clarksburg Road. This could be partially due to the size of the TAZ. Portions of the Cabin Branch area may have a reduction in travel time if the TAZ had been split, but likely the travel time savings would be limited to the areas to the east and not to the north or west
90	Written	F	CEX - MCDOT letter	Travel Analysis (Appendix K)	K 4	Travel modeling assumptions and results	Agree with long-term project assumptions listed on page 4.	Thank you for your comment.
78	Written	F	CEX - MCDOT letter	Transportation (3.B)	50	Bicycle Parking Stations	Figure 13 shows several Bicycle Parking Stations, but there is no accompanying narrative describing these. Pull info for these from the Bike Master Plan and add into this section.	Staff suggests adding clarifying language in the Active Transportation recommendations about the intended purpose of Bicycle Parking Stations of the Planned Bicycle Network Map, such as, "Secure long-term bike parking adjacent to anticipated transit stations to support access to transit from a larger capture area."
83	Written	F	CEX - MCDOT letter	Transportation (3.B.21)	49	Traffic Calming	In general, master plans should not be recommending operational studies or interim facilities. Recommendations need to conform with Planning's role.	Staff suggests revising Recommendation #14 to read, "Reduce traffic speeds on Shawnee Lane through such measures as narrowing the roadway, installing traffic calming measures, converting outer drive lanes to on-street parking, etc." and to delete the last sentence in the paragraph that reads, "Prior to the addition of any traffic calming measures, or reconstruction of the road to conform to the master planned street type, MCDOT should consider an interim approach to calming traffic on Shawnee Lane, such as by converting outer travel lanes to parking lanes."

Comment #	Testimony Source	Written Testimony ID	Commenter	Plan Section Reference	Plan Page # (if applicable)	Comment Topic	Comment / Issue	Staff Response / Recommendation
84	Written	F	CEX - MCDOT letter	Transportation (3.B.25)	52	Brick Pavers	Brick pavers are not recommended due to accessibility and maintenance concerns.	Staff suggests removing the reference to 'brick pavers' as a potential paving material.
91	Written	F	CEX - MCDOT letter	Transportation (3.B)	36	PLOC Map	Consider resizing Figure 9 (the PLOC Map) onto its own page to improve legibility.	Staff can increase the size of Figure 9 to fit to the full width of the page.
92	Written	F	CEX - MCDOT letter	Transportation (3.B)	38	Lakewood Dr	Is Lakewood Dr the correct street? I'm not recalling where this is nor finding it online, but I'm guessing it's either Lake Ridge Drive, or the future extension of Cabin Branch Ave?	This typo will be corrected to refer to Lake Ridge Drive, not Lakewood Drive.
93	Written	F	CEX - MCDOT letter	Transportation (3.B.8)	39	Reference Errors	RE:#\$8 - Fix the two reference errors	These references will be corrected to refer to Figure 11 and Table 1
96	Written and Public Hearing	G & AA	Steve Robins and Bob Elliott (River Falls LLC)	Transportation (3.B.6.d)	39	Retain the planned I-270 interchange (Exit 17)	Commenter claims that the Comsat site needs direct access to I-270 (via Exit 17) to reach its full potential and that, without the possibility of the interchange, the property owner will struggle to market the site to any major commercial, retail, and life science tenants. Comment states that removing the planned interchange would be devastating for attracting tenants who can bring jobs and retail to the area. Eliminating the possibility of an interchange would also put unnecessary stress on the local road network, require costly and disruptive intersection widening that could jeopardize Vision Zero goals, and potentially jeopardize the prospects for dedicated bus lanes on Observation Drive. Written testimony Exhibit AA includes a letter dated September 25, 2025, from Tommy Cleaver, CBRE, Executive Vice President, Mid-Atlantic Life Sciences Leader, addressed to Artie Harris, Chair, and Members of the Planning Board, commenting on CBRE's efforts to market the Comsat property and the key elements of the Sector Plan needed to unlock the site for a major opportunity in Montgomery County. Written testimony Exhibit AA includes a memorandum from RCLCO to Lantian Development LLC, dated September 23, 2025, regarding the importance of the planned Exit 17 interchange and its potential to unlock market opportunities for the Comsat property. Written testimony Exhibit AA includes a memorandum from Will Zeid, PE of Kimley Horn dated October 3, 2025, discussing examples of how an interchange can be	[See staff's response to testimony comment #46]
107	Written	J	Anne Cinque (FOTMC)	Transportation (3.B.6.a)	39	Supportive of current master planned alignment of Observation Drive	Supports the draft plan's elimination of the Master Plan Alignment for the extension of Observation Drive south to West Old Baltimore Road. This decision will preserve many acres of forest and avoid substantial environmental impacts on the Cool Brook Tributary and, consequently, on Little Seneca Creek.	Staff acknowledges this comment.
