

**Meeting Summary**  
**US 29 South Corridor Advisory Committee (CAC) Meeting #8**  
**September 26, 2016, 6:30 p.m. – 9:00 p.m.**  
**Silver Spring Civic Building**  
**1 Veterans Place, Silver Spring, MD 20910**

**Attendees**

<b>CAC Members ('X' for attendees, blank for apologies)</b>			
Louis Boezi		Karen Michels	X
Alan Bowser	X	Anita Morrison	X
Marie-Michelle Bunch		Brian Morrissey	X
Ilhan Cagri	X	DeAndre Morrow	
Barbara Ditzler	X	Michael Pfetsch	X
Sean Emerson	X	Shane Pollin	X
Karen Evans	X	Mark Ranze	X
Roberta Faul-Zeitler		Dan Reed	X
Dan Figueroa		Michele Riley	X
Joseph Fox		Herb Simmens	
Sean Gabaree	X	Tina Slater	X
Melissa Goemann	X	Brad Stewart	
Larry Goldberg		Eugene Stohlman	
Avi Halpert (alternate Nat Bottigheimer)	X	Mel Tull	X
Kevin Harris	X	James Williamson	X
Sean Heitkemper		Teddy Wu	
Linda Keenan	X	Lori Zeller	X
Tom Lansworth		James Zepp	X
Tracy Lewis		Clifford Zinnes	
Jeffrey McNeil			
<b>Study Team</b>			
<b>Meeting Facilitator – Jen Kellar</b>		<b>Lead Project Facilitator – Andrew Bing</b>	
<b>MTA Program Manager – Jackie Seneschal</b>		<b>Assistant Facilitator – Lauren Michelotti</b>	
<b>MTA Corridor Manager – Tamika Gauvin</b>		<b>SHA Team Member – Laura Barcena</b>	
<b>Consultant Engineer – Kendall Drummond</b>		<b>SHA Team Member – Scott Holcomb</b>	
<b>Consultant Engineer – Feng Liu</b>		<b>MCDOT Rapid Transit System (RTS) Manager – Joana Conklin</b>	
<b>Consultant Engineer – Chris Bell</b>		<b>MCDOT Team Member – Darcy Buckley</b>	
<b>Consultant Engineer – Brian Lange</b>		<b>MCDOT Team Member – Rafael Olarte</b>	
<b>Consultant Engineer – Angela Jones</b>		<b>MCDOT Team Member – Rick Kiegel</b>	

Public	
Abdul Mohammed – SSCAB	Harriet Quinn - WPCA
Pete Tomas – Coalition for Smarter Growth	Debbie Spielberg – Representative of Councilmember Marc Elrich
Robin Davis	

**Handouts**

Handouts to add to CAC Members’ study binders were distributed, which included:

- Meeting #8 Agenda
- Meeting #8 PowerPoint Presentation
- Meeting #7 Meeting Summary

Meeting materials, including a video recording of the meeting, will be posted on the County’s BRT website: [www.montgomerycountymd.gov/brt](http://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/brt) .

**Introductions**

Jennifer Kellar, the meeting facilitator, opened the meeting by providing an overview of the meeting materials being distributed and reviewing the agenda for the meeting. She said there would be a question and answer period following each section of the presentation and there would be an open house-style tabletop discussion session for members to speak directly with study team representatives following the completion of the full presentation.

**Progress Update and Upcoming Milestones**

Study Team Member Brian Lange reviewed the schedule update. He stated the study team would begin to report out the preliminary data gathered and emphasized that the main points of interest for tonight’s meeting are potential physical impacts of the alternatives and anticipated transit ridership.

The October CAC meeting will focus on traffic operations. The study team plans to have a draft corridor study report submitted by mid-October. In November, public workshops will be held that focus on alternatives and analysis results. In December or January, the team expects to hold briefings to local officials on the analysis results and public input collected. By winter 2017, the study team hopes to recommend an alternative.

Update: The October CAC meetings, the draft corridor study report and the public workshops have been postponed. New dates will be provided soon.

**CAC Member Comment:** Member expressed concern with one of the selection criterion – “commence as quickly as possible.” The member felt the proposed project should commence after thorough research and data evaluation. He suggested that the study team should consider MetroExtra service as a potential near-term interim alternative, so that more time can be spent studying BRT service options and improvements.

