

**Meeting Summary**  
**US 29 South Corridor Advisory Committee (CAC) Meeting #5**  
**December 2 2015, 6:30 p.m. – 9:00 p.m.**  
**Silver Spring Civic Building**  
**1 Veterans Place Silver Spring, MD 20910**

**Attendees**

<b>CAC Members</b>			
Louis Boezi	X	Karen Michels (alternate Larry Dickler)	X
Alan Bowser		Bernice Mireku-North (alternate Ed Levy)	X
Marie-Michelle Bunch	X	Anita Morrison	X
Ilhan Cagri		Brian Morrissey	X
Carmen Camacho		Michael Pfetsch	X
Barbara Ditzler	X	Shane Pollin	X
Sean Emerson	X	Mark Ranze	X
Karen Evans	X	Dan Reed	X
Roberta Faul-Zeitler	X	Michele Riley	X
Joseph Fox	X	Herb Simmens	
Sean Gabaree	X	Tina Slater	X
Melissa Goemann	X	Julie Statland	
Larry Goldberg	X	Brad Stewart	
Bradley Gude		Eugene Stohlman	
Avi Halpert		Chris Wilhelm	
Kevin Harris	X	James Williamson	X
Linda Keenan	X	Teddy Wu	X
Rebecca Lentz-Fernandes	X	Lori Zeller	X
Tracy Lewis		James Zepp (alternate Harriet Quinn)	X
Harold McDougall	X	Clifford Zinnes	X
Jeffrey McNeil (alternate Eileen Finnegan)	X		
<b>Project Team</b>			
Facilitator – Jennifer Kellar		Facilitation Staff – Lauren Garrett	
Lead Project Facilitator – Andrew Bing		Facilitation Staff – Lauren Michelotti	
SHA Representative – Brian Lange		County RTS Manager – Joana Conklin	
SHA Project Manager – Jamaica Arnold		MCDOT – Tom Pogue	
MTA Planning Director – Kevin Quinn		Park and Planning – Larry Cole	
MTA Program Manager – Jackie Seneschal		County Project Engineer – Rafael Olarte	
MTA Corridor Manager – Tamika Gauvin		County Representative – Reemberto Rodriguez	
MTA Representative – Kyle Nembhard			
<b>Public</b>			
George Moary		Matt Bottigheimer	

## **Handouts**

Handouts to add to CAC Members' study binders were distributed, which included the following:

- Meeting #4 Summary
- Meeting #5 Agenda
- Meeting #5 PowerPoint
- Meeting #5 Breakout Discussion Info Sheet

Meeting materials, including a video recording of the meeting, will be posted on the county's RTS website: [www.montgomerycountymd.gov/rts](http://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/rts).

## **Introductions**

Jennifer Kellar, the meeting facilitator, opened the meeting by providing an overview of the meeting materials being distributed and the agenda. This meeting is an informational session followed by a breakout session.

## **BRT Project Management Team Update**

Kevin Quinn, the Director of Planning and Programming with Maryland Transit Administration (MTA) introduced himself for the first time to the CAC South members. MTA is the operator of transit around the Baltimore region and also the lead planner and advocate for transportation for the state of Maryland. Kevin noted that when the study first started Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA) was the lead; since then MTA has had an opportunity to step up and serve as a lead as the study continues. It doesn't change the project team and key contributors; it actually allows us to add resources.

Joanna Conklin spent a few minutes addressing the announcement by County Executive Leggett regarding BRT efforts in Montgomery County. The press release was provided to members with the section highlighted that impacts this project. He has instructed the Department of Transportation to continue with the studies that are underway and as part of those efforts look at short-term solutions that might be able to be used to improve transit in the area for more immediate results while studies on longer-term efforts are being finalized. These BRT studies take years, but the executive recognizes there is still a need to improve transit in the area in the shorter term.