108	Written	J	Anne Cinque (FOTMC)	Transportation (3.B.6.b/c)	39	Supportive of removal of Clarksburg/MD 355 bypass roads	Supports the draft plan's removal of the Clarksburg/355 Bypass from the plan. This means the elementary school will remain and the headwaters, forests and wetlands of both Ten Mile Creek and the Cool Brook Tributary can be spared additional insults.	Staff acknowledges this comment.
109	Written	J	Anne Cinque (FOTMC)	Transportation (3.B.6.d)	39	Supports removal of planned I-270 interchange (Exit 17)	Supports the draft plan's removal of the I-270 Interchange from the plan. The I-270 Interchange was the most destructive alternative for access to the sector plan area and unnecessary as two interchange access points, to the north and south, already provide this access.	Staff acknowledges this comment.
113	Written	J	Anne Cinque (FOTMC)	Transportation (3.B.5)	38-39	Supportive of narrow master plan roads	Supports the draft plan's narrowing of planned roadways, if new roads are built.	Staff acknowledges this comment.

Comment #	Testimony Source	Written Testimony ID	Commenter	Plan Section Reference	Plan Page # (if applicable)	Comment Topic	Comment / Issue	Staff Response / Recommendation
115	Written	J	Anne Cinque (FOTMC)	Transportation (3.B), Environment (3.E) and Linthicum Neighborhood (4.C.7)	96	Preserve the forest abutting I-270 on the Linthicum property	Recommend preservation of the forest abutting I-270 on the Linthicum property. The Plan designates a new alignment for the northward extension of Observation Drive that would cut through the forest abutting I-270. While the Plan states that the re-alignment of Observation Drive closer to the western property line of the Linthicum Farm Property would "minimize potential adverse impacts to stream valley buffers" (p.39), it does not appear that this re-alignment really has any impact on the Little Seneca stream buffer. However, the new alignment would devastate the forest abutting I-270, which for some inexplicable reason was not designated as a Priority Urban Forest.	Planning Staff support the goal of preserving forest to the greatest extent feasible, yet we see Observation Drive Extended as a critical future connection in the transportation network for Clarksburg, for people driving, walking, cycling, rolling, and taking public transit. It's completion between Waters Discover Landing and Gateway Center Drive is a central recommendation for the draft plan. The recommended re-alignment of the planned Observation Drive away from the Little Seneca Creek stream valley and to the west closer to I-270 is intended to minimize environmental impacts and facilitate a more cohesive developable area on the Linthicum Family property. If the current master planned alignment for Observation Drive is retained, through the central portion of this property, future development would likely occur in all or a portion of the existing forest stand along I-270, rather than the entire forest stand being considered for preservation.
118	Written	J	Anne Cinque (FOTMC)	Transportation (3.B.6.a)	39	Utilize existing roads on COMSAT campus for Observation Drive Extended, or utilize open areas to avoid forest impacts	Support a less environmentally damaging alternative for Observation Drive Extended, which is to utilize the existing roads on the COMSAT campus to provide connectivity from the southern terminus of Gateway Center Drive at Shawnee Lane, heading south to West Old Baltimore Road. This existing north-south connectivity would serve as a neighborhood connector for any development on the COMSAT property and would avoid the environmentally damaging impact to the tree-covered areas. If this road is built on the draft plan's recommended alignment, utilize the open areas to the maximum extent possible to avoid the taking of any Priority Urban Forest.	The Public Draft Plan recommends an alignment for Observation Drive Extended that avoids much of the natural and topographically challenging areas that the 1994 Clarksburg Master Plan proposed for the roadway. The recommended alignment (and additional plan recommendations for future road and bridge designs) strikes a balance between minimizing environmental impacts from this future roadway while establishing a new, efficient north-south connection in the plan area that provides space for multiple users (pedestrians, bicyclists, drivers, transit riders) and accommodates future development areas along the roadway. Following the existing alignments for internal roads and driveways on the COMSAT property would not achieve these multiple goals.