**CAC Member Comment:** Member expressed concerns regarding transparency of data and the quantity and quality of traffic and travel data the CAC members have received. Member



expressed further concern that there is not sufficient time for CAC members to review the information given to them before meetings. He requested that Meeting #9 be held in November to allow CAC members 30 days to review information.

- **Response:** Thank you for your input. The study team will relay these concerns to the project management team and follow direction received.
- **Update:** The October CAC meetings, the draft corridor study report and the public workshops have been postponed. New dates will be provided soon. The next CAC meeting will be scheduled after the release of the Draft Corridor Study Report.

**CAC Member Comment:** Member expressed concern that MetroExtra is not being taken into account as an alternative. He feels that MetroExtra meets all of the selection criteria the study team has outlined. He believes it is a less expensive option that should be included as a Transportation Systems Management (TSM) alternative. He noted that both the MD 586 and MD 355 BRT studies have TSM alternatives, but US 29 does not and he is concerned that not all feasible options are being considered.

- **Response:** The decision by the State and County to not explicitly include a TSM for US 29 is based on the fact that the two BRT alternatives currently being considered for the corridor are comparable to a TSM alternative in terms of cost and impacts. For both MD 586 and MD 355, the TSM alternative is more than just the implementation of limited-stop service. The TSM for those projects includes the implementation of new service but also infrastructure improvements such as queue jumps, intersection widening, Transit Signal Priority, and enhanced bus stops. The build alternatives for US 29 avoid the widening and related property impacts that occur with the improvements proposed in the MD 586 and MD 355 TSM Alternatives. The US 29 BRT Study is unique among the ongoing BRT studies in Montgomery County in that the project has to be implemented within the existing pavement, and right-of-way to the extent possible. Additionally, the study team's job is to come up with the best BRT system possible within the parameters of the project purpose. For the purposes of moving forward tonight, we'll focus on the two alternatives within those parameters.

**CAC Member Comment:** Member expressed concern regarding the cost of a BRT system and stressed the importance of studying other less expensive or free alternatives.

### **Alternatives Review**

Brian reviewed the alternatives for the proposed project. He explained that the No-Build Alternative serves as a baseline for comparison of the two Build Alternatives. He stated that **Alternative A** involves repurposing existing curbside lanes into peak direction Business Access Transit (BAT) lanes in the south portion of the corridor. BAT lanes would be utilized by BRT buses, local buses, and all right turning traffic. In the north portion of the corridor, Alternative A proposes an all-day dedicated median shoulder lane for BRT buses.

**Alternative B** involves repurposing existing curbside lanes into peak direction managed lanes in the south. Managed lanes would be utilized by BRT buses, HOV2+ vehicles, local buses and all right turning traffic. In the north portion of the corridor, Alternative B proposes BRT and local buses utilize the outside shoulder as a bypass lane during periods of traffic congestion.

Alternative A and B both contain segments where buses would travel in mixed traffic. The limits of these segments vary between the two alternatives in order to help the study team better

understand how traffic would function under different conditions. In some cases, longer segments of mixed traffic were used to facilitate transition areas or were included due to design or impact constraints.

Brian then moved on to the presentation of the preliminary alternatives analysis results. He said that in terms of potential physical impacts of the alternatives, the three main elements analyzed were:

1. Range of impacts to natural resources
2. Range of impacts to socioeconomic and cultural resources
3. Range of impacts to properties

Regarding potential impacts to natural resources, Brian said that Alternative B has the potential to have a greater number of impacts than Alternative A, as a result of potential shoulder reconstruction. He explained that shoulders are generally constructed with less pavement depth than the main roadway; therefore, the use of an outside shoulder lane in Alternative B has the potential to cause pavement degradation if precautions are not taken to reconstruct the shoulder to accommodate the higher volumes and associated loads. Once the study team determines which areas of the shoulder do not have a sustainable pavement depth, they'll determine which parts need reconstruction. Given the preliminary status of this planning-level study, the team assumed a range of potential impacts associated with a "best-case" minimal shoulder reconstruction and a "worst-case" full shoulder reconstruction. Even under the worst-case full reconstruction scenario, the data analysis results of potential impacts to natural resources indicates that impacts are anticipated to be relatively minimal as compared to larger roadway widening projects.

Potential impacts to socioeconomic and cultural resources, possible Environmental Justice communities, parks, and historic properties have been taken into account. The study team's goal is to minimize or avoid impacts in these areas. They hope to create a system where the benefits of efficient transit outweigh any minor impacts on property in these areas. Overall, data analysis found that neither alternative is anticipated to have significant impacts, although Alternative B has the potential to create more impact than Alternative A, as a result of potential shoulder reconstruction.

