

Pike Center H155 Floating Zone Plan - DRC Comments 2024-1004

comment

Applicant response

Fire Access Plan - Marie Labaw, marie.labaw@montgomerycountymd.gov

1	Show 15ft wide clear and walkable grade along all exposed exterior walls. identify any obstructions such as stormwater management facilities.	On this side of the bldg. we have no SWM facilities at grade and we show 22' clear (partially because of the WSSC esmt).
2	Locate and clearly label lowest elevation of apparatus access for each building.	Applicant has added a spot for each building on the plans.
3	Identify ground floor retail layout and access points.	Applicant will work on this layout at Site Plan. There is no programmed area as of yet.
4	Can't locate a hydrant behind parking.	Applicant has relocated this to an area with no parallel parking.

Urban Design - Natasha Fahim, natasha.fahim@montgomeryplanning.org

5	1. Staff is pleased to see this proposal within the White Flint 2 Master Plan area and near the well-established Pike and Rose development and Twinbrook metro station. This development transformed a single-use shopping strip with a vast surface parking lot into compact and walkable blocks for mixed-use buildings, framing the existing streets. It also focused on a central active public space right along Rockville Pike, one of the sector plan recommendations for this area.	The Applicant appreciates your review and thoughts.
6	2. Narrow pedestrian-oriented streets framed by mixed-use development patterns create great neighborhoods and communities. We hope this development will continue that effort and hopefully trigger further compact development along Rockville Pike.	Applicant acknowledges the comment.
7	3. Staff fully support this Local Map Amendment application due to the site's prominent location and transformative potential for the White Flint area. Below are some design comments for future discussion at the Sketch and Site Plan stages. We look forward to working with the Applicant through the future applications to create a transformative development in White Flint that furthers the Sector Plan's vision and maximizes benefits for the greater community.	Applicant acknowledges the comment.
8	4. Site Layout a. Neighborhood Green: Staff generally supports the provision of a neighborhood green along Rockville Pike, as it was recommended in the Sector Plan. The proposed streetscape along Rockville Pike and the new street around the green will provide pedestrian-friendly amenities for future residents and the greater community. Additionally, Staff appreciates retail spaces and residential lobbies for buildings A and B, which will provide direct access to the sidewalk along this public open space, further activating the proposed open space.	Applicant acknowledges the comment.
9	i. Staff strongly recommends the Applicant review the "2017 PROS Plan" and "Energized Public Spaces Design Guidelines" from Montgomery Parks Department. These two documents provide additional design guidelines for each urban park type. Staff recommends sharing initial design ideas for this neighborhood green early to ensure enough time for potential required modifications.	Applicant will consult this document in the next stage of design.
10	b. Curbless street along the green: To enlarge the public open space and enhance the streetscape along this public amenity, Staff recommends that the applicant explore the idea of creating a shared/ curbless street in one of the streets surrounded by the proposed neighborhood green. This type of street can be closed off on special occasions or days of the week for community gatherings, movie screenings on the lawn, or farmers markets.	The Applicant will consider this at Preliminary Plan and Site Plan.
11	5. Building Massing & Architecture a. Staff is not commenting on the architectural design at this point. This will be reviewed in detail in the Sketch Plan and Site Plan applications. Staff recommends focusing on the design of the ground floor along all streets and providing walk-out units with individual entryways and dooryards as well as semi-public outdoor spaces such as patios, balconies, and terraces to the greatest extent possible.	The Applicant will continue to develop the design and provide schematic level architectural drawings and information at the time of Site Plan. Some studies have been made in coordination with at-grade SWM planters to meet SWM requirements for the site.
12	i. Regardless of the architectural vocabulary, buildings should clearly delineate the base, middle, and top. The base should support and frame the sidewalks and contain the first one or two floors. The tops should give character to the skyline from afar and should be created by stepping the building mass back, changing materials, and/or special features.	Applicant acknowledges the comment.
13	b. The tower portion of Building B: As shown in the massing model on sheet ARCH 03 the taller portion of building B has a long façade fronting the neighborhood green, which will be easily viewed from Rockville Pike. Although we understand that the 3-dimensional computer model images are preliminary and mostly "boxy" in nature, we hope that elements such as unique corner treatments and building treatments will be introduced into the building design to break the horizontal mass with vertical elements that further ground the building at the retail level.	Applicant acknowledges the comment.
14	c. Walk-out units along the ground levels: To create an activated frontage along all streets framed by the residential building, Staff recommends providing walk-out units along Bou Avenue, Chapman Avenue, and along both sides of proposed street A to the extent possible. The walk-out units should offer individual entryways with canopy and small dooryards with landscaping elements, which help create an active frontage for this development.	The Applicant will continue to develop the design and provide schematic level architectural drawings and information at the time of Site Plan.
15	6. Public Realm a. Street trees: All streets should be framed with a dense line of large street trees planted 30' apart to create a buffer between sidewalks and moving traffic and provide environmental benefits such as reducing stormwater runoff and cooling in the summer months.	Applicant acknowledges the comment and will strive to achieve the correct balance between utilities, On-street parking, and visibility.
16	b. Interim placemaking: Staff recommends the Applicant develop an interim placemaking plan that shows how the site will be used during interim phases, focusing on providing gathering spaces and programming for the wider community.	The Applicant plans to do this as part of Sketch Plan, as they want to have a cohesive site, even during a phased condition.
17	c. Utilities: Utilities along existing public streets and new private streets should be undergrounded. Transformers, junction boxes, etc., should be placed away from public view so as not to obstruct pedestrian walkways and public open spaces.	Staff clarified that this is for Bou and Chapman and does not pertain to Rockville Pike, as Rockville Pike is part of a larger program.
18	d. Rain Gardens: Rain gardens should be incorporated into the standard urban design of the building and site. Tree wells and planting strips can enhance these features. Larger, suburban rainwater swales and/or natural triangular or amorphous forms should be avoided in this dense urban setting.	Applicant acknowledges the comment.
19	7. Sustainability a. Montgomery County Council and the Executive have set very high goals for reducing greenhouse gases in the county by 2035. Buildings and their construction are among the highest emitters of greenhouse gases. Staff recommends that the Applicant meet the highest environmentally sustainable goals and standards for this development to attempt to achieve a Net Zero Energy building by introducing geothermal heating and cooling, solar panels, recycled gray water, greater insulation, and/or high efficiency electrical and plumbing fixtures, etc. Please provide details on how the Applicant is pursuing a goal of being exceptionally environmentally sustainable.	The Applicant will study the options available.

