

**Montgomery County Pedestrian, Bicycle, and Traffic Safety Advisory Committee  
Motion Tracking Report**

5/2/16

**Status Key**

ONR—Open, No Response                                      CNR—Closed, No Response  
 OAR—Open Acceptable Response                                      CAR—Closed Acceptable Response  
 OUR—Open Unacceptable Response                                      CUR—Closed Unacceptable Response  
 OIP—Open, In Progress                                      NRN—No Response Necessary

Date of Motion/ Action	Motion/Action	Date Transmitted To CE/CC	Date of Response	Status	Comments Next Steps
<b>2. January 2011</b>	<p>MOTION: The PBTSAC supports Bill 37-11, to authorize the installation of school bus safety cameras and that the program should include a strong education component and citizen involvement through a citizens’ advisory committee, similar to the advisory committee used for implementing the County’s speed camera program.</p>	<p>5/1/14 Provided complete grid</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>OIP</p>	<p>The program has been one of the most successful in the nation. Given the large number of citations, more education may be needed - - or maybe not, given all the signage and warning lights school buses now use. Additional funding was not provided for this program.</p> <p>A vendor with a different pricing model would like to outfit all 1,200 school buses with new cameras. MCPD supports the school board in issuing a sole source contract to this vendor. This camera system will save MCPS \$800,000 a year. The vendor would keep all the revenue to cover maintenance and equipment costs. If approved, it would protect every school bus in the fleet. The current bus camera contract with Xerox expires in June 2016.</p> <p><b>MONITOR PROGRESS</b></p>
<b>3. January 2011</b>	<p>ACTION: Two suggestions were made: 1) expanding the SRTS program incorporating bicycle education; 2) MVA should conduct some sort of continuing driver education every 10 years.</p>	<p>5/1/14 Provided complete grid</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>OIP</p>	<p>Driver education is a State MVA issue. Dunckel reported that pedestrian safety has become a very high priority for the State; pedestrian fatalities now comprise 25% of all traffic fatalities in Maryland, up from 20% a year ago. It is a good time to be raising these issues at the State level.</p> <p>The Maryland Motor Vehicle Administration (MVA) is adding pedestrian and bicycle safety questions to their test given for drivers licenses. The questions are being developed now.</p>

<p><b>4. November 2012</b></p>	<p><u>MOTION</u>: PBTSAC recommends to the County Executive that funding be increased for pedestrian education and bicycle safety programs without negatively impacting other pedestrian safety programs.</p>	<p>5/1/14 Provided complete grid</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>OIP</p>	<p>MCDOT has worked with Montgomery College and the Washington Area Bicycle Association (WABA) to hold classes on Bicycle Safety. And the Bikeshare Program has created a subsidized helmet program. Nadji Kirby has been providing Bicycle Safety educational materials within the schools via bike rodeos. Droblich suggested another alternative may be working with SHA to provide local bicycle shops with the already printed bicycle safety handouts. <b>The Committee has confirmed that State law actually mandates that it will provide materials to do so. This program is less than stellar.</b></p> <p>Anyesha Mookherjee and Jeff Dunckel will work together to get materials to distribute through bike shops. Need list of bike shops throughout the county including box stores.</p> <p><b>MONITOR PROGRESS</b> Anyesha and Jeff Dunckel will provide update at Nov mtg.</p>
<p><b>5. September 2013</b></p>	<p><u>MOTION—County-wide Bike Safety Education Campaign</u>: Voted, that the PBTSAC recommend to the County Executive that a county-wide bicycle safety education campaign be developed that meets national best practices (i.e. League of American Bicyclists) for bicyclists of all levels with consideration for less experienced bicyclists to address the anticipated increase in bicyclists due to the implementation of Bikeshare. In addition, the PBTSAC recommends that an education campaign be developed which focuses on motorists regarding safe interactions around and with bicyclists. This may include details such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding the rights and responsibilities of bicyclists in using the roads, trails, and/or sidewalks.</li> <li>• Conflict mitigation with other road users</li> <li>• Use of protective and reflective devices to reduce risk while riding</li> <li>• Use of proper signals to inform other road users of bicyclists actions</li> </ul>	<p>5/1/14 Provided complete grid</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>OUR</p>	<p>Jeff Dunckel stated that the PBTSAC has requested a significant increase from the County Council last year. The issue is under review by OMB and the County Executive. The Operating budget will not be released until after the March PBTSAC meeting so MCDOT will not be able to discuss what was requested until after that release. The status of the recommendation remains “open-no response.”</p> <p><b>No FY16 funding was requested by the County Executive for this item. There has been no official response from the CE about why funding is not being pursued.</b></p> <p><b>MONITOR PROGRESS</b> <b>NEED UPDATE FOR FY17</b></p>

