MD 355 - South Corridor Advisory Committee Meeting # 5

Montgomery County - Executive Office Building
Rockville, Maryland
December 15, 2015
6:30 pm to 9:00 pm
Welcome

Agenda:

- BRT Project Management Team Update ........................................... 10 min
- Project Process & Schedule .............................................................. 20 min
- Goals & Objectives/Preliminary Purpose & Need ......................... 20 min
- Conceptual Alternatives Development .......................................... 15 min
  - Breakout Discussions ................................................................... 45 min
  - Discussion and Sharing ............................................................... 30 min
- Additional Q&A ............................................................................... 10 min
BRT Project Management Team Update

• MCDOT, SHA, MTA partnership continues uninterrupted

• Management of US 29 and MD 355 Corridor Studies transferred from SHA to MTA
  • SHA has seen increase in highway related projects, straining resources
  • MTA has available resources
  • MTA brings additional transit-related expertise
• All consultant teams will remain involved
Questions?

✓ BRT Project Management Team Update

✓ Q&A

• Project Process & Schedule
• Goals & Objectives/Preliminary Purpose & Need
• Conceptual Alternatives Development
  • Breakout Activity
  • Discussion and Sharing
• Additional Q&A
Corridor Planning Process

- Existing Conditions and Data Collection
- Corridor Goals/Pre-Purpose and Need
- Conceptual Alternatives Development
- Project Introduction
- Public Meeting
- Preliminary Analysis of Conceptual Alternatives
- Alternatives Public Workshop
- Alternatives Retained for Detailed Study (ARDS)

We are here
# MD 355 Milestone Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual Alternatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Introduction Public Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridership, Traffic and Impacts Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alts. Public Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARDS Package</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives Refinement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build Traffic &amp; Ridership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Tech Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Corridor Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPA Selection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CAC meetings through ARDS. Future meetings TBD based upon outcome of ARDS.
Planning Timeline

WE ARE HERE

Preliminary Purpose and Need

Federal Approval Process (NEPA)

Purpose and Need

Project Begins
Identification of Needs and Conceptual Alternatives

Alternatives Retained for Detailed Study

Selection of Locally Preferred Alternative

Entry Into Federal Approval Process (Begin NEPA)

Federal Approvals Granted (NEPA Complete)
Questions?

✓ BRT Project Management Team Update
✓ Project Process & Schedule
  ✓ Q&A
  • Goals & Objectives/Preliminary Purpose & Need
  • Conceptual Alternatives Development
    • Breakout Activity
    • Discussion and Sharing
  • Additional Q&A
Development of Goals and Objectives
CAC Input

- CAC Meeting #2
  - Corridor Planning Study
    - Overview
    - Needs and Values Exercise

- CAC Meeting #3
  - Draft Preliminary Purpose and Need language
    - Purpose
    - Need
  - Existing and Projected Traffic & Transit Conditions
Development of Goals and Objectives

CAC Input – Meeting #2 Exercise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Needs</th>
<th>Values and Concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serve commuter/regional travel from MD 355 Corridor into downtown DC. (This proposed item was removed by two of the four groups)</td>
<td>Maintain or improve travel times to corridor destinations for residents living near the corridor (dedicated lanes).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serve local/shorter distance trips in and along the MD 355 corridor, particularly between Red Line stations.</td>
<td>Provide transit service that is competitive with the automobile (travel times and reliability).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serve existing and future activity centers (frequently spaced as future growth).</td>
<td>Reduce traffic congestion on MD 355 and intersections in service areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce local traffic, reduce red light for pedestrians on MD 355 and intersections in service areas.</td>
<td>Serve local trips for residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve accessibility to businesses, services, and recreation areas on MD 355.</td>
<td>Cost effective solutions, “do-ability”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve accessibility to businesses, services, and recreation areas on MD 355.</td>
<td>System that can fund a major portion of the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional bridges over Potomac/Reduce congestion on 495/720/355</td>
<td>Improve existing bus service on 49 (and expand)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create redundant service to Red Line to support growth. 60% of riders go to Shady Grove.</td>
<td>Move as many people as possible in most efficient way (any mode); Emphasize moving people not autos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fare integration – reasonable/competitive fare.</td>
<td>Recognize changing travel patterns to emerging employment (residential hubs)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following matrix shows the compiled values/concerns that the groups developed, as well as the number of times a CAC Member identified it as an important value/concern. Photographs of the posters are attached as an appendix to this summary.
Development of Goals and Objectives

Inputs

- MCDOT
- RTS Steering Committee
- MTA
- M-NCPPC
- SHA
- PUBLIC & CAC

Goals
Needs
Objectives

Measures of Effectiveness
Development of Goals and Objectives

CAC Input

**CAC Needs**
- Provide Competitive, Predictable Service
- Encourage Ridership
- Maximize User Experience

**Quantifiable Objectives**
- Make Trips Faster and More Reliable
- Increase Transit Ridership
- Provide appealing transit service that will attract new riders
Goal

Improve Quality of Transit Service

Objectives

- Make Bus Trips Faster
- Make Door-to-Door Transit Travel Time Competitive with Door-to-Door Auto Travel
- Increase Transit Ridership
- Provide an Appealing Transit Service that will Attract New Riders
Goal
Develop Transit Services that Enhance Quality of Life

Objectives
- Provide Premium Transit Service Convenient to Households and Jobs within the Corridor
- Minimize Private Property Impacts
- Serve Transit Dependent Populations
- Engage Public in Process
Development of Goals and Objectives

CAC Input

CAC Needs
- Create Multi-Modal Opportunities
- Create Neighborhood Connections
- Encourage Long Distance Commuter Use