Joana also discussed the status of the MD 650 (New Hampshire Ave) Study. In May, County Council voted for two amendments to be added to the RTS project: 2 million dollars in funding for FY 16 (current fiscal year) and added language that we would begin the study of the New Hampshire study corridor in FY16. A formal letter was sent to the state requesting a schedule, budget, and scope to initiate the study. At the time SHA was managing the US 29 and MD 355 studies and reviewing their resources. SHA has been coordinating with MTA on a response to determine the State's ability to take on this additional work. The county is awaiting their answer and looking for guidance on how the project will move forward.

**Question:** This quote by Leggett says you want to explore less expensive alternatives and phasing into BRT. So is the CAC aimed at producing the BRT? I think a lot of us think we are studying the viability of BRT, not studying how to make the BRT happen. I just want to make sure that the no-build option is still on the table.

- **Answer:** When we formed the CAC it was clear that our purpose was to support the corridor studies for BRT. The master plan does call for BRT; however, there is always a no build or a traditionally short-term Transportation Systems Management (TSM) option to be considered. We are still looking at a range of options.

**CAC Member Comment:** It sounds like we are saying we are going to do a BRT, but we are going to do it incrementally and that we are just going through the motions. The CAC could say “No” to BRT, but County Executive Leggett is saying “Yes”, yes we are going to do this.

- **Project Team Response:** I don’t know that the function of the committee is to say “Yes” or “No” for the BRT; the Master Plan does call for a BRT system. Certainly the input from the CAC’s will be used as part of the decision making process, but it is not the function of this body to make a final decision.

**CAC Member Comment:** There are a lot of Master Plans that say we are going to do this and that; the Master Plan says yes, but that doesn’t always play out and we don’t always implement what is in a Master Plan.

- **Project Team Response** I agree, we don’t always implement what is in the Master Plan. But when priorities are established to study Master Planned improvement recommendations, we must follow through with those studies and investigate recommended implementation options.

**Question:** When the BRT concept was developed, were there alternatives identified in the process that might be useful here?

- **Answer:** There were alternatives identified that span a range of implementation, from short-term to longer-term, but they were all BRT. Our assignment was to look at the maximum BRT service network. It wasn’t a general transit question it was specifically in regards to a BRT system. There were different types and levels of treatment for BRT, but there wasn’t a different mode, all buses. Each option would lead to a BRT option.

**Question:** Is there timeframe when DOT is going to go forward with the general outline with what they think they will be doing?

- **Answer:** We don’t have a defined timeframe. We are trying to turn something around in the next couple months that the executive could potentially make a decision on how to move forward.

**CAC Member Comment:** The BRT Master Plan was developed to provide the State the ability to study the BRT in response to the recommendations of a few local area and sector plans. The reason these committees were established was because it was going through different local areas that the communities had not looked at and needed an opportunity to study and comment on.

**CAC Member Comment:** There are many players planning in this one corridor. It is not my impression that the vote or verdict given by this group is either going to make BRT happen or veto it.

- **Project Team Response:** Yes, this is not a voting body. You are here to make recommendations to the study team for consideration.

### **Project Process and Schedule**

Jackie Seneschal from MTA covered our current activities and those that are still projected.

Jackie explained that as part of the Federal Transit Authority (FTA) approval process, SHA and MTA are required to do extensive preliminary work before they can enter the formal NEPA process and receive federal approval for funding. SHA and MTA will want to have as much of the fundamental planning and preliminary engineering work complete prior to entering the federal approval process, because once entered all approvals must be acquired within two years or the study will be denied federal funding. It is imperative that SHA and MTA have documents like the Preliminary Purpose and Need complete to a level where federal approvals could be reasonably expected.

The study team has developed a process where we do a lot of up front technical work during the pre-NEPA process that can then roll fairly easily into FTA's project development process of materials. The flow chart on slide 5 shows the preliminary process we are going to follow. We are at the point where a great deal of data has been collected and presented, but it's clear from a number of requests we've gotten that we have not provided all of the pieces of data to the CAC. We are very close to having the preliminary purpose and need document assembled and ready to share with the CAC members. We want to provide it in language as clear and cohesive as possible. We have worked really hard to determine a set of goals and objectives to be included in the preliminary purpose and need based on initial feedback provided by CAC members. We are also in the very beginning of the development of conceptual alternatives. We want to cast a wide net for those improvement concepts; we have to develop a set of measures of effectiveness to evaluate the conceptual alternatives. The goal is to have, by this time next year, identified a narrower set of alternatives that are reasonable and those that are not considered feasible will have been dropped from consideration based on the evaluation criteria we establish.