Area Master Plan - Erin Fowler, erin.fowler@montgomeryplanning.org

20	1. The Subject Property falls into the Montrose Crossing sub-area of the 2018 White Flint 2 Sector Plan (p. 44). The application is overall consistent with the vision for the sub-area, which identified the Pike Center and Montrose Crossing shopping centers as properties with the potential to be “major mixed-use destinations along Rockville Pike...New mixed-use development is appropriate for both properties since they are equidistant from the White Flint and Twinbrook Metro Stations.”	Applicant acknowledges the comment.
21	2. The key Sector Plan recommendations for the Pike Center property are to create a network of short blocks and internal streets, provide a ½ acre neighborhood green and a local street connection, and to create building frontages along Rockville Pike and Bou Avenue that enhance the public realm, including landscaping and bicycle infrastructure (p. 45). The proposed provision of Private Streets A and B, the ½ acre neighborhood green, and the building frontages along Rockville Pike and Bou Avenue conform with these recommendations.	Applicant acknowledges the comment.
22	3. Page 58 of the Sector Plan recommends that “each optional method development in the CR and CRT zones should provide 15 percent MPDUs as the highest priority to earn their public benefit points.” The application proposes to provide 15% MPDUs for 30 public benefit points across two phases, making it consistent with this recommendation.	Applicant acknowledges the comment.
23	4. Page 59 of the Sector Plan recommends providing “a range of unit types, including for families, seniors, and persons with physical challenges.” As the final unit mix is determined in future applications, please consider incorporating diversity of unit types. Given that the applicant is seeking public benefit points for enhanced accessibility for the disabled, this should be achieved.	Applicant acknowledges the comment and will finalize at Site Plan.
24	5. Per page 79 of the Sector Plan, the free-right-turn ramp at the intersection of Bou Avenue and Chapman Avenue should be removed. Details can be worked out at future stages of development, per Area Transportation reviewer Richard Brockmeyer’s comment.	This will be addressed at the Preliminary Plan stage of development.
25	6. Please elaborate on the proposed project’s consistency with Thrive Montgomery 2050, the County’s General Plan, as this is key piece of the Local Map Amendment necessary findings, per Section 59-7.2.1.E.2.a.	The Statement of Justification has been updated accordingly.