119	Written	J	Anne Cinque (FOTMC)	Transportation (3.B.6.d)	39	Utilize (and expand if needed) West Old Baltimore for east-west connectivity instead of Little Seneca Parkway	Rather than extending Little Seneca Parkway through forests and wetlands, utilize the existing east-west transportation infrastructure – West Old Baltimore Road – that already links Route 355 to Lake Ridge Drive. West Old Baltimore Road has long-served east-west connectivity for auto transportation into and out of the Sector Plan area. The road is wide enough to add bus stops and a shared-use path for pedestrians and bicyclists, and it can be further widened.	The West Old Baltimore Road right-of-way and I-270 underpass is not sufficient to serve the traffic capacity projected in the Clarksburg area over the plan's 20-year planning horizon, nor does it allow space for continuous, safe movement by non-vehicular travel modes across I-270 (i.e., walking, biking, and rolling). Connecting the existing segments of Little Seneca Parkway on either side of I-270 will provide access for all modes between the currently disconnected communities of Cabin Branch and Clarksburg Village Center.
120	Written	J	Anne Cinque (FOTMC)	Transportation (3.B.6.a)	39	Do not recommend extension of Observation Drive across Little Seneca Creek, south of West Old Baltimore Road	The draft plan to extend Observation Drive north to connect with Gateway Center Drive would have devastating environmental impacts on an area designated for Priority Urban Forest preservation. The northward extension of Observation Drive would cut through and destroy upland forests, cross floodplains, traverse wetlands and steep slopes, and sever the greenway park – all of which would seriously degrade the mainstream of Little Seneca Creek. In addition, the recommended alignment shows this northward extension cutting through the forest on the Linthicum property rather than traversing the open field, which is a far less destructive route. We strongly urge the planners to forego consideration of the northward extension of Observation Drive south of West Old Baltimore Road due to the extensive environmental impacts as well as the costliness of the bridge and road construction.	The Public Hearing Draft seeks to complete a critical piece in the Clarksburg transportation network with the construction of Observation Drive. Not only has the plan revised the recommended roadway alignment away from natural and sensitive environmental areas, but the draft plan also recommends a narrower right-of-way and street design than the 1994 Clarksburg Master Plan. Furthermore, the draft plan recommends that bridges over streams in the plan area be designed and constructed to minimize environmental impacts to the greatest extent possible. The recommended re-alignment of Observation Drive Extended does, in fact, pass through an existing forest stand on the Linthicum property, however, Staff believes that a portion of this forest stand, possibly all of it, would be affected by development even if Observation Drive Extended follows the current planned alignment through the middle of their property.

Comment #	Testimony Source	Written Testimony ID	Commenter	Plan Section Reference	Plan Page # (if applicable)	Comment Topic	Comment / Issue	Staff Response / Recommendation
127	Written and Public Hearing	O	Mark Stunder	Transportation (3.B.6.d)	39	Retain the planned I-270 interchange (Exit 17)	Support for the overall vision of the Gateway Sector Plan, its emphasis on mixed-use development, environmental stewardship, and multimodal connectivity reflects thoughtful planning for Clarksburg's future. However, I respectfully request that the Planning Board: • Retain the ability to build the I-270 interchange in the plan. • Let the Upcounty traffic study (Balcombe) be completed and publicly reviewed. • Evaluate interchange alternatives that incorporate environmental safeguards and multimodal access. • Engage community stakeholders in a transparent process that reflects both mobility needs and sustainability goals after the traffic study is completed.	[See staff's response to testimony comment #46]
128	Written and Public Hearing	Z	Soo Lee-Cho (representing JNP/Avanti Group)	Transportation (3.B.6.a)	39	Support for recommended Observation Drive re-alignment	Supports the draft plan's recommended relocation of Observation Drive west of current MPOHT (and 1994 CMP) alignment. Minimizes environmental impacts, topographic disturbance, and development limitations.	Staff acknowledges this comment.