Slide 6 shows a preliminary schedule of project activities. Those activities that are shown in beige have not been funded thus far, but will be required to be completed prior to entering the formal federal NEPA approval process.

**CAC Member Comment:** There seems to be a gap in the steps we are taking now because we have been asking for a baseline of existing conditions data since March. At a minimum we should have existing traffic volumes, ridership, etc., but we haven't gotten any of that and you are moving beyond the next step. The MD 355 project has information we have been requesting and we still don't have that for US 29. You're saying we might get it in two weeks but there won't be a follow-up meeting where we can discuss it. Before you can get to your purpose and need the foundation is the baseline existing data. When do we get to have that conversation and meet with the engineers?

- **Project Team Response:** What we are going to do is provide all of that data in the appendices to the Preliminary Purpose and Need document and we're going to distribute this information by the middle of December. That document is currently still being edited by the project team. I have requested that the MD 355 project team to look at the data we are providing for US 29 so there is consistency and comparable data provided. The document gives you an understanding of what is set forth for the purpose of the project and the appendices will give you the data on how we reached the purpose and need. We are asking you to review the document and provide all of your comments to the project team in writing by the end of January. We can in fact have an additional discussion about it but the best way to move forward is to do it in writing at this time.

**Question:** Who makes the decision to selectively give the information to one corridor but not the other?

- **Answer:** We are committed to ensure that the groups are getting consistent information. We will be distributing the Preliminary Purpose and Need document to you in the near future. We are looking for interaction and a public meeting for this information to be presented. We want CAC Members to have the interaction with the project team and engineers.

**CAC Member Comment:** Slide 5 says we have existing conditions but we don't, and it says we have the purpose and need and we don't. As a volunteer, I'm being asked to come in here and suggest where a bus stop should be, when I have no data about who is driving, who is in the bus, or where they are heading. None of us in this room have any data to make any knowledgeable suggestion about where a bus stop should be. I don't have any data and we have been asking for data. Some of us requested this meeting be postponed until we get the data we have been requesting. We are not prepared for the exercise that is happening tonight and we have not been prepared by the organizers and planners of this meeting.

- **Project Team Responses:** At this point, I will say we have been through a similar exercise at North CAC Meeting and they found this exercise very useful. We understand we haven't provided all of the data that has been requested. You live in this corridor and we can benefit from what you know about this corridor from living in it, which is what we are looking for. We're interested in having a dialogue to capture the information that you have and continue to educate ourselves with your local knowledge.

**CAC Member Comment:** We want a commitment from the Project Team that we will be able to discuss the baseline of the corridor.

- **Project Team Response:** The information that you've requested is best provided in a broader context. The project team has attempted to respond to CAC Member requests and those responses have not felt adequate because you don't have all of the information to look at all at once. I believe at this point, the best thing is for us to do is to provide all of the data in the purpose and need, give it to you for review, digest it, and then have you provide your feedback back to us in writing. Following the review, if your questions suggest we need additional dialogue, we will do that.

**CAC Member Comment:** I haven't seen or been exposed to any information that goes to the benefit of the communities, so far nothing has been based on actual information or preferences of the community. Traffic counts are great but it doesn't replace an origin and destination survey.

While we are looking for alternatives, knowing where people are going would be very helpful. Are you going to make decisions based on surveys of demand or is it all based on national data based on other locations?

- **Project Team Response:** The ridership forecasts that have been developed are based on the travel demand model for this region. By now you know they conduct periodic surveys, traffic information, and routine travel survey. The model that is used to generate the demand is built on local data.