Regarding potential impacts to properties, Brian stated that part of the study team's goal is to stay within the existing right-of-way to the extent practicable. In a few instances, the proposed improvements might edge onto properties for shoulder reconstruction, or as a result of station element placement. As there are no anticipated displacements at this time, the study team expects the proposed project to have little impact on properties as compared to larger roadway widening projects.

**CAC Member Question:** Member expressed concern regarding right transit lanes (BAT and Managed Lanes) and how they will be enforced.

- **Study Team Response:** The study team would expect drivers to respect the legally supported traffic signage but recognizes that these lanes may pose a challenge. We are studying different kinds of signage, both overhead and on the roadway, which we hope

will decrease any confusion. Future discussions will be held on how to enforce restricted lanes or shoulders and deter misuse.

**Question:** Member asked how the study team defines “peak” hours.

- **Response:** “Peak hour” refers to either 8:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. or 5:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m., and “peak period” refers to either 6:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. or 4:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.

**Question:** A member said that at previous meetings, the CAC was informed there will be no change to the schedules of other bus services. The member questioned if these buses will be able to drive in BRT lanes. Member expressed concern that BRT will not be rapid, given traffic patterns and other bus services.

- **Response:** These are all factors that the study team is looking into to determine the best alternative for a truly “rapid” transit system. At this time, the study team is assuming the local buses would run in the BAT/Managed lanes and outside shoulders, and the inside shoulders would only be used by BRT buses.

**Question:** Member questioned if BAT lanes would be similar to the lanes currently on Georgia Avenue.

- **Response:** Yes, BAT lanes would be similar.

**Question:** Member asked if there would be a proper median in areas where a median shoulder is implemented.

- **Response:** Yes, there would still be a median in areas where the study team proposes a median shoulder lane. It would be narrower, but in most areas, a median space would remain.

**Question:** Member asked for clarification regarding BRT route pattern timing.

- **Response:** The study team identified three BRT route patterns. Two of them would operate during peak periods and one would operate during off-peak periods. The exact hours of operation have not yet been fully determined.

**Question:** Member asked when HOV and BAT lanes would be enforced.

- **Response:** The study team has not finalized exact time frames yet, but they will be enforced during specific periods when lanes are dedicated for buses.

**Question:** Member expressed concern about bike lanes and how bikes might affect traffic.

- **Response:** At this time, the study team is not proposing bike lanes down the corridor. This decision has to do with our efforts to stay within the existing pavement, but we are working to find parallel bike routes in order to satisfy bicycle travel needs. However, state law allows bicyclists to travel on US 29 general travel lanes and this project would not preclude bicycle use.

**Question:** Regarding potential impacts to natural resources, member expressed concern regarding the level of detail about impacts and their intensity. Member requested that the CAC receive more information regarding impact intensity.

- **Response:** The study team will not have more detail on that until more detailed design efforts have been completed on the recommended alternative. We will provide more details on the design effort at a later date.

**Comment:** Member expressed concern that the decision-making process is happening too quickly. Member feels there is a lack of information and expressed that the CAC’s ability to be effective or useful in an advising role is limited by this.

- **Response:** Thank you for your comment. The study team will continue to work on providing materials and information to the CAC members in a way that allows them to review and share information with the communities and groups they represent. Please

recall that we are not asking the CAC members to make decisions, only to share information and feedback.

**Question:** Member expressed concern about the lack of detail regarding the kinds of impacts that are anticipated and whether they will be long-term or environmentally detrimental impacts.

- **Response:** The proposed project is still at a high-level planning stage. The study team will provide specific details about impacts when the project is at the 30 percent design phase. The kinds of impacts anticipated are primarily construction-related, such as grading impacts related to shoulder reconstruction and stormwater management needs that might affect some natural resources in localized locations. Most of these impacts are temporary. The natural environment is one of the key elements we work to protect. As the project progresses, we will work to minimize and avoid impacts, and we will be subject to stringent environmental permitting requirements and monitoring during and after construction.

**Comment:** Member explained that as the study team moves forward and creates more detailed design plans, they can provide more detail regarding impacts as well as a better understanding of what exactly would have to be altered or reconstructed. Member stressed that the proposed project is in its early stages and asked that CAC members keep this in perspective. Member shared his experience with construction changes that have taken place on US 29 over the years. He does not feel this proposed project is comparable to larger changes US 29 has undergone in the past.