129	Written and Public Hearing	Z	Soo Lee-Cho (JNP/Avanti Group)	Transportation (3.B)	43	Allow for adequate SWM facilities in Observation Drive cross-section	Draft plan's typical cross-sections for Observation Drive Extended do not account for adequate stormwater management facilities and do not accurately represent complete street design. Recommend that the plan provide a road section that incorporates SWM facilities within the ROW. Suggest modified road sections for the two Observation Drive Extended cross-sections in the draft plan. [See proposed cross-sections, below]	The commenter's proposed cross-sections for Observation Drive Extended do not allow for adequate dimensions for street elements established by the Complete Street Design Guide. Furthermore, continuous stormwater management facilities along a "closed section" road (built with curb-and-gutter as opposed to an "open section" road with no edge curb to allow stormwater to flow into side swales or other collection areas) are not a consistent element of the plan's recommended typical street cross-section. The Public Hearing Draft recommends the inclusion of both shade trees and stormwater management facilities within the right-of-way of both master planned street and local, non-master planned streets (See Recommendation 3.B.5.e and 3.B.17.c)
129	Written and Public Hearing	Z	Soo Lee-Cho (JNP/Avanti Group)	Transportation (3.B)	43	Allow for adequate SWM facilities in Observation Drive cross-section (Exhibit B-1)		[Image row for Comment #129]
129	Written and Public Hearing	Z	Soo Lee-Cho (JNP/Avanti Group)	Transportation (3.B)	43	Allow for adequate SWM facilities in Observation Drive cross-section (Exhibit B-2)		[Image row for Comment #129]
134	Written and Public Hearing	Q	Margaret Schoap (TAME)	Transportation (3.B.1.b, 3.B.2.a/b)	37-38	Support for transit recommendations, but on existing roads	Supports transit improvements in Clarksburg (esp. 1.b, 2.a, and 2.b), yet suggests that transit routes and stations should be located on existing roadways rather than new roadways that may not be built and would cause environmental impacts.	The Public Hearing Draft recommends that new transit stations to serve the enhanced bus Corridor Connector Route on Observation Drive Extended be located on this new master planned roadway. Since the draft plan recommends an alignment for this street that diverges from the existing internal roadways and driveways on the COMSAT and Linthicum properties, planned transit stations must be located along these planned roadways.

Comment #	Testimony Source	Written Testimony ID	Commenter	Plan Section Reference	Plan Page # (if applicable)	Comment Topic	Comment / Issue	Staff Response / Recommendation
135	Public Hearing		Gary Unterberg (River Falls LLC)	Transportation (3.B.6.d)	39	Retain the planned I-270 interchange (Exit 17)	Requests that the plan retain the planned I-270 interchange (Exit 17) as an option for highway access to the COMSAT property and Black Hills Regional Park	[See staff's response to testimony comment #46]
139	Public Hearing		John Parrish (Friends of Ten Mile Creek (FOTMC))	Transportation (3.B.6.d)	39	Supports removal of planned I-270 interchange (Exit 17)	Supports the draft plan's removal of the I-270 Interchange from the plan. The I-270 Interchange was the most destructive alternative for access to the sector plan area and unnecessary as two interchange access points, to the north and south, already provide this access.	Staff acknowledges this comment.
142	Public Hearing		John Parrish (FOTMC)	Transportation (3.B.6.a)	31	Avoid forest loss from Observation Drive Extended alignment	Re-routing Observation Drive to the west (on the Linthicum Family property) will still impact a large forest stand. It should avoid forest impacts as much as possible.	[See staff's response to testimony comment #120]
143	Public Hearing		John Parrish (FOTMC)	Transportation (3.B.5)	38	Support for recommended narrow new roads to reduce impervious surface	Supports the plan's recommendations to narrowing roads to reduce impervious surfaces.	Staff acknowledges this comment.
145	Public Hearing		Laurie Babb (MCEDC)	Transportation (3.B.6.d)	39	Retain the planned I-270 interchange (Exit 17)	Maintain the planned highway interchange on I-270 (Exit 17) to attract potential commercial tenants. Visibility from I-270 is critical, as well.	[See staff's response to testimony comment #46]
147	Public Hearing		Beth Wolff (President, Clarksburg Neighbors Alliance (CNA))	Transportation (3.B.6.a)	39	Support for completion of Observation Drive	Support completion of Observation Drive Extended as an important north-south connector in the community	Staff acknowledges this comment.