**CAC Member Comment:** I am glad to hear somebody speak who has transit experience. We need all of the information we have been requesting and I'm frustrated about the way we are getting this information, which will be in this large document. We need to have a meeting where we can be walked through it the way that we've been walked through much less complex stuff than the purpose and need. Let's have a meeting to discuss this. Unless we have a baseline, the exercise of rating alternatives doesn't mean anything to us.

- **Project Team Response:** There are a lot of steps we need to go through before we rate alternatives. We will be having a both additional CAC and public meetings in the spring where we will talk about the purpose and need and conceptual alternatives. So the release of the written purpose and need document is an opportunity for you to help us get it right and allows the CAC Members to provide feedback to us.

### **Goals and Objectives/Preliminary Purpose and Need**

Tamika Gauvin reviewed the purpose and need discussion that was initiated during Meetings 2 and 3. Tamika clarified that the purpose and need is a specific document that is reviewed and approved as part of the formal NEPA process to justify the project and provide a way to compare and evaluate the alternatives to determine the best alternative. We want to be best positioned for the NEPA process later, so we are currently identifying where we are now as the preliminary purpose and need. We have already started to get quantifiable data, and have identified the problems and possible solutions known as conceptual alternatives. We are starting the conversation tonight about the conceptual alternatives that we will present in greater detail at a later date.

Using CAC feedback, the study team has begun development of some language for the preliminary purpose and need. A number of groups have provided input on the preliminary purpose and need such as MCDOT, the county Rapid Transit System Steering Committee, MTA, Maryland National Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC), SHA, and the CACs.

In addition to developing the goals and objectives and purpose and need the study team must also develop measures of effectiveness (as noted earlier by Jackie) to see how the alternatives will perform.

CAC needs that were captured in previous meetings were made into quantifiable objectives by the project team. Primary goals drafted include:

- Improve quality of transit service

- Develop transit services that enhance quality of life
- Improve mobility opportunities and choices
- Develop transit services that support master planned development
- Support sustainable and cost effective transportation solutions

The next step is for the project team to distribute the preliminary purpose and need to the CAC. We will address your comments on the purpose and need, then provide it for general public comments. This is a living document; it will be revised by local agencies along with the CAC, members of the public, and project team.

**Question:** I believe the process for the ICC demand was wrong, and cost billions of dollars to build. What can we learn from the failure of the ICC? Was the same model used for ICC as this project?

- **Answer:** The forecasts for the ICC were done using a slightly different process and a completely different round of modeling background and assumptions. My understanding is the current traffic volumes on the ICC are consistent with the travel demand study that was done when tolls were set for the ICC. Right now, we are trying to make a decision about a facility that will be build several years in the future to meet future demand (25 or 30 years). No model is perfect, but we use the best available data and processes for the region.

**CAC Member Comment:** The goals aren't exactly reflective of our opinions, such as use of cars and having different modes of transit. Yes, a good bus service is important but people still want to use their car and it doesn't seem to be focused on here. It should be modified.

**CAC Member Comment:** What this committee could do tonight is go through goals and objectives and review those and give comments on that. What is decided on goal-wise frames the possible solutions. It is really critical to determine the goals and objectives before moving forward. If we move past that and keep going, then the solution is already determined. I would like to ask that the agenda be changed so we can review the goals and objectives together tonight. I'm being asked to do an exercise and have discussions on topics we're not ready to discuss.

- **Project Team Response:** We have always taken your recommendations for additional meetings into consideration. We have noted your request but we are sticking with our agenda this evening. This is meant to be an opportunity to discuss what BRT might look like, challenges, and potential tradeoffs. This is a very early discussion and we are not expecting that recommendations or decisions be made on a detailed level. These are high-level communications where we want to hear from the members about what's important to them and what they initial envision for this transportation corridor.
- **CAC Member Comment:** I would not support moving backwards in time. Traffic on US 29 is bad and we are trying to come up with a solution to it better.
- **CAC Member Comment:** I would like a technical meeting in February to review the purpose and need document that is to be provided to us in December.