Area Site Plan - Tamika Graham, tamika.graham@montgomeryplanning.org

26	1. Page 10 of the SOJ: The findings focus on the Subject Site and the “character of adjacent neighborhoods”.... The SOJ focuses on the lack of nearby single-family detached homes and overlooks existing multi-family residential properties to the west of Rockville Pike that are within the Applicant’s established boundary of surrounding areas. These areas will not redevelop into dense mixed use as they are zoned R-200 and R-20. Please discuss.	The Statement of Justification has been updated accordingly.
27	2. The SOJ notes (page 13) that the Project is not required to satisfy the height compatibility provisions of Section 59-4.1.8.B of the Zoning Ordinance. Please clarify if any height compatibility requirements from the City of Rockville are applicable. Further, any applicable requirements for Rockville should be reflected.	The Statement of Justification has been updated accordingly.

28	3. Please address the Master Plan’s intent for the undergrounding of utilities along the Property’s frontage(s).	The Statement of Justification has been updated to note that the Applicant plans to underground utilities, with the exception of along the Rockville Pike frontage as M-NCPPC has confirmed that this comment does not pertain to that frontage.
29	4. Sidewalks should not be included in the public open space calculation. Please revise the data table showing the square footage of appropriate open spaces.	The Applicant has revised the plan and tabulation, as this is conceptual at the Rezoning stage.
30	5. Please clarify if any of the neighborhood green will be encumbered by stormwater management facilities. If so, what is the relationship or proximity of the SWM to the playground. Staff recommends incorporating sustainable playground practices to address environmental priorities of the master Plan while also maximizing the usable are of the neighborhood green.	The SWM Concept does not envision affecting the civic green.
31	6. The supply and demand recreation spreadsheet should accompany the proposed recreation plan.	The supply & demand chart have been added to the revised exhibit.
32	7. The plan shows the bicycle station on Level 2 due to the Site’s grading. Is this amenity intended to provide access to residents only or includes the general public? If public access, could this be relocated to provide access from the street?	This amenity is for residents only. Public at grade bike parking will be provided on street near the open space and retail. Locations to be determined at site plan.
33	8. Future applications must include the calculations for the proposed public benefits package. Given the timing of future applications, the Applicant may be subject to revised incentive density guidelines.	Applicant acknowledges the comment.
34	9. Please expand on the proposal for enhanced accessibility for the disabled. How many units are proposed for this treatment and what specific features are proposed?	Based on DRC discussion, this will be addressed in later applications.
35	10. Future applications will need to address Section 59.6.3.8. Open Space Landscaping and Outdoor Lighting as it relates to permeable areas and tree canopy.	Applicant acknowledges the comment.

Environmental - Amy Lindsay, amy.lindsey@montgomeryplanning.org

36	1. A noise analysis must be submitted with the future preliminary plan submission. Please refer to the EPlans for comments.	Applicant acknowledges the comment. Applicant has responded to the ePlans comments below.
37	The mitigation trees must be shown on the FCP.	The mitigation trees are now reflected on the revised plan as part of this response.
38	Plans will need to include the planting specs for the mitigation trees.	The planting specifications have been added to PFCP-004

Area Transportation - Richard Brockmeyer, richard.brockmyer@montgomeryplanning.org