148	Public Hearing		Beth Wolff (CNA)	Transportation (3.B.6.d)	39	Retain the planned I-270 interchange (Exit 17)	Retain I-270 interchange (Exit 17) in the plan to support the COMSAT property for development and access for Clarksburg. Preserves the option for construction if needed.	[See staff's response to testimony comment #46]
152	Public Hearing		Beth Wolff (CNA)	Transportation (3.B.1.b)	37	Plan for transit service that brings people to job centers	Transit hubs/stations along proposed Corridor Connector are not the right fit for how people travel in Clarksburg. They need to be located along transit routes that get people to jobs.	Staff believes that the transit stations proposed along the Corridor Connector route on Observation Drive are an important element of the county's broader public transit network, with the potential to provide rapid bus service between Clarksburg and Germantown. This connector route is also recommended in the Approved and Adopted 2022 Corridor Forward: The I-270 Transit Plan. The planned MD 355 Flash BRT service will be an additional rapid bus service serving Clarksburg. Staff suggests that, in addition to the planned enhanced or rapid bus services, the sector plan might recommend establishing a new or modified Express Bus service that brings Clarksburg residents to job centers in the Mid- and Downcounty areas of the county.
153	Public Hearing		Beth Wolff (CNA)	Transportation (3.B.1.b)	37	Design for safe transit stations that connect to job centers	Transit stations bring safety concerns. Design them holistically to connect them to job centers and with safety in mind.	Staff acknowledges this comment.
154	Written and Public Hearing	AK	Cherian Eapen (Coalition for Upcounty)	Transportation (3.B.6.d)	39	Retain the planned I-270 interchange (Exit 17)	Supports retention of I-270 interchange (Exit 17) for its additional highway access to the Clarksburg community and support of mixed-use development on COMSAT. Asserts that the 'county has abandoned Clarksburg' with the loss of the CCT, I-270 improvements, Mid County Highway, extension of Observation, MD 355 BRT. Planned BRT is not likely to be successful as an alternative to roadway capacity or supported by adequate ridership in Clarksburg.	[See staff's response to testimony comment #46]
155	Written and Public Hearing	AK	Cherian Eapen (Coalition for Upcounty)	Transportation (3.B.6.a)	39	Support for recommended Observation Drive alignment	Supports the draft plan's proposed Observation Drive alignment	Staff acknowledges this comment.
156	Written and Public Hearing	AB	Michael Ortman	Transportation (3.B.6.d)	39	Support for Little Seneca Parkway I-270 overpass, not as an interchange	Support for draft plan's recommendation of a Little Seneca Parkway overpass. Public Hearing testimony exhibit included as Written Testimony Exhibit AB	[See staff's response to testimony comment #46]

Comment #	Testimony Source	Written Testimony ID	Commenter	Plan Section Reference	Plan Page # (if applicable)	Comment Topic	Comment / Issue	Staff Response / Recommendation
157	Written and Public Hearing	AB	Michael Ortman	Transportation (3.B.19.e)	48	Concern for intersection safety at West Old Baltimore Road and Lake Ridge Drive	Requests that MCDOT address a pedestrian safety issue at West Old Baltimore Road (WOB) and Lake Ridge Drive. Very little to no visibility of westbound WOB from southbound Lake Ridge Drive. Westbound through and right-turn lane is combined, making lake Ridge Drive drivers uncertain and forced to move into WOB. Suggests implementation of a 4-way stop, remove mound with a new right turn lane, traffic light, or other safety improvement.	Staff acknowledges this comment. The Public Hearing Draft recommends prioritizing pedestrian and bicyclist safety and comfort at key intersections in the plan area, including the intersection of West Old Baltimore Road and Lake Ridge Drive. (Recommendation # 3.B.19.e)
158	Public Hearing		Jason George	Transportation (3.B.6.d)	39	Retain the planned I-270 interchange (Exit 17)	Supports retention of planned I-270 interchange (Exit 17) as an option for construction, especially in light of the upcoming Comprehensive transportation study between Clarksburg and Montgomery Village.	[See staff's response to testimony comment #46]
162	Written and Public Hearing	P	Amy Presley	Transportation (3.B.6.d)	39	Retain the planned I-270 interchange (Exit 17)	Supports retention of Exit 17 to help relieve local road congestion, making employment development possible, and future development on COMSAT. Recommends a phased implementation of the interchange	[See staff's response to testimony comment #46]
166	Written and Public Hearing	P	Amy Presley	Transportation (3.B.6.a)	39	Support recommended Observation Drive alignment	Supports the draft plan's recommendation for the alignment of Observation Drive	Staff acknowledges this comment.