## Conceptual Alternatives Development

Brian Lange presented the conceptual alternatives. He explained that we want to help you understand our approach to the development of the conceptual alternatives and to get your feedback on those. You live this every day, we want to hear from you at a high level on what we should be discussing at this early stage of the study, these are the issues and details that we cannot gage from a computer model. We want your individual feedback to be more focused and on the overarching needs of the corridor. We're not interested in crawling through the details of the design alternatives at this point.

Brian emphasized that the team wants to help members better understand our approach to the development of the conceptual alternatives and to then in return receive feedback on those components and how they could be potentially applied. The following components combine to make up the conceptual alternatives:

- Running way (there are 6 options)
- Station locations, surroundings, and access
- Service and operations

Keep in mind, not every running way option is appropriate for every section of the project area. Tradeoffs are important when thinking about the best approach for implementing improvements. We want to bring in as many riders as possible to these transit systems, safely, and efficiently. Up to this point, we have not discussed service operations much, but we need to consider bus routing, transfer points, headways (time between buses) and frequency.

While in the breakout groups, we encourage the members to consider all of these components, the tradeoffs of implementing each; how they interact with the surrounding communities and travel demand centers, potential impacts, rider needs and connectivity, and the user experience associated with running ways, station locations, and service operations options.

**Question:** Part of the CLRP proposal is to turn part of US 29 into a freeway in the future with the grade separated interchanges. Are you providing us with the width of the road along the corridors so that we can be thinking about running ways and adding pavement or not adding pavement? Are these maps to scale?

- **Answer:** As of right now, we are not considering those interchanges because they are not funded currently. The maps are to scale, but we are not providing rulers or dimensions. We are not looking for that level of detail tonight. We are asking that everyone do the best they can with the exercise using the base information and materials provided.



## **Breakout Session Overview**

The CAC Members then split up into five groups:

- South Group #1 (Tables I and II): Transit Center to Lanark Way
- South Group #2 (Tables III and IV): Sligo Creek Parkway to Lockwood Drive
- South Group #3 (Tables V and VI, merged into one table for the exercise): Lockwood Drive to Industrial Parkway (includes Lockwood Drive/Stewart Lane Spur)

Groups were tasked with covering the following three topics:

- Running Way – What running way(s) may be appropriate for this segment of US 29?
- Station Locations, Surroundings, and Access – What station locations may be appropriate for this segment of US 29?
- Service and Operations – What activity centers should the BRT system serve?

The Breakout Session took a total of 75 minutes followed by each group reporting out to all CAC members. Member Kevin Harris abstained from participating in the conceptual alternatives breakout session stating he *“did not feel equipped with anywhere near enough existing conditions data to make recommendations on such granular topics as bus stop location.”*

The CAC members were instructed that the purpose of the breakout sessions is to receive individual feedback, comments, concerns and ideas and to allow the CAC members to dialogue with each other. The purpose is not to seek consensus or agreement on any ideas shared by fellow CAC members.

## **Breakout Session Report-Out**

The following is a running summary of the comments and discussions recorded during the breakout session for each topic. For each breakout group, there is also a summary of what was reported out to the entire group from the designated group reporters.

### ***South Group #1 (Table I): Transit Center to Lanark Way***

Written Report-Out Notes: Collected from Group Volunteer Recorder

#### Topic 1: Running way type

- BRT along curb lane, keep reversible lane dedicated to BRT lane in peak direction.
- Some are concerned/opposed to dedicated lanes.
- Give BRT dedicated lane during rush hour.
- No BRT in mixed traffic.
- Middle lane to remain reversible.
- Dedicated BRT curb lane.
- Mixed traffic in curb lane in vicinity of I-495.
- Dedicated BRT lane until you get to Spring Street. Huge pedestrian problem. Four way intersections so you can cross in every direction.
- Dedicated BRT lane during rush hour only.

Topic 2: Station locations, surroundings, and access

- Perhaps BRT should not stop inside Beltway. The Transit Center is only two blocks away.
- Do not have stations south of the Beltway.
- How do people get out of their neighborhood?
- No stations at Fenton Street.
- BRT Buses – is there room in the Transit center for BRT?
- Do not provide advance signalization for buses traveling on US 29 at Dale Drive or Spring Street. These intersections feature significant cross-traffic, as well as pedestrian crosswalks. Traffic signal priority is important and problematic in constricted areas. It would impact feeder and pedestrian traffic.