39	1. Per the White Flint 2 Sector Master Plan, the free-right-turn ramp at the intersection of Bou Avenue and Chapman Avenue should be removed and may be something that this project should perform as part of frontage improvements. This can be further addressed at future stages of the development.	This will be addressed at the Preliminary Plan stage of development.
40	2. Per the Complete Streets Design Guide and the Bicycle Master Plan, protected Intersections are the default intersection treatment for all intersections with separated bike lanes, side paths, buffered bike lanes and conventional bike lanes at one or more approaches. This can be further addressed at future stages of the development. Prior to submission of the Preliminary Plan please complete the Protected Intersection Checklist for each intersection. Please contact Richard Brockmyer at richard.brockmyer@montgomeryplanning.org if you need a copy of the checklist.	Applicant acknowledges the comment.
41	3. Justification for private roads will be required as part of any future Preliminary Plan submission. Please be aware of section 50.4.3.E.4.d.v. of the county code, which states except where a Master Plan indicates that a Downtown Street or Town Center Street could be private, a Downtown Street or Town Center Street may be a private road only when it is not required to provide an adequate traffic level of service. A private Downtown Street or Town Center Street may be approved only when the proposed road is either not a connector between two higher classification roads or a road that is not planned to extend beyond the boundary of the preliminary plan.	This is discussed in the updated report and will be addressed at the Preliminary Plan stage of development in the updated LATR report.
42	4. There are two existing bus stops on the site frontage. These should be identified on the plans. Please note one of these stops includes a bus shelter and needs to be maintained as a shelter bus stop. Please coordinate with Mr. Wayne Miller at Wayne.Miller2@montgomerycountymd.gov about bus stop placement and any required improvements.	The bus stops have been located on the revised plans and labeled.
43	5. Per the Complete Streets Design Guide and section 49.32.f. of the county code, the curb radius at the corner of each intersection should be 15 feet. If a larger radius is needed to accommodate trucks and fire vehicles, please consider the use of truck aprons. This can be further addressed at future stages of the development.	Applicant has adjusted some curb geometry to serve the two buildings with WB50 and WB67 vehicles. Truck movements to be provided at Preliminary & Site Plan when schematic level architecture is developed.
44	6. Please provide dimensions of intersection spacing. Please be aware that per section 50.4.3.E.2.f.ii. the distance between intersections for Rockville Pike (MD 355), which is classified as a Downtown Boulevard, is 400 feet. When the Board finds that a greater or lesser distance is appropriate, the Board may specify a greater or lesser distance than otherwise required after considering the recommendation of the transportation agency responsible for maintaining the road. Justification for a shorter spacing will be needed at the time of Preliminary Plan.	Intersection spacing and discussion is shown in the updated report. Note that some of the driveways are existing and can be addressed at the time of Preliminary Plan in the updated LATR report.
45	7. Combined agency comments on the LATR Transportation Study were provided to Wells + Associates on September 12, 2024. They are also provided below for reference.	Applicant acknowledges the comment.
46	8. Page 9 Figure 1-1: It might be helpful to identify the policy area type in this map by either labeling or coloring them accordingly.	This has been addressed in the updated report.
47	9. Page 13 Bicycle Facilities section: Please note that the west side of Rockville Pike is identified as part of the Breezeway network.	Applicant acknowledges the comment.
48	10. Page 23 Vehicular Analysis section: Please note in the text that Figure 2-1 only shows the orange policy area intersections. Or better yet, include all intersections in the table but note which are in a red policy area.	This has been addressed in the updated report.
49	11. Page 25: Please provide queuing results in a table format in this section for existing conditions.	This has been addressed in the updated report.
50	12. Page 26: Please provide an explanation as to why some of these pipeline projects differ from what was included in the scoping document. Was the pipeline map information incorrect?	This has been addressed in the updated report.
51	13. Page 29 Figure 3-1: It would be helpful to identify the project site location on this map for context.	This has been addressed in the updated report.
52	14. Page 38 Table 3-5: This is different than what in the scoping documents. The differences should be explained somewhere in the write up or in a footnote. In general, pass-by assumptions that will be used should be discussed at the time of scoping.	This has been addressed in the updated report.
53	15. Page 40 Figure 3-4: The access ins/outs do not seem to add up to the calculated trip generation numbers from the table.	This has been addressed in the updated report.
54	16. Page 41 Figure 3-5: The access ins/outs do not seem to add up to the calculated trip generation numbers from the table.	This has been addressed in the updated report.
55	17. Page 46: Please provide queuing results in a summary table to allow for comparison on queuing between existing, background, phase 1, and phase 2 conditions.	This has been addressed in the updated report.
56	18. Page 48 Street Lighting section: Please note that the review of streetlights is not only focused on if they are operational, but also if they meet the MCDOT standards.	This has been addressed in the updated report.
57	19. Page 54 Table 4-3: Please note that when this is submitted as part of the Preliminary/Site Plan it is expected that further information about ramps will be required. Please see the LATR Guidelines and the ADA Tool Kit for further information.	This has been addressed in the updated report.
58	20. Page 59 Figure 4-5: Consider providing a map with an aerial to replace this map or in addition to this map to clearly show where bus stops are located in relation to the site and identify which have shelters and which do not.	This has been addressed in the updated report.

Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) - Deepak Somarajan, deepak.somarajan@montgomerycountymd.gov

59	The following comments shall be addressed in the preliminary plan/site plan: 1. The free-right-turn ramp at the intersection of Bou Avenue and Chapman Avenue should be removed.	Applicant acknowledges the comment.
60	2. There are two existing bus stops on the site frontage. These should be identified on the plans. Please note one of these stops includes a bus shelter and needs to be maintained as a shelter bus stop. Please coordinate with Mr. Wayne Miller at Wayne.Miller2@montgomerycountymd.gov about bus stop placement and any required improvements.	The bus stops have been located on the revised plans and labeled.
61	3. Sight Distance: Submit a completed, executed MCDOT Sight Distances Evaluation certification form, for all existing and proposed site entrances onto County-maintained roads, for our review and approval. Please refer the new sight distance form: https://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/dot-dir/Resources/Files/SightDistanceForm.pdf .	These were submitted to MCDOT review and are now included here again.
62	4. Storm Drain Study: a. Submit a storm drain study if any portion of the subject site drains to the Montgomery County public storm drain system. Please refer the storm drain checklist: https://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/dot-dir/Resources/Files/StormDrainRevChecklist.pdf	Applicant submitted this directly to MCDOT.
63	5. Design all access points and alleys to be at-grade with the sidewalk / sidepath, dropping down to street level between the sidewalk / sidepath and roadway.	Applicant has this in their design.
64	6. The applicant is responsible for relocating utilities along existing roads to accommodate the required roadway improvements.	Acknowledged. M-NCPPC Staff has clarified that this comment does not pertain to the Rockville Pike frontage of the site.
65	7. We need the revised TIS to provide comments on the required right-of-way improvements. Please see below for the TIS comments provided on September 12, 2024.	The Applicant has revised the TIS document incorporating responses to the comments below (a-f).
66	a. Some of the existing volumes in Figure 2-4 do not match the count sheets in the Appendix. For example, the NB and SB left turns at MD 355/Bou Ave do not match, the SB thru movements on MD 355 at Hubbard Dr do not match and all of the PM volumes at the MD 355/Twinbrook Pkwy-Rollins Ave do not match.	This has been addressed in the updated report.

67	b. The individual trip assignment sheets for the pipeline developments are not included; therefore, we could not verify that they were taken from approved studies as noted in the report.	This has been addressed in the updated report.
68	c. It would seem that combining the background volumes (Figure 3-3) with the Phase 1 site trips (Figure 3-4) and Phase 2 site trips (Figure 3-5) would yield the total trips for Phase 1 and 2; however, this is not the case. The Phase 1 total trips (Figure 3-6) and Phase 2 total trips (Figure 3-7) do not compute this way, please clarify. Since we cannot follow how the total trips were achieved, it's difficult to determine if the analyses are valid or not.	This has been addressed in the updated report.
69	d. This could be an issue at the MD 355/Bou Ave, Chapman Ave/Twinbrook Pkwy, and Nebel St/Randolph Rd intersections, where the capacity analyses results approach the critical threshold.	This has been addressed in the updated report.
70	e. Based on the comments above, several queuing issues would be exacerbated if the higher volumes were considered. Even with the lower volumes used in the study, multiple queuing deficiencies are identified. In many cases, the SimTraffic projections note that the 95th percentile volumes exceed capacity and that the queues may be longer than shown.	This has been addressed in the updated report.
71	f. The development is adding very significant volume. Queuing along Bou is already significant in both AM and PM peak periods. Queues typically extend past the proposed driveway of the new development. Traffic exiting the development onto Bou will likely encounter a stopped queue, so egress from the site will be difficult during peaks. The conditions are expected to worsen if no intersection upgrades are planned. How is the applicant addressing these issues?	This has been addressed in the updated report.