175	Written and Public Hearing	X	Francoise Carrier (Linthicum Family)	Transportation (3.B.6.a)	39	Support recommended Observation Drive alignment	Support the alignment for Observation Drive recommended in the Plan, which minimizes the impact of this major roadway on the stream valley abutting the Property to the east, and at the same time preserves space for a cohesive, attractive residential community by pushing the road as close as possible to I-270.	Staff acknowledges this comment.
178	Written and Public Hearing	Q	Margaret Schoap (TAME)	Transportation (3.B.6.d)	39	Supports removal of planned I-270 interchange (Exit 17)	Support removing Exit 17 as a planned interchange with I-270. Instead of extending Little Seneca Parkway, recommends that the plan enhance existing West Old Baltimore Road.	Staff acknowledges this comment.
180	Written	R	Henry Gudelsky	Transportation (3.B.6.d)	39	Retain the planned I-270 interchange (Exit 17)	"Please don't close exit 17 in Clarksburg. The increase in traffic CB and commute would always certainly force us to move from Clarksburg town center. This would be terrible for the community and crush the success of the new development."	[See staff's response to testimony comment #46]
181	Written	S	Poetry T	Transportation (3.B.6.d)	39	Retain the planned I-270 interchange (Exit 17)	"County has constantly failed to support upcounty residents. Please do not remove Exit 17. This would force many residents to move out as County is becoming hopeless and worthless compared to neighboring Virginia."	[See staff's response to testimony comment #46]
184	Written	U	Kasane Lee	Transportation (3.B.6.d)	39	Retain the planned I-270 interchange (Exit 17)	Requests that Exit 17 remain as a planned interchange with I-270	[See staff's response to testimony comment #46]
185	Written	V	Ram Valiyl	Transportation (3.B.6.d)	39	Retain the planned I-270 interchange (Exit 17)	Requests that Exit 17 remain as a planned interchange with I-270	[See staff's response to testimony comment #46]
186	Written	W	Sharron Saunders	Transportation (3.B.6.d)	39	Retain the planned I-270 interchange (Exit 17)	Requests that Exit 17 remain as a planned interchange with I-270	[See staff's response to testimony comment #46]
187	Written	Y	Beth Wolff (on behalf of 17 Clarksburg residents)	Transportation (3.B)	-	Request for lighting along MD 355 shared use path	Multiple letters recommend addressing the lack of lighting on the Frederick Road (MD 355) shared use path, between Clarksburg High School and Cool Brook Lane, a route that middle school and high school students must use daily to get to and from school and frequented by Clarksburg residents, as well. Trash cans are also requested to be installed along the path.	Staff suggests that the plan add a new recommendation increase safety and comfort along all existing shared use paths in the plan area, including the installation of lighting, visible and context-sensitive street crossings, wayfinding, etc.

Comment #	Testimony Source	Written Testimony ID	Commenter	Plan Section Reference	Plan Page # (if applicable)	Comment Topic	Comment / Issue	Staff Response / Recommendation
188	Written	Y	Beth Wolff (Clarksburg residents)	Transportation (3.B)	-	Request for enhanced crosswalk at Running Brook Drive and Frederick Road	Request for a Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon or similar flashing light at the Running Brook Drive crossing of Frederick Road (MD 355)	While the sector plan should not specify specific pedestrian safety treatments (this is the purview of MCDOT), staff suggests that the intersection of Running Brook Drive and Frederick Road (MD 355) should be added to the list of prioritized intersections for pedestrian and bicyclist safety and comfort improvements, Recommendation 3.B.19. This intersection may replace the currently recommended priority intersection of Wims Road and Frederick Road, since Wims Road does not continue as a public street east of Frederick Road (across the street from Clarksburg High School) and the Running Brook Drive has an existing single crosswalk across Frederick Road
192	Written	Y	Beth Wolff (Clarksburg residents)	Transportation (3.B)	-	Concern for parking, trash, and trucks on Gateway Center Drive	Support for separate bike lanes on Gateway Center Drive and not allow abandoned trucks to be able to park along Gateway Center Drive. These cause safety concerns and are unsightly.	Staff acknowledges this comment.