Topic 3: Service and Operations

- Is BRT designed for local vs regional trips?
- Are all buses allowed in dedicated lanes for stops only?
- How many BRTs running in an hour?
- Do BRTs stop in line or adjacent to lane?
- RideOn should be feeder for BRT.
- 3,000 trucks per day on Colesville Road, get rid of freight in lanes at the end of Colesville Road.
- There is a freight problem.
- Do what works best for a particular section of US 29 then conversations with DC and Howard County should occur.
- RideOn and BRT can communicate with technology. RideOn should not use BRT lane.
- Advanced signalization and wider intersections. Cross traffic not suitable or TSP.
- Take away parking for businesses.

Verbal Report-Out Notes: Report-Out from Group Volunteer Reporter

- Is BRT designed for local vs regional trips? BRT is not for local traffic, existing bus use from ride on to metro is sufficient.
- BRT from Beltway to Metro Transit Center has no need for stops along that line
- There should be a dedicated curb lane for rush hour only but not get rid of reversible separate lane that switches
- Are exiting buses allowed to use the bus lane for pickups and drop offs to not disrupt BRT?
- The number of BRTs running in an hour was not addressed
- Traffic signal priority is important and problematic in constricted areas. It would impact feeder and pedestrian traffic.
- Hundreds of commercial use US 29, so dedicated lane full time would interrupt business loading and unloading
- Taking away street parking is a concern for businesses
- BRT in mixed traffic would defeat purpose
- How do people get in and out their neighborhoods with BRT lanes?
- Would right turns be able to use the dedicated BRT lanes?

**South Group #1 (Table II): Transit Center to Lanark Way**

Written Report-Out Notes: Collected from Group Volunteer Recorder

**Topic 1: Running way type**

- There is no extra pavement required (ex. Blair High School). Proposing a median reversible busway from Lockwood Dr. to Sligo Creek Pkwy avoids Beltway issues.
- Concerns with left turns on Lanark Way.
- Concerns with the light at Crestmoor Dr. in terms of cut-through traffic to Woodmoor Shops from US 29 south.
- No left turns during rush hour.
- Two-lane median past Montgomery Blair High School. Keep in mind the Z transfer.
- There should potentially be an alternative to the Study Bus or HOV lane during rush hour.
- You should preserve the Polychrome Historical District on the west side of US 29 between Lanark Way and the Beltway. Account for this when considering any widening on the Blair High School side.
- How do right turns work with dedicated curb lanes?
  - Concerns:
    - What if drivers use it to bypass traffic?
    - How far from the intersection can you make turns?
- Consider reversible lanes in DTSS or dedicated curb lanes from Spring Street to Silver Spring Transit Center.
  - Concerns:
    - What about on-street parking?
    - What about loading?
    - School buses stopping in front of AFI Silver
- Two main congested areas:
  - North of Four Corners in the right lane
  - Between Spring Street and the Transit Center
- Consider a dedicated median from the Beltway to Sligo Creek Pkwy.
  - Concerns:
    - Access to stations and making sure that people can safely cross the street (2-3 lanes of traffic) to reach them.
    - Dedicated median between the Beltway because of conflicts with drivers in the right lane going to the Beltway.
    - Station needed by the Transit Center
      - Existing bus lane for buses entering the Transit Center.
      - It's bad already and always will be.

**Topic 2: Station locations, surroundings, and access**

- Safety on US 29 should be a top priority.
- Account for neighborhood access.
- Account for commercial access.
- Account for Beltway access and backups – most of the traffic is going to and from the Beltway.

- Consider jug handle circulation and geography.
- There have been 3 deaths in 2 years due to pedestrian crossings on US 29 between Lockwood Drive and MD 650.
- Rush hour and peak hour traffic is a problem.
- Throughout Four Corners area (Sligo Creek Pwky to NW Branch) may be constraining area.
- Consider a southbound Fenton St. stop near Spring St. on the United Therapeutics Corporation campus.
- Do we need a Franklin Ave. stop?