Maryland Dept. of Transportation – State Highway Administration (MDOT SHA) Travel Forecasting and Analysis Division (TFAD) Scott Holcomb		
72	1. There are fifteen (15) background developments listed on Pages 26-28; however, Figure 3-1 (Page 29) shows seventeen developments. Please confirm if 5500 Edson Lane and Twinbrook Place are to be included in the pipeline developments.	This has been addressed in the updated report.
73	2. There is an exclusive right turn lane along southbound Twinbrook Parkway at the Parklawn Drive intersection. The model shows this as a shared through/right turn lane. Also, Chapman Avenue south of Bou Avenue (after the parking lot) is a two-lane roadway. The Synchro model coded this segment as a 3-lane roadway. Revise the models and analysis as needed for these items.	This has been addressed in the updated report.
74	3. It is not clear why PLOC in Figure 4-2 does not show a value for Twinbrook Parkway west of the train tracks as Figure 4-1 displays sidewalks in this area.	This has been addressed in the updated report.
75	4. The queue analysis results in Appendix I demonstrate that southbound MD 355 left turn queues at Bou Avenue are significantly worse with Phase 1 than with the background condition. While this appears to be resolved with the improvements in Phase 2, this condition may exist for multiple years. TFAD recommends that intermediate mitigation be discussed for this location.	This has been addressed in the updated report.

Traffic Development & Support Division (TDSD) - Chenhao Yuan		
76	1. The introduction section of the report on page 1 states that the site has 5 existing access points but only listed 4, please add the main signalized site driveway intersection of Rockville Pike opposite Federal Plaza.	This has been addressed in the updated report.
77	2. The introduction section of the report states that 1 new point of access will be proposed, and 2 existing access points will be closed for the new development. However, in section 2 (Background Data), it states that 2 new access points to the development will be provided. Please verify and correct it to keep the consistency.	This has been addressed in the updated report.
78	3. 3 major intersections we focus on: a. Rockville Pike (MD 355) & Bou Avenue	Acknowledged.
79	b. Rockville Pike(MD 355)&Federal Plaza/Pike Center	Acknowledged.
80	c. Rockville Pike (MD 355) & Rollins Avenue/Twinbrook Parkway. The synchro file indicated that all these 3 intersections are operated at actuated coordinated mode, which means the cycle length should be fixed through this entire suburban arterial. However, the cycle length is not fixed for these 3 intersections according to the provided synchro files, the cycle length for the 3 intersections listed above are 200 s, 158.5s and 160s, respectively. Please verify the cycle length because they should be same.	This has been addressed in the updated report.
81	ii. At intersection of Rockville Pike & Bou Avenue, Total future AM, and PM phase 1 and total future PM phase 2 synchro model show that southbound left turn storage bay is not sufficient to accommodate all the left turning vehicles, which causes the queue of left turning vehicles to extend back to the thru lanes causing spillovers that blocks the thru movements. The queuing analysis also shows that the 95th percentile queue length exceeding the capacity for southbound left turn are at least 238 ft, 630 ft and 374ft (Queue might be longer) respectively, which once again indicates that the southbound left turn storage bay is not sufficient to accommodate the traffic volume at this intersection. TDSD recommends extending the storage bay to lessen the spillover impact.	This has been addressed in the updated report.

