

Meeting Summary
US 29 North Corridor Advisory Committee Meeting #1
February 28, 2015, 11:00 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.
Montgomery County Executive Office Building, 2nd Floor Conference Room
101 Monroe Street, Rockville, Maryland

Attendees

CAC Members			
Erik Amick	X	Matthew Koch	X
Carole Ann Barth	X	Peter Myo Khin	X
John Bowers	X	Rob Richardson	
Brian Downie	X	Mike Rosenberg	X
Oladipo Famuyiwa	X	Ian Swain	
Johnathan M. Genn	X	Joseph Tahan	X
Latisha Johnson	X	Eric Wolvovsky	X
Bernadine Karns	X		
Project Team			
Facilitator – Alan Straus		Facilitator Assistant – Kelly Stoll	
Consultant Project Manager – Brian Lange		SHA Representative – Tessa Young	
County Staff			
County Regional Service Center Director – Jewru Bandeh			
Public			
Dan Wilhelm			

Handouts

Study binders were distributed to each member, which included the following:

- Plenary Session Agenda
- Plenary Session PowerPoint
- Breakout Session Agenda
- Breakout Session PowerPoint
- Homework (Feedback Form)

Meeting materials will be posted on the project website: www.montgomerycountymd.gov/rts

Introductions

The facilitator opened the meeting with introductions by the project team, CAC members, and the public. During introductions, participants were invited to share their takeaways from the earlier plenary session or expectations for their participation in the CAC.

CAC Member Session

Member comments and questions are captured below:

- Communities that do not lie directly adjacent to US 29 should be considered as part of this study as they are impacted by transportation issues within the Silver Spring area
- It is difficult to provide information on reliable transit systems in the corridor to folks new to the area, many of which are not from the United States—most immigrants do not have access to personal vehicles and could benefit from this information
- We are beneficiaries of the foresight of past generations and we should provide that same foresight for those that follow
- Providing a quality and reliable rapid transit system for the corridor is our responsibility for future generations
- We must look for this solution to be sustainable
- This project must have a robust public participation process
- Both the State and County should be certain that efforts are made to truly reflect the needs, wants, suggestions made by community members
- There are huge frustrations with congestion levels that affect all forms of transportation—there is currently no way to avoid getting stuck in traffic
- Whatever solution is chosen, access for those with bicycles must be considered; this seems like an afterthought in some projects
- It is clear there is no one-size-fits-all solution
- Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) could be used on the Intercounty Connector
- We must look at this as a comprehensive system and not just from a Montgomery County perspective and should partner with neighboring jurisdictions
- Need to consider service from the users' perspective; this can't be a study that focuses only on traffic and ridership, we must consider how to make the systems more attractive and comfortable for users
- BRT is a good alternative in areas of medium development density; our area seems like a medium density area, which makes it a good choice for US 29 BRT service
- The project should examine lines running East/West through the County; there are many riders who have a hard time getting to the North/South roads and transit lines
- An important part of the study should be how to get people to the BRT system, whether by spurs or other multi-modal elements
- Splitting the corridor into North and South segments could lead to issues where proposed improvements may not mesh or meet the needs of each location; close coordination between North and South segments will be very important moving forward

Map Exercise

Next, the CAC members were invited to make comments specific to the corridor and mark the affected areas on a physical map. As comments were made, the Study Team placed numbered

stickers on the map to correspond with their comment. The numbered stickers were used randomly and are not intended to be in a particular order or ranking.

The following is a list of points identified on the map. The map with numbered locations that correspond to the comments recorded is included as an attachment to this summary.

- #2 - There is regular traffic congestion from Tech Road to downtown Silver Spring; includes University Boulevard/Four Corners, New Hampshire Avenue, Randolph Road/Cherry Hill Road
- #4 - The overpass crossing New Hampshire Avenue where the road is reduced to two lanes is a bottleneck and creates safety and congestion concerns
- #6 – In recent months, the Metrobus Z-Line service has decreased in the Four Corners area, making it an underserved area
- #8 - Pedestrian crossing safety at the Tech Road and US 29 intersection is a concern
- #10 - East Randolph and Old Columbia Pike – is there an opportunity there for transfer points (Metrobus Z Line and Ride-On Route #10 transfers)
- #12 Consider re-directing the Metrobus Z Line Route through the shopping center parking lot rather than looping around Stewart Lane
- #16 - Keep in mind the access and visibility of retail spaces and shopping along US 29; possibly include signage and access from US 29
- #18 – The Burtonsville revitalization plan includes the Park and Ride; we need to better understand the current use of Park and Ride, as well as review the possibility of moving Park and Rides lots, if necessary
- #22 – Refurbish and use old bridge over Paint Branch to route traffic to Old Columbia Pike and the White Oak Center; also, include emergency access for the future hospital and future shopping center
- #24 – There is a community near Briggs Chaney that needs service, as does the Auto Park, so that citizens from that area can travel to Metrorail and locations downtown
- Additional note – Look at latest Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC) plans for White Oak in relation to the proposed Lockwood Drive/Stewart Lane spur

Mission Statement

The MD 355, MD 586, and US 29 Corridor Advisory Committees' Mission Statement was presented to the group. It was also distributed as part of the presentation.

Ground Rules

Likewise, CAC Ground Rules were presented, which summarize how we treat each other; how we provide feedback and how the feedback will be used; and how we communicate with those outside the CAC.

Logistics

The next meeting will be held on Thursday, March 26, 2015, 6:30 p.m. -8:30 p.m., at Eastern Montgomery Regional Services Center located at 3300 Briggs Chaney Road, Silver Spring, Maryland, 20904. This location is accessible via WMATA Routes Z6, Z8, and Z11 (note Z11 does not run past 8 p.m.) Parking is available onsite.

Homework (Feedback Form)

As homework, a feedback form was provided where members have the opportunity to provide input on their desired outcomes for the CAC process, input about the corridor, and questions they would like answered. They have been encouraged to complete and return the form using one of the following methods:

- Scan and email the form to your facilitation team at *Lauren.Garrett@aecom.com*
- Mail the form to:
Lauren Garrett
AECOM
430 National Business Parkway, Suite 400
Annapolis Junction, MD 20701

Self-addressed stamped envelopes were offered for those who wish to mail the form.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:30 p.m. and members were invited to enjoy the box lunch provided in the cafeteria.

Next Steps

The facilitator will communicate with the group via email with meeting logistics updates.

A list of member email addresses will be shared with the membership per their request for use in communications between meetings.

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