Quantifiable Objectives
- Create Direct Modal Transfers
- Enhance Bike/Ped Access and Feeder Bus
- Provide Parking at Key Stations
Goal

Improve Mobility Opportunities and Choices

Objectives

Serve as Many Travelers as Possible by Efficiently Utilizing the Right-of-Way
Balance Travel Times for Automobile and Transit Users
Enhance Pedestrian and Bicycle Options in the Corridors
Create Direct Transfers Between Premium Bus and Other Modes
Goal

Develop Transit Services that Support Master Planned Development

Objectives

- Improve Alternative Transportation Service to and Between Activity Centers
- Increase Trips by Non-Automobile Modes to Support Development in the Master Plan
- Select station locations that support infill and redevelopment
Support Sustainable and Cost Effective Transportation Solutions

Maintain Environmental Quality

Minimize Cost of Building and Operating Transportation Services
Purpose and Need

Purpose and Need = WHAT and WHY

Purpose

• **WHAT** are the major goals and objectives?
• **WHY** will they be addressed by this project?

Need

• **WHAT** are the existing or forecasted problems?
• **WHY** are these problems occurring?

These fundamental questions provide support for later phases:

• Conceptual alternatives analysis: options for how to address the **what and why**
• Recommendations: the “best” options for how to satisfy the **what and why**
Purpose and Need Development

**Preliminary Purpose and Need**

Role:
- Living document
- Basis for alternatives evaluation
- Follows NEPA guidelines
- Saves time in formal NEPA process

**NEPA Purpose and Need**

Role:
- Basis for Selected Alternative Evaluation
- Provide consensus between regulatory agencies
- Adopted by federal lead agency
Preliminary Purpose and Need Process

- Utilizes quantifiable data to identify problem(s) that require attention and further study.
- Acknowledges problems have multiple potential solutions.
- Forms baseline for comparison of future evaluations.
- Drives conceptual alternatives discussion.
- Supports recommendation of alternatives for detailed study.

WE ARE HERE
Preliminary Purpose and Need Document Next Steps

• CAC Member Review and Comment
  • Facilitators will email link to Draft Document in mid-December
  • Provide comments by end of January 2016
  • CAC Member comments will be combined with comments from the Spring public meetings
Questions?

✓ BRT Project Management Team Update
✓ Project Process & Schedule
✓ Goals & Objectives/Preliminary Purpose & Need
  ✓ Q&A
  • Conceptual Alternatives Development
    • Breakout Activity
    • Discussion and Sharing
  • Additional Q&A
Conceptual Alternatives Development Process

• Work completed
  • Existing conditions evaluation
  • Goals and Objectives
  • Needs identification

• Next Steps
  • Obtain CAC Member Input
  • Complete Draft Preliminary Purpose and Need
  • Develop conceptual alternatives
  • Present conceptual alternatives for public input
What makes a Conceptual Alternative?

- Components:
  1. Running way
     - Physical location and interaction with surrounding environment for the BRT
  2. Station locations
     - Specific location of BRT stops
  3. Service plan
     - BRT operational characteristics (headways, hours of service, bus routing)
Conceptual Alternative Component
BRT Running Way

• Running Way options have been identified for consideration
• The proposed options can be mixed and matched along different segments of the corridor to best fit within the surrounding area
• Location and dimensions of proposed roadway elements will vary throughout the corridor
• NOT EVERY OPTION IS APPROPRIATE FOR EVERY SEGMENT OF THE MD 355 CORRIDOR
Conceptual Alternative Component
BRT Running Way

Considerations:

• BRT operations (speed, reliability)
• Traffic operations
• Visibility
• Connectivity
• Potential impacts
BRT in Mixed Traffic

Brampton, Canada

Brampton, Canada
BRT Queue Jump

Queue Jump Concept
Reversible / Bi-Directional BRT Lane

Eugene, Oregon
Bi-Directional BRT Lane

Eugene, Oregon
Dedicated Median BRT Lanes

Alexandria, Virginia

Chicago, Illinois (Concept)
Dedicated Curb BRT Lanes

Snohomish County, Washington

Chicago, Illinois (Concept)
Conceptual Alternative Component Station

• Began with station locations as proposed in the Countywide Transit Corridors Functional Master Plan

• Made revisions to station locations based on further study by the City of Gaithersburg and input from the City of Rockville and the Montgomery County Department of Transportation

• Considerations:
  • Adjacent land use
  • Proposed development
  • Ease of access (vehicles, bicycles, pedestrians)
  • Connectivity to existing and proposed transit service
Station Configuration – Median Running

Eugene, Oregon

Changzhou, China
Station Configuration – Curb Running

Brooklyn, New York
Conceptual Alternative Component Operations Plan

Considerations:

• Bus Routing (Spurs)
• Transfer Points
• Headways/Frequencies
• Number of Buses
Conceptual Alternative Component
Sample Operations Plan

- Bethesda Metro: 10 buses per hour, 6 min headways
- Shady Grove Metro: 10 buses per hour, 6 min headways
- Lake Forest Transit Center: 15 buses per hour, 4 min headways
- Clarksburg: 5 buses per hour, 12 min headways

5 buses per hour, 12 min headway
Conceptual Alternatives Development Breakout Activity

Three Topics to Discuss:

1. **Running Way** - What running way(s) may be appropriate for this segment of MD 355?

2. **Station locations, surroundings, and access** - What station locations may be appropriate for this segment of MD 355?

3. **Service and operations** - What activity centers should the BRT system serve?
Questions?

✓ BRT Project Management Team Update
✓ Project Process & Schedule
✓ Goals & Objectives/Preliminary Purpose & Need
✓ Conceptual Alternatives Development
  ✓ Breakout Activity
  ✓ Discussion and Sharing
  ✓ Q&A
• Additional Q&A
Additional Questions
Adjournment