Regional and Intermodal Planning Division (RIPD) - Darren Bean		
82	1. Please note the State’s fiscally constrained FY 2024-2029 Consolidated Transportation Program (CTP) includes projects under construction and/or development and evaluation. The CTP includes no projects affecting MDOT SHA facilities analyzed in this TIS.	Acknowledged.
83	2. [HNI] Please note the State’s fiscally unconstrained Highway Needs Inventory (HNI), the State’s long-range plan, includes projects that are critical to Maryland’s transportation needs. The HNI includes reconstructing a 4-6 lane roadway to a 6-lane divided closed section along MD 355 (Rockville Road/Frederick Road) from Montrose Parkway to MD 124 affecting MDOT SHA facilities analyzed in this TIS]. If and when such improvements proceed, they may affect right-of-way.	Acknowledged.

District 3 Engineering Systems Team (EST) - Ahmed Oyeyemi		
84	We offer no comments at this time.	Applicant acknowledges this.

District 3 Traffic - Alvin Powell		
85	We note several discrepancies between the Pipeline Developments listed in the Scoping Agreement in Appendix A and those listed on Page 26 of the traffic impact study (TIS) report in the “Future Background Conditions” section.	This has been addressed in the updated report.
86	a. The Pike and Rose development was not included in the scoping agreement, however it was included in the list of pipeline projects (Page 26) and included in the background trip generation in the TIS report (Table 3-2).	This has been addressed in the updated report.
87	b. The Mid Pike Plaza and 5500 Edson Lane /Peace Palace developments were identified as pipeline projects in the scoping agreement but were not included in the list of pipeline developments in the TIS report (Page 26) and not included in the background trip generation (Table 3-2).	This has been addressed in the updated report.
88	c. Please label the pipeline development shown to the east of the proposed development in Figure 3-2.	This has been addressed in the updated report.
89	2. There appears to be a discrepancy between the existing AM and PM peak hour turning movement count data presented in Appendix C and the TMC volumes presented in Figure 2-4 of the TIS report. Please update the turning movement data presented in Figure 2-4 at the following study intersections: o Rockville Pike and Bou Avenue - (Intersection 1)	This has been addressed in the updated report.
90	a. Rockville Pike and Site Driveway/Federal Plaza - (Intersection 2)	This has been addressed in the updated report.
91	b. Rockville Pike and Twinbrook Parkway/Rollins Avenue - (Intersection 4)	This has been addressed in the updated report.
92	c. Chapman Avenue and Site Driveway North - (Intersection 6)	This has been addressed in the updated report.
93	d. Chapman Avenue and Site Driveway South - (Intersection 8)	This has been addressed in the updated report.
94	e. Rockville Pike and Hubbard Drive - (Intersection 15)	This has been addressed in the updated report.
95	3. We note that the report incorrectly references appendices that are unrelated to the text provided in the specific sections of report: o The “Vehicular Analysis” subsection of the “Future Background Conditions” section (Page 27) indicates that HCM and CLV worksheets are provided in Appendix F. However, pass-by trip assignments are provided in Appendix F,	This has been addressed in the updated report.
96	a. The “Site Tip Assignments” subsection of the “Total Future Conditions” section (Page 35) states that the pass-by intersection volumes are presented in Appendix G. However, Appendix G contains diverted trip assignments.	This has been addressed in the updated report.
97	4. Please revise the text provided in the report accordingly.	This has been addressed in the updated report.
98	5. We note the following calibration issues in the Synchro/SimTraffic models provided, that should be addressed.	This has been addressed in the updated report.
99	6. Traffic Volumes - There appears to be inconsistencies between the traffic volume data provided in the appendices, Synchro files and CLV analysis at the following intersections under background and total future conditions:	This has been addressed in the updated report.
100	a. Rockville Pike and Bou Ave (Intersection 1),	This has been addressed in the updated report.
101	b. Rockville Pike and Halpine Rd (Intersection 12),	This has been addressed in the updated report.
102	c. Chapman Ave and Site Drive North (Intersection 6),	This has been addressed in the updated report.
103	d. Nebel St and Randolph Rd (Intersection 14),	This has been addressed in the updated report.
104	e. Chapman Ave and Randolph Rd (Intersection 16), and	This has been addressed in the updated report.
105	f. Rockville Pike and Rollins Ave Ext. (Intersection 18).	This has been addressed in the updated report.
106	7. Peak Hour Factor - There appears to be discrepancies between the computed intersection peak hour factors provided in Appendix A and those inputted in the Synchro models at the following intersections:	This has been addressed in the updated report.
107	a. Rockville Pike and Bou Ave	This has been addressed in the updated report.
108	b. Rockville pike and Gas Station Driveway	This has been addressed in the updated report.
109	c. Chapman Ave and Site Driveway North	This has been addressed in the updated report.