<p><b>6. September 2013</b></p>	<p>MOTION—<i>Improve Bicycle Infrastructure</i>: Voted, that the PBTSAC recommend to the County Executive that emphasis be given to improving existing bike infrastructure or implementing new bike infrastructure in the areas where Bikeshare will be implemented, working with all appropriate stakeholders, including but not limited to affected schools. This will provide the Bikeshare program with the opportunity to succeed by helping participants feel safe and confident when using bicycles. Research indicates that proper signage, bike lanes, sharrows, etc. help facilitate safe bicycling by notifying bicyclists and motorists alike of where bicycles are allowed to ride as well as create an expectation that bicyclists will be using these facilities.</p>	<p>5/1/14 Provided complete grid</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>OIP</p>	<p>Jeff Dunckel explained that Park and Planning has designated 28 BiPPA areas in Montgomery County. The first five BiPPAs to be studied (designated by County Council) are Silver Spring, Wheaton, Glenmont, Grosvenor, and Veirs Mill/Randolph.</p> <p>Aruna Miller provided an update at the October meeting. Moving into FY16, the County has \$875,000 to implement recommended improvements. MCDOT decided to target one area for this year's expenditures: Silver Spring. The total budget is \$5 million over 5 years.</p> <p><b>MONITOR PROGRESS</b></p>
---------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------	-------------	------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<p>7. September 2013</p>	<p>MOTION: <u>Crosswalk Striping and Crossing Treatment Policy</u>: Voted, that the PBTSAC recommend to the County Executive that a crosswalk striping policy and crossing treatment policy be developed that meets national best practices for pedestrian safety for all roadways users of all mobility levels, and that is consistent for local, county and state roadways. This may include details such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High visibility (ladder) crosswalks shall be utilized at signalized intersections in CBDs and adjacent to transit stops/stations and other high pedestrian volume locations. On other roadways, parallel line striping at signalized intersections is warranted (the goal is to reserve funds for most needed locations and convey consistent message to motorists). Consider use of advance stop bars and diagonal striping to improve visibility. Investigate use of a vertical and detectible ridge along crosswalks in high volume locations to improve safety of persons with visual impairments</li> <li>• Develop maintenance goals to ensure crossing surface is smooth and without obstruction and markings remain in good repair.</li> <li>• Crossing distances shall be mitigated/shortened at every opportunity through the use of raised pedestrian refuge islands (adequate to accommodate a wheelchair, protected with a nose), curb extensions or tightened turning radii. Signals should be set to meet the most recent MUTCD pedestrian walking speed of 3.5 ft./second.</li> <li>• At uncontrolled crossings of multiple lane roads with high traffic volumes and speeds over 40mph, marked crosswalks alone are inadequate for pedestrian safety. Beacons or half signals and advance warning signs should be implemented.</li> </ul>	<p>5/1/14 Provided complete grid</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>OAR</p>	<p>Dunckel stated MCDOT has moved towards remarking crosswalks on a three-year cycle now, with high-visibility, ladder-style crosswalks being installed. Funding has been recently increased to this program to enable an expansion. Bilgrami clarified that as older, faded crosswalk within the County are replaced, the unsignalized crosswalks, urban districts, HIAs, and crosswalks with higher pedestrian volumes will be marked with a ladder-style crosswalk marking. The ladder-style pavement marking is for greater visibility and increased awareness of pedestrians. It is agreed the status is to change to "closed- acceptable response," though the work is ongoing - - and never really closed.</p> <p><b>MONITOR PROGRESS NEED FUNDING UPDATE IN RELATION TO FY17 BUDGET AND ADA COMPLIANCE</b></p>
--------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------	----------------	------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<p><b>8. September 2013</b></p>	<p>MOTION—Pedestrian Criteria in Speed Camera Placement: Voted, that the PBTSAC recommend to the County Executive the specific placement of speed cameras to take pedestrian activity and crossings into greater consideration, particularly at the location of bus stops and other pedestrian generators and natural crossing paths. Speed cameras are a vital tool to slow motorists on roadways and allow pedestrians to cross roadways, particularly on arterials where signalized intersections are at great distances and pedestrian generators such as bus stops encourage mid-block crossings.</p>	<p>5/1/14 Provided complete grid</p>		<p>CAR</p>	<p>Cpt. Didone stated every speed camera placement has a pedestrian factor included. If there is not a pedestrian factor as part of a need for the camera, then the speed camera does not usually get approved.</p> <p>Montgomery County is the only agency running a speed camera program that has received a positive evaluation – the Insurance Institute evaluated the program. The County has proven that cameras do save lives. Captain Didone recently studied the crash data from 2003 – 2008, and 2008 – 2014. The County used to average 50 motor-vehicle fatalities and 15 pedestrian fatalities a year. Since speed cameras have been installed, those numbers have gone to an average of 33 motor-vehicle fatalities and 10 pedestrian fatalities a year. The County will not be able to expand the program for another two years.</p> <p><b>MONITOR PROGRESS</b></p>
<p><b>9. September 2013</b></p>	<p>MOTION—<u>Montgomery County Pedestrian Master Plan</u>: Voted, that the PBTSAC recommend to the County Executive and the County Council that Montgomery County develop a Pedestrian Master Plan to establish overarching goals for the County regarding pedestrian mode share, crash rates, and facilities. Agreed-upon goals help guide individual projects and construction and raise awareness of the need to accommodate pedestrians equally with motorists. A master plan provides evidence of national best practices for facilities and sets the design and engineering standards for pedestrian facilities in road construction and development projects. A pedestrian master plan will not only address concerns raised by the disabled community regarding street crossings, but also about maintaining a clear path of travel on sidewalks (often blocked by utility poles and street furniture and construction projects), and improving safety in parking lots and access to bus stops.</p>	<p>5/1/14 Provided complete grid</p>		<p>OUR</p>	<p>The CE or CC requested no funding for this item in the FY16 Budget.</p> <p>Wolanin suggested putting together a work group to review what Colleen had prepared and to discuss the best process to develop some type of plan or guidance for the County. Droblich suggested that Colleen Mitchell, George Branyan and David Anspacher meet with Emil Wolanin to work through an outline of what this document or plan should be.</p> <p><b>NEED TO DISCUSS NEXT STEPS.</b></p>