### Topic 3: Service and operations

- If possible, service every 5 minutes at rush hour.
- Service every 15 minutes maximum the rest of the time.

### Verbal Report-Out Notes: Report-Out from Group Volunteer Reporter

- Hung jury about what to do with Sligo Creek to Metro Transit Center
- Dedicated curb lanes from Spring Street to Transit Center
  - Concerns about how right turns would work, how drivers might use it to bypass traffic, and how far from the intersection it would be allowed for you to get in the lane to make right turns
  - Concerns about street parking in Silver Spring, and loading and unloading zones
- Congested areas
- Dedicated median Beltway to Sligo Creek
  - Access to station, curb to station in middle, should be at a stop light for safe crossing
  - To eliminate right turning issues
- Is a lane needed at all near transit center? There's already lane there currently.
- Fenton St. – need a stop there
- South bound stop should go north by United Therapeutics
- Franklin Ave – need a stop there

### ***South Group #2 (Table III): Sligo Creek Parkway to Lockwood Drive***

### Written Report-Out Notes: Collected from Group Volunteer Recorder

#### Topic 1: Running way type

- Why do we need a station at Four Corners?
- Need to address 3,000 students at Blair High School and 300 staff
- Access to Four Corners shopping center and Safeway need to be addressed
- Put a mixed traffic lane at Woodmoor Dr. and US 29.
- Many kids crossing in the traffic at University Blvd. and the Beltway.
- Road widening will directly impact minority and immigrant homeowners on US 29 between Lorain Ave. and University Blvd.
- Put a mixed traffic lane at Crestmoor Dr. and US 29.
- You can't widen the road through this section

### Topic 2: Station locations, surroundings, and access

- Option: On US 29 only BRT could turn left on University Blvd. Currently making a left is prohibited and you must use a jug handle.
- Maybe have a stop at the Blair High School, then BRT could “loop around” the jug handle to get back on US 29.
- Cons for station at University Blvd. and US 29:
  - There’s no room for a station
  - There’s too much pedestrian traffic
  - Traffic from the Beltway
- Pros for station at University Blvd. and US 29:
  - There is a lot of demand
- Two people suggest a station at University Blvd. and US 29 near the churches.
- Others want a station south of the Beltway by Hastings Dr. and US 29.
- There’s already heavy congestion at University Blvd. and US 29.

### Topic 3: Service and operations

- Express buses currently service the area well and are half empty. We wouldn’t suggest stopping at Four Corners or the Dillon’s [Bus Service commuter bus stop].
- The major traffic backup is due to the Beltway.
- The area is too congested to widen the road.
- A pedestrian overpass would be good at Four Corners.

### Verbal Report-Out Notes: Report-Out from Group Volunteer Reporter

- Traffic in Four Corners is piled up on two inside lanes (because of traffic that comes through is heading to Beltway)
- Express buses that county has put in place cruise through Four Corners with not many people on them, they are in the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> lane.
- Four Corners area station, the cons of putting station there, there are many children crossing, ton of traffic getting off beltway, existing buildings there already (church, school, shopping centers); while Tina feels there should be a station there because there is a lot of demand there
- Homeowners on US 29 would be impacted by road widening
- Buses service area well but don’t’ stop at Four Corners
- Need a pedestrian overpass at Four Corners to help kids cross

### ***South Group #2 (Table IV): Sligo Creek Parkway to Lockwood Drive***

### Written Report-Out Notes: Collected from Group Volunteer Recorder

#### Topic 1: Running way type

- If BRT must go through, it might work to have it make a left before the Woodmoor Shopping Center and then make a right onto University Blvd. to make another left onto US 29 South.