193	Written	Y	Beth Wolff (Clarksburg residents)	Transportation (3.B.6.a)	39	Support for Observation Drive connection between I-270 Exit 16 and Exit 18	Support for an alternative route to Maryland Route 355, parallel to 355 between Exit 16 and 18.	Staff acknowledges this comment.
63	Written	F	CEX - MCDOT letter	Travel Analysis (Appendix K)	K 3	Question about travel modeling assumptions and results	Would we be able to understand the types of changes made to O/D within the TAZs? Were these held consistent between scenarios? What changed from the baseline?	Land Use assumptions were held constant across all Master Plan Test Scenarios 1-3. The Test Scenarios projected a different level of development than the Baseline scenario, which was more heavily focused on employment uses than residential uses due to the existing zoning districts upon which the Baseline scenario was based.
198	Written	AG	Barry Fantle (President, Clarksburg Civic Association)	Transportation (3.B.6.d)	39	Retain the planned I-270 interchange (Exit 17)	I would like to reiterate support for the Clarksburg Master Plan which includes the new vitally important interchange on 270. This is very important in helping with traffic. Also, COMSAT, which has sat vacant for many years, depends on this interchange for future development. Please do not remove this from the Sector Plan.	[See staff's response to testimony comment #46]
199	Written	AH	Kiersten Greenfield	Transportation (3.B.6.d)	39	Retain the planned I-270 interchange (Exit 17)	I am writing to express my strong support for keeping exit 17 on I-270 in the Clarksburg Gateway Sector Plan. As you know, traffic congestion has become a serious challenge, creating delays, safety concerns, and limiting access for residents, businesses, and emergency vehicles. A new exit would significantly ease congestion in the town center, improve quality of life for residents, and make our community more accessible and attractive for economic growth. This is a practical and much needed step toward addressing current transportation pressures and preparing for future growth.	[See staff's response to testimony comment #46]
200	Written	AI	Seenu Suvarna	Transportation (3.B)	-	Prioritize mass transit and other transportation improvements before approving additional residential development	Adding more housing without the transit systems to support it is not just shortsighted—it's detrimental to the long-term health of our region. Clarksburg residents are spending more time commuting, more money on transportation, and more energy navigating gridlock. This is not sustainable. I urge you to prioritize mass transit improvements before approving additional residential development. We need expanded bus service, better Metro rail connectivity, and safe, accessible options for walking and biking. These changes are essential to reduce traffic, improve quality of life, and make Clarksburg a truly connected community.	Staff acknowledges this comment.
201	Written	AI	Seenu Suvarna	Transportation (3.B.6.d)	39	Retain the planned I-270 interchange (Exit 17) and deliver reliable, connected transit	We need to bring jobs to Clarksburg—not send our residents elsewhere. The former Comsat building is a prime opportunity. Consider offering incentives like one year of free rent to innovative companies willing to invest in revitalizing the space. Attracting tech and life sciences firms would boost our local economy, reduce outbound traffic, and create a vibrant hub for business and community activity. To support this we need Exit 17 to be implemented to keep traffic to the Gateway Center location manageable.	[See staff's response to testimony comment #46]

Comment #	Testimony Source	Written Testimony ID	Commenter	Plan Section Reference	Plan Page # (if applicable)	Comment Topic	Comment / Issue	Staff Response / Recommendation
202	Written	AJ	Anokhi Cifuentes	Transportation (3.B.6.d)	39	Retain the planned I-270 interchange (Exit 17) and deliver reliable, connected transit	I appreciate the vision in this plan — new housing, parks, transit, and mixed-use areas. It sounds exciting! But what's missing is a real commitment to the infrastructure that makes all of that actually work for the people already here, and those still to come. We continue to lack reliable east-west connectivity and redundancy in our road network. Whether it's the removal of the planned Exit 17 interchange, incomplete local street connections, or the fact that the promised BRT system still hasn't materialized, it all sends a clear message: this community's access needs are being overlooked.	[See staff's response to testimony comment #46]
203	Written	AJ	Anokhi Cifuentes	Transportation (3.B.6.a)	39	Support for expedited completion of the recommended realignment of Observation Drive	I urge you to expedite the realignment of Observation Drive through the plan area. This is an opportunity to build smarter, more resilient infrastructure — but it needs to happen in coordination with future development, not decades later.	Staff acknowledges this comment.