<p><b>10. September 2013</b></p>	<p>MOTION—<u>Purple Line Project - No Additional Lane Capacity Be Provided</u>: Voted, that the PBTSAC recommend to the County Executive and County Council that in central business districts, locations with other high capacity transit services (metro stations, bus hubs), locations with high pedestrian volumes and planned pedestrian generators, that no additional lane capacity be provided for motor vehicles, including no additional turn lanes. Instead, right of way should be dedicated to bicycle facilities, promenades with wide planting strips and street trees.</p>	<p>5/1/14 Provided complete grid</p>		<p>OIP</p>	<p>The PBTSAC’s recommendations had been put forward to the MTA which responded by speaking to the Committee last summer. Drew Morrison reported that Councilmember Riemer wrote MTA a letter addressing the lane widths along Wayne Avenue and feels additional conversation needs to ensue.</p> <p>Drew Morrison reports that the Governor should provide his response to the proposed Purple line by mid- to late-May. If the project proceeds, the contractor project teams should submit their proposals this August.</p> <p><b>NEED UPDATE</b></p>
<p><b>11. September 2013</b></p>	<p>MOTION—<u>Purple Line Project - Specifications for Pedestrian Crossings</u>: Voted, that the PBTSAC recommend to the County Executive and County Council that anywhere the Purple Line travels through central business districts, locations with other transit services (metro stations, bus hubs), locations with high pedestrian volumes and planned pedestrian generators, crossings should include raised pedestrian refuge islands (that cross over the striped crosswalk), tight turning radii, and planting strips with street trees.</p>	<p>5/1/14 Provided complete grid</p>		<p>OIP</p>	<p>The PBTSAC’s recommendations had been put forward to the MTA which responded by speaking to the Committee last summer. Drew Morrison reported that Councilmember Riemer wrote MTA a letter addressing the lane widths along Wayne Avenue and feels additional conversation needs to ensue. The County is waiting for the new Governor’s proposal.</p> <p>Drew Morrison reports that the Governor should provide his response to the proposed Purple line by mid- to late-May. If the project proceeds, the contractor project teams should submit their proposals this August.</p> <p><b>NEED UPDATE</b></p>