**Question:** Member asked that sidewalks be considered a socioeconomic element and suggested that impacts to sidewalks be taken into account.

- **Response:** Sidewalk improvements are already factored into the planning. Any change the study team proposes will be ADA compliant.

**Comment:** Member expressed concern for the Jewish community along US 29. Member suggested incorporating their need to walk to their institutions into the study team's considerations.

**Question:** Member asked if the study team could expand on the locations of residential properties that would be impacted.

- **Response:** The study team has provided this information in the maps that will be used during the breakout session.

**Comment:** Member expressed concern the study team's focus is to come up with the best BRT, rather than the best way to increase mobility and ease congestion.

- **Response:** The study team is reviewing data to determine the best ways to increase mobility options by accommodating a high frequency, reliable transit service operating within existing right-of-way to the extent practical.

**Question:** Member questioned the need for the station location south of Lockwood Drive.

- **Response:** This location was specifically identified in the County's master plan. It offers access to a park which would be beneficial for the residents, to an office park for commuters, and to retail businesses nearby for patrons.

**Question:** Member asked if the United Therapeutics area downtown is still being considered in terms of station locations.

- **Response:** Yes, the CAC will see this on the map in the breakout session.

**Question:** Member suggested each segment (north and south) of the corridor be reviewed individually, which would create four different build alternatives rather than two.

- **Response:** There has been similar feedback regarding this alternative review approach. It is being considered by the study team.

**Question:** Member asked why the area from Sligo Creek Parkway up to the beltway has a curbside BAT lane in Alternative A but is shown in mixed traffic in Alternative B.

- **Response:** The study team is reviewing these different transit/roadway use configurations in an effort to determine what combination ultimately could work best for all modes.

**Question:** Member asked if the Franklin Avenue/Sligo Creek Parkway stop was removed.

- **Response:** Yes, it was removed. Placing a station in that location would prove to be potentially impactful to the park, environmental resources, and adjacent property. Based on the feedback we received and our ridership numbers, the study team felt more harm than good would be done by the stop in this location. This location will still be served by local buses.

**Question:** Member asked about the proposed location of the Four Corners station.

- **Response:** The breakout maps can offer much more detail, but generally, two different configurations are being considered— one where the station is in the median, and one where the stations are on the curbsides.

**Comment:** Member pointed out that the CAC is dealing with one initial set of alternatives for BRT. He explained that as the study team gets further into the design and engineering process, they will likely choose different pieces of Alternative A and Alternative B for different locations. Neither alternative is fixed.

**Question:** Member asked if in the future, the CAC could receive the maps that will be used in breakout sessions ahead of time.

- **Response:** Since the files are very large, we would need to discuss the feasibility of that, but we will make note of the request.

**Question:** Member expressed concern regarding how BRT would access median stations that require multiple lane crossovers and are closely preceded by, or followed by, stations on the right side of the road. Member questioned if signal prioritization is a feasible solution.

- **Response:** These kinds of movements and the effects of station locations are all factors the study team is testing and we welcome any feedback. It is also important to note that both options (median and shoulder) are presented for the Four Corners area. The team is studying a different option in either alternative to better understand the overall effects on transit and general traffic. It's also important to note that in locations where transitions between lanes would be required, these would be segments of mixed traffic.

**Question:** Member asked if the goal of BRT is to create a system efficient enough to reduce the number of single-occupant vehicles on the road. Member expressed concern that BRT could increase congestion and asked if the study team anticipates a decrease in single-occupant vehicle traffic in order to prevent BRT from increasing traffic.

- **Response:** Yes, a potential positive effect of this project is that by implementing BRT, we could reduce single-occupant vehicles and encourage more HOV vehicles – transit and otherwise. Our goal is to put a more rapid and efficient transportation service into effect in order to get more people through the corridor.

**Question:** Member asked about the width of BRT bus stops and buses.

- **Response:** The study team projects the platform would be about 12 ft. wide, but it's important to note that we are still in early stages, and these width assumptions are made for general cost-estimating purposes. MCDOT, utilizing MWCOG funding through the Transportation Land Use Connections grant program, is leading the effort to design

prototype BRT stations. This effort is currently underway and the study team does not yet have an exact station footprint, only those placeholder dimensions discussed this evening. It is likely that the stations sizes will vary depending on location and capacity needs.