110	d. Chapman Ave and Site Driveway South	This has been addressed in the updated report.
11	8. Conflicting Pedestrians - Please include the following input parameters in the Synchro/ Sim Traffic models provided:	This has been addressed in the updated report.
112	a. number of conflicting pedestrians per hour, and	This has been addressed in the updated report.
113	b. number of conflicting bicycles per hour	This has been addressed in the updated report.
114	9. Model Geometry - The lane configuration shown in the Synchro/SimTraffic models do not replicate the existing lane configuration at the following intersections:	This has been addressed in the updated report.
115	a. Twinbrook Parkway and Chapman Avenue (Intersection 5)	This has been addressed in the updated report.
116	b. Twinbrook Parkway and Parklawn Drive (Intersection 13)	This has been addressed in the updated report.
117	10. Analysis Periods - Based on the calibration indicated in the SimTraffic analysis files provided, each cycle recorded was based on one 10-minute interval. In keeping with established SimTraffic analysis procedures there is an initial 15-minute seeding interval followed by a recorded cycle typically comprised of four 15-minute recording intervals.	This has been addressed in the updated report.

City of Rockville - Faramarz Mokhtari, fmokhtari@rockvillemd.gov

118	1. Chapman Avenue: The City of Rockville Bikeway Master Plan includes a recommendation to provide on-street bicycle lanes on Chapman Avenue in both directions between Halpine Road and the city limits to the south. This recommendation also includes the section between Twinbrook Parkway and Bou Ave since the city boundary is about halfway between these two intersections. For these reasons staff recommends the applicant be required to provide on-streetbicycle lanes along Chapman Avenue between Twinbrook Parkway and Bou Street. The existing off-street shared use path on the westside of Chapman is an acceptable replacement for an on-street bicycle lane if it is providing for at least 10-foot-wide space for both pedestrian and bicycle travel along with appropriate signage for all users. Provision of an off-street bi-directionalbicycle facility of at least 14-feet wide is also an acceptable option.	Due to the turn lanes from Twinbrook Parkway onto Chapman Avenue, there is no width in the existing street section to add bike lanes. An off-street shared use path on the west side of Chapman is shown. Applicant suggets increasing the 10' path to 14' and reducing the buffer from 7' to 3' to accomodate the two-way travel.
119	2. The intersection of Chapman Avenue and Twinbrook Parkway: Currently there are two left turn lanes from westbound Twinbrook to southbound Chapman. Changes to this intersection maybe needed to accommodate all traffic movements. Additionally, residents have raised concerns about the pedestrian crossings, particularly the east Twinbrook Parkway leg and the north Chapman Avenue leg. Pedestrian improvements to improve visibility, LPI, no right turn on red, should be considered for all legs. A recent safety audit recommends a NTOR from northbound Chapman to eastbound Twinbrook and from westbound Twinbrook to northbound Chapman. Staff recommends evaluation to determine whether the existing free-rightturn lane from southbound Chapman to westbound Twinbrook Parkway can be eliminated.	This has been addressed in the updated report.
120	3. Additional Pedestrian-related Improvements: All crosswalks should be marked and follow the continental style pattern. Add benches to the tree lawn area along Chapman Avenue. This is consistent with the City's Pedestrian Master Plan recommendations.	Applicant acknowledges the comment.
121	4. In addition to other comments provided as part of ongoing coordination with the City of Rockville, Rollins Avenue, Opposite of Proposed Street A, is City street and as part of this development it would be good to include ADA ramp provisions for this intersection approaches.	This has been addressed in the updated report.