<p><b>12. November 2013</b></p>	<p>MOTION—<u>Construction Signage – Pedestrian Safety Concerns</u>: Motion voted that the PBTSAC recommend to the County Executive (<i>that the County</i>) explore requiring appropriate signage at construction areas which provides information to the public where they can call or notify the County (e.g. 311) about possible improper impediments to the flow of pedestrian traffic or other potential pedestrian and traffic safety concerns; a Motion was moved and seconded to add an amendment that the PBTSAC requests that the County Executive ask the State to follow the same procedures. The motion was unanimously approved with the amendment.</p>	<p>5/1/14 Provided complete grid</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>OIP</p>	<p>Jeff Dunckel stated this issue primarily involves the Department of Permitting Services, as well as SHA. In recent discussions, it was agreed that the information that needed to be placed on signage in the public rights-of-way should be defined. Bilgrami, Dunckel, and Mookerjhee will meet with DPS and discuss what measures should be taken to establish proper public notification of disruptions to pedestrian pathways, and to decide what signage in the public ROW should be posted. SHA already has required signage including a phone number to report any issues. A follow up meeting is proposed to include State Highway, Permitting Services, Highway Services, and Traffic Engineering to discuss this topic further.</p> <p>Bill 3-15 was passed in March as part of the department of permitting budget. An inspector will be hired to ensure sidewalks remain clear during construction. Signage will also be provided on construction sites, work will need to be properly staged, and construction sites will need to accommodate pedestrians. This bill is for County right-of-way, but not state right-of-way.</p> <p><b>MONITOR PROGRESS: NEED UPDATE ON IMPLEMENTATION</b></p>
<p><b>14. May 2014</b></p>	<p>Motion: Voted that the PBTSAC recommend to the Montgomery County Executive and the Montgomery County Council, that each find an appropriate body to consider the possibility of asking PEPCO to allow public access to bicycles and pedestrians to use whatever portions of PEPCO utility real estate that might be made safely available for such use.</p>	<p>9/2/14</p>		<p>OIP</p>	<p>Negotiations are underway with Pepco regarding the right-of-way issue and future use for trails.</p> <p><b>MONITOR PROGRESS</b></p>

<p><b>15. May 2014</b></p>	<p>Motion: Voted that the Pedestrian, Bicycle &amp; Traffic Safety Advisory Committee recommend to the County Council that it begin consideration of a formal review process of the Countywide Bikeways Functional Master Plan, which has not been updated since 2005. The plan should be updated in order to account for county growth, new engineering best practices and to promote interconnectivity of bicycle trails and bicycle roadway accommodations.</p>	<p>9/2/14</p>		<p>OIP</p>	<p>The Bike Master Plan update started on July 1, 2015 and will be a two-year process. Kick off meetings for the Bicycle Master Plan began around the County in September. On October 6<sup>th</sup>, a meeting will take place at Walter Johnson High School. They had great reception in the more urban areas and people really liked the interactive map where you can provide comments on the different problems.  <a href="http://www.montgomeryplanning.org/gis/interactive/bikeways.shtm">http://www.montgomeryplanning.org/gis/interactive/bikeways.shtm</a>. The draft plan will be submitted to the board in late 2016 and approved by County Council in late 2017. Darrel Drobnich has been appointed to the Plan Advisory Group.</p> <p><b>MONITOR PROGRESS:</b></p>
<p><b>16. September 2014</b></p>	<p>Motion: Voted that snow removal and the general clearance of pedestrian facilities is an important safety issue, and it is one that the County should increase its efforts to ameliorate the hazards that result from the current level of effort.</p> <p>Bill 21-14, with its main thrust being the development of a Plan for removal of snow from sidewalks, is a good first step in increasing focus on this issue. Bill components, which include mapping and prioritizing pedestrian infrastructure, clarifying the removal responsibilities, and educating and enforcement components, are positive elements of this effort and are supported by the Committee.</p> <p>While the Committee fully expects this bill to evolve as input from stakeholders is heard and incorporated, and as a snow removal plan is developed, Bill 21-14 is a good starting place.</p>	<p>10/30/14</p> <p>Via Letter</p>		<p>OIP</p>	<p>Bill 21-14 for snow removal had three components: 1) conducting an inventory of sidewalks and ownership, 2) getting the inventory map digitized and posted to the County web site so people could go online and click an area where a sidewalk needed to be cleared, and 3) identifying funds to clear sidewalks. The Council approved the inventory for \$200,000 for #1. The other two items were not approved in this year's budget.</p> <p><b>MONITOR PROGRESS</b>  Drew Morrison to provide update about implementation and FY17 budget possibilities.</p>



<p><b>17.</b> <b>April 2015</b></p>	<p>Motion: Voted that the PBTSAC support adding \$125,000 to the FY16 budget to support a comprehensive pedestrian safety education and enforcement approach. The motion passed with one abstention.</p>	<p>4/1 Transmitted in Council</p>		<p>OIP</p> <p>Drobnich testified in support of additional funding for both enforcement and education before the full Council and submitted testimony to the T&amp;E Committee.</p> <p>The Council's Reconciliation list included \$80,000 for pedestrian enforcement and \$100,000 for pedestrian safety education.</p> <p>Tom Didone provided update at October meeting. The FY16 \$80,000 budget for enforcement was excluded from the County's savings plan - - but MCPD are having trouble finding it. Last year the police averaged 18 details a month. This year's plan has the police doing 40 details a month. That is 1,920 hours of police enforcement dedicated to pedestrian safety this year.</p> <p><b>MONITOR</b></p>
-----------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------	--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------