**Question:** Member expressed concern regarding BAT lane congestion when approaching the Four Corners area, as a result of the volume of HOV and existing public transit vehicles that would have the ability to share lanes with BRT.

- **Response:** Currently, the BAT lane scenario near the Four Corners area is only proposed under Alternative A. The other alternative near Four Corners would involve mixed traffic. The team is looking at both options to determine which will provide the optimal travel conditions.

**Question:** Member expressed concern regarding how HOV vehicles would share a lane with local buses, given they would have to make frequent stops to continue to function regularly.

- **Response:** Each alternative has different scenarios for each area. These are all just ideas that are being looked at to determine what works and what doesn't. While the HOV vehicles would deal with the buses in the curb lane, they would still be getting relief in the form of fewer single occupant vehicles to contend with.

### **Ridership Analysis Review**

Brian reviewed the ridership analysis explaining that the results are meant to be comparable to the No-Build Alternative against which the study team can evaluate the proposed build elements. He reviewed the BRT ridership modeling assumptions which include the headway times (6 minutes during peak periods, 10 minutes during off-peak periods) as well as the three BRT route patterns which were previously presented.

Brian went on to discuss the ridership analysis results. Based on 2040 projections of daily boardings data, the study team predicts there would be a 22 percent increase in daily ridership with Alternative A and an 18 percent increase in daily ridership with Alternative B.

Another element the study team focused on while reviewing the screening criteria was the number of jobs that can be reached within 45 and 60 minutes via transit for people living within the corridor. Brian pointed out that the study team's projections show an increase in transit accessibility for each alternative compared to the future No-Build condition.

Brian then reviewed the third element of screening criteria – population accessibility within 45 minutes and 60 minutes via transit. This data determined the number of people who live outside the immediate US 29 area, who would have access to businesses and jobs in the area as a result of transit enhancements. Brian pointed out that the study team's projections show an increase in transit accessibility for each alternative compared to the future No-Build condition.

It was noted that the measurement of jobs and households within 45 and 60 minutes were calculated for two different geographic units - corridor segments and Regional Activity Centers (RACs). For the corridor segments, all Transportation Analysis Zones (TAZs) that are within ½ mile of the BRT corridor were identified, and all TAZs falling within the radial 45 minute or 60 minute transit shed of each segment TAZ were identified. Households and employment for all the transit shed TAZs were summed to determine the actual number of jobs and households within the 45 minute and 60 minute shed. A similar process was used for the Regional Activity





Centers (Silver Spring and White Oak) located along the corridor as defined by the MWCOG. Once tabulated, the engineers used the population information contained in each TAZ “hit” and the job information from the RACs “hit” to calculate how many of each could be accessed via transit in 45 minutes and 60 minutes, based on the proposed improvements in alternatives A and B. These numbers were then presented as they compare to the future no-build condition.

Brian reviewed the ridership project goals and pointed out that the significant increase in total transit ridership in both Alternative A and Alternative B is an important takeaway. He reminded members to keep in mind that there is more work to be done and more information to come related to the traffic operations. He also stressed that there may be other alternative configurations that could be evaluated during subsequent phases of the study.

**Question:** Regarding the study team’s 2040 daily boarding projections, member asked about the decrease in Z-Line riders.

- **Response:** These projections were based on the modeled results indicating that existing Z-Line riders would become BRT riders.

**Question:** Member asked if the study team could display 2040 employment accessibility on a map rather than a graph.

- **Response:** This is something the study team is looking into and hopes to be able to visually show the radial impact.

**Question:** Member asked about bus versus auto travel times in each alternative and what the increase in bus service hours would be if BRT was implemented.

- **Response:** Travel data will be discussed in the next meeting. In terms of service hours, the study team has not calculated additional revenue hours compared to current conditions. For context, BRT service would mirror Metrorail hours. For analysis purposes, the team is assuming weekday service would run from 5:00 a.m. to midnight, Saturday service from 6:00 a.m. to midnight, and Sunday service from 7:00 a.m. to midnight.

**Question:** Regarding the 45 minute and 60 minute trip timeframes, member asked what travel speeds the study team is assuming and what distance an individual could travel in those times.

- **Response:** The study team will be reviewing travel time and travel speeds at the next meeting. These ridership accessibility numbers are provided to give a big picture idea of the differences under each alternative for the corridor as a whole and how many more people and jobs can be served over future no-build services.