Topic 2: Station locations, surroundings, and access

- You might need to have a station on the left side of the street (University Blvd.).
- Another option is to now have a station at Four Corners at all.
- Four Corners has a lot going on during rush hour. Southbound US 29 gets backed up from the Beltway to University Blvd. in the right lane.
- Staff for Blair High School can only access parking from the northbound lane of US 29. Staff coming from the east and west of University Blvd. or southbound US 29 must make a U-turn at Brewster Ave. so you can't have a station block that.

Verbal Report-Out Notes: Report-Out from Group Volunteer Reporter

- Road widths discussion, there is room for a reversible median guideway through entire corridor through Lockwood to Sligo Creek which includes Four Corners
- At Four Corners to across Beltway, have 2 lane configurations; that would take away left lane of northbound US 29 between University Boulevard. Once past that take away 10 feet of property of Blair High school.
- Left turns would be issue in few areas that need to be addressed
- Cut out left turns at rush hour
- Make bus lane rush hour only and turn into HOV lane in other times
- Stopped at Franklin wouldn't get much usage, move to Indian Spring
- Concerns at Four Corners for safety of pedestrians crossing
- The area between Woodmoor shopping center and Hastings has 6 travel lanes between 11-12 ft. each. If we narrow the lanes we could still leave ourselves with 20 ft in the middle, leave room for a 2-way bus way, and preserve the 6 travel lanes.
- More people have more access to the local stations than they would to the BRT stations.
- There's no signalized left from Crestmoor to US 29 south.
- Maybe add a median bus lane or a mixed traffic lane on Colesville near the Woodmoor shopping center area.
- If you did a center reversible lane, there's a way to preserve a left into every neighborhood. (Sean )

***South #3 (Table V): Lockwood Drive to Industrial Parkway (includes Lockwood Drive/Stewart Lane Spur)***Written Report-Out Notes: Collected from Group Volunteer RecorderTopic 1: Running way type

- US 29 deals with local connectivity traffic as well as throughput from Howard County.
- From MD 650 to Paint Branch Stream Valley the median should be used for an alternating (reversible) lane.
- Consider routing buses along Old Columbia Pike to alleviate local traffic.
- Consider putting a dedicated lane above Paint Branch Stream Valley and widen the bridge.
- Route from Lockwood Dr. from MD 650 to US 29 should be eliminated.
- Use US 29 from MD 650 to Four Corners.

Topic 2: Station locations, surroundings, and access

- Proposed station should be put at or north of Stewart Ln.

#### Verbal Report-Out Notes: Report-Out from Group Volunteer Reporter

- Overburden from Howard County to the District
- Local traffic (up county to metro and need to move around the area)
- Thru put (overburden flow)
- Keep BRT separate from local bus traffic so through put of BRT wouldn't suffer.
- Bridge over Paint Branch need to be widened
- Paint Branch to 650 area use median to work into dedicated lane
- There is a region of community/neighborhoods that need a BRT station near Industrial Parkway
- Widen bridge over Paint Branch Park
- Have to service residential travelers as population will grow around BRT stations in White Oak. White Oak should also service FDA
- Suggest Old Columbia Pike bridge be utilized to facilitate local traffic flow back into Life Sciences area
- Object to using Lockwood Drive from MD 650 to US 29, it does not provide BRT type of flow. Suggest BRT traffic come down US 29.
- There is a need for a station on the US 29 side as opposed to Lockwood.
- Provide service to Fort Totten Metro via MD 650

#### Additional Question and Answer Session

**CAC Member Comment:** I would like to have the entire project staff introduce themselves and identify who is the lead engineer.

**Question:** Are there transportation economists involved in this project?

- **Answer:** Within AECOM we do have economists; I don't believe they are currently scoped to be involved in the project. That is a conversation we'll have to have with MTA.

**Question:** With MTA being operator and a management consultant is there a MTA conflict of interest?

- **Answer:** MTA is an FTA grant recipient, the state receives several funding sources, and those sources are geographically bound. There is no competition based on geographical locations.

#### Next Steps

The facilitator will communicate with the group via email regarding future meetings as dates are set.

Following review by the internal project team, the meeting summary will be circulated to the members for feedback before being finalized and posted online.