**Question:** Member requested to see a progression of data from 2020 when the proposed project is projected to be completed through the 2040 numbers that have been given. Member also asked how residents would be able to reach more jobs with BRT than they would with local buses, if BRT buses intend to travel along routes that local buses travel.

- **Response:** The study team will take this request into account. Regarding job reach, the data is more temporal or time-based than geographic. Ideally, BRT buses would be able to travel farther and faster utilizing dedicated lanes and more efficient stops than local service, which would increase the number of jobs that can be accessed within a given amount of time.

**Question:** Member suggested that the 2040 employment accessibility slide be edited to display all of the information differently and in a way that is easier to understand.

- **Response:** Thank you. The study team will address.

**Question:** Member asked how the study team anticipates riders will commute to BRT stations.

- **Response:** We anticipate riders using Park and Rides, bicycle and pedestrian facilities near stops, and other local transit and ride-sharing services.

**Question:** Member expressed concerns that the BRT process is moving too quickly and it doesn't seem efficient to place HOV vehicles in the same lane as local buses. Member requested to see a breakdown of Purple Line data for the 2020-2040 ridership. Member also asked how the study team's analysis takes traffic from outside of Montgomery County, specifically from Howard County, into account. Member pointed out that a lot of the traffic on US 29 is not from people living adjacent to the corridor. The problematic traffic comes from outside areas.

- **Response:** Our models do take into account vehicles that come from outside the corridor. The study team has met with Howard County and is working together to see if it is possible to ultimately tie a Howard County BRT with the Montgomery County BRT system and infrastructure. The study team will look to see if 2020-2040 ridership for the Purple Line is available to provide.

**Question:** Member asked when CAC will know projected ridership numbers from various stations.

- **Response:** The study team will be presenting that data set at the next meeting.

**Question:** Member asked about the assumptions and data behind the 2040 daily boardings data on Slide 26 of the presentation. Member expressed concern that ridership projections are inaccurate, given the projected population increase. Member expressed further concern about projected employment growth rates provided by Montgomery County and how they affect the study team's data.

- **Response:** The numbers used in our COG model are agreed upon by elected officials and the people responsible for planning for the region's needs. The study team does not make adjustments to those numbers.

**Question:** Member asked if and when the study team looked into traffic flow studies.

- **Response:** The study team has looked into traffic flow and analysis has been ongoing. The data was collected prior to May 2016 and the models have been in progress since May. CAC members will receive the results of these studies at the next meeting.

**Question:** Member asked about data provided by Park and Planning and expressed concern about how traffic will be affected by the White Oak build-out.

- **Response:** The study team's projections take the build out at White Oak into account.

### **Wrap-up**

The facilitator asked members to proceed to the tabletop sessions. She encouraged everyone to interact with the study team and ask any questions they may have. At that point, the formal portion of the meeting adjourned.

Discussions between staff and members included topics such as:

- Ridership assumptions and preliminary results
- Preliminary station locations and ridership effects
- Potential impacts to properties and resources
- Next steps in the planning process.

Members provided the following specific written notes on the preliminary plans:

- At Fenton Street / Spring Street members suggested, “BRT should stop at either Fenton Street or Spring Street, and if it’s too difficult to do at Fenton because of historic property, take advantage of new United Healthcare facility”.
- Member stated, “BRT should not stop in Central Business District (CBD)”.
- Member commented, “BRT should stop in CBD – this is already a busy stop and major shopping destination, and having a stop here will encourage people to use the service”.
- Member requested to “please reinstate Franklin Avenue Station”.
- Member commented, “Franklin Avenue Station doesn’t make sense. Few people are traveling north in am and there are many local buses to downtown Silver Spring. A BRT bus going south from Franklin Avenue won’t be any faster than Metrobus or RideOn”.
- Member noted that at University Blvd (MD 193), “Students J-walk” across US 29.
- Member noted that Montgomery Blair staff parking is “only accessible from northbound US 29”.
- Member asked if the proposed station at April Lane / Stewart Lane might impact one of the existing apartment buildings. Study team notes that this building would not be displaced as part of this project.
- Member suggested study team “consider median stops or stations on Castle Boulevard in order to potentially decrease right-of-way impacts”.

\*Note: Since this meeting, the study team has postponed the October 5<sup>th</sup> CAC meeting #9. A new date will be provided soon.