MEMORANDUM

March 2, 2020

TO: Transportation and Environment Committee

FROM: Glenn Orlin, Senior Analyst

SUBJECT: FY21-26 Capital Improvements Program (CIP)—transportation: mass transit and pedestrian facilities/bikeways projects, and Facility Planning-Transportation

PURPOSE: Worksession

Please bring the Executive’s Recommended FY21-26 CIP to this worksession.

This is the second Committee worksession scheduled to review the transportation portion of the FY21-26 CIP. This worksession will include a review of mass transit and pedestrian facilities/bikeways projects, and Facility Planning-Transportation. Staff anticipated to attend this worksession include:

- Chris Conklin, Director, Department of Transportation (DOT)
- Emil Wolanin, Deputy Director, DOT
- Tim Cupples, Chief, Division of Transportation Engineering, DOT
- Dan Hibbert, Chief, Division of Transit Services, DOT
- Fred Lees, Chief, Management Services, DOT
- Brady Goldsmith, Office of Management & Budget
- Sara Benson, Senior Transit Facilities Planner, WMATA
- Michael Hance, AECOM

A. PRELIMINARIES

A clarification is requested regarding the February 27 worksession. The Executive did not include PDFs for the Highway Noise Abatement and Dedicated but Unmaintained Roads projects in his Recommended FY21-26 CIP. Council staff had recommended retaining these PDFs in the CIP, but not showing funding within the six-year period. In addition, over the next two-year CIP cycle, Council staff recommends that DOT reevaluate whether the criteria for these two programs be revised or to scrap the programs altogether, and to bring its recommendations to the Council. However, at the worksession Council staff did not receive the Committee’s recommendation.

Council staff has requested certain short briefings as part of this worksession, noted in italics in this staff report. The Planning Board’s comments on several projects are on C1-5. Where the Board made a recommendation on a project, it will be noted in this report.

1 Key word: #transportationcip
B. MASS TRANSIT PROGRAM PROJECTS

1. “Consent” projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consent Mass Transit Program projects (page)</th>
<th>Funding Change</th>
<th>Timing Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bethesda Metro Station South Entrance (17-3)</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Stop Improvements (17-14)</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent Transit System (17-16)</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Council staff recommends concurring with the Executive.

2. Boyds Transit Center (17-5). This project will construct a bus loop and a 38-space parking lot on the northeast side of the Boyds MARC commuter rail station. Access will be off Barnesville Road. The project will primarily serve Clarksburg residents, especially those in the developing neighborhoods of Cabin Branch west of I-270. Bus service to the meet each of the 10 trains serving the station (4 in the mornings, 6 in the afternoon and evenings) currently is not possible, because there is no room for buses to turn around. There are only 17 existing spaces on the southeast side of the tracks, so the project would more than triple the parking at the station.

An illustration of its design is on ©6. In FY19 the Council approved a $620,000 appropriation to acquire the Anderson property for the transit center. The Executive is now recommending an additional $5,030,000 to conduct remediation on the site in FY21 and to design and build the center between FY22-FY25. Council staff recommends budgeting the project according to the production schedule (below), that would complete the station a year earlier, in FY24 ($000):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan/Design/Sup.</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Thru FY19</th>
<th>Est. FY20</th>
<th>6-Yr Total</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>FY24</th>
<th>FY25</th>
<th>FY26</th>
<th>Beyond</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plan/Design/Sup.</td>
<td>1,766</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,766</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Improv/Util.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>3,247</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,247</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,827</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,650</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,030</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>3,544</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Councilmember Rice requests that the transit center’s completion be accelerated (©7).

3. Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) projects: **MD 355** (17-8), **System Development** (17-9), **US 29** (17-11), and **Veirs Mill Road** (17-13). The Executive is recommending the following for these projects:

- **MD 355**: Add $15 million in FYs21-23 ($5 million annually) to complete preliminary engineering (35% design) on the entire route from Bethesda to Clarksburg.
- **System Development**: Add $3 million ($500,000 annually) to support the DOT and DGS staff managing the BRT program. The conceptual design studies for New Hampshire Avenue (FYs22-24) and North Bethesda Transitway (FYs24-25) are unchanged from the Approved CIP. The Hillandale Citizens Association asks to accelerate the New Hampshire Avenue study (©8).
- **US 29**: Add $550,000 of WSSC funding in FY21.
- **Veirs Mill Road**: The $3 million to complete preliminary engineering has already been appropriated and is still programmed for FYs20-21.
A group of organizations have written to the Council advocating that $16 million of the funds proposed to be allocated to the Veirs Mill Road, New Hampshire Avenue, and North Bethesda BRT lines be used instead towards the design and construction of a dedicated lane on US 29 between White Oak and Silver Spring, and that the $15 million proposed for carrying the MD 355 BRT through preliminary engineering be used towards the design and construction of the White Flint Metro Station North Entrance (©9-11). Council members Hucker and Glass have requested DOT share the results from its facility planning study of dedicated lane(s) on US 29 at this worksession (©12-13); Director Conklin indicated that he and his staff will brief the Committee on DOT's findings and conclusions.

There are two problems with the group's approach. First, the funds reallocated will not be nearly sufficient to fund the two projects: DOT reports that managed lanes on US 29 will cost in excess of $75 million, and the cost of the White Flint Metro Station Northern Entrance, as noted later in this staff report, is $38.1 million, not including an underpass beneath Rockville Pike. Secondly, it is unlikely that any of the BRT lanes will be affordable without Federal aid, and the only way to be eligible for such aid is to carry these projects through preliminary engineering. Diverting funding from the MD 355, Veirs Mill Road, New Hampshire, and North Bethesda BRTs will postpone their potential implementation by at least 6 years.

Last July the Council reviewed alternatives for the MD 355 BRT, but it deferred to the Executive's request not to select a preferred alternative until information has been solicited from the private sector. DOT has been asked to report to the Committee what it learned from this exercise, and to indicate when the appropriate time would be for the Council to select the preferred alternative to carry into preliminary engineering. In the meantime, DOT is undertaking a thorough survey of the right-of-way with the $3 million that was appropriated in FY20; the survey information will be needed regardless of the preferred alternative chosen.

Council staff recommends concurring with the Executive on all four PDFs.

4. Purple Line (17-17). This project funds the County's direct contribution to the construction of the Purple Line within Montgomery County. The $53,612,000 has not changed from the Approved CIP; $40,000,000 was negotiated with the State to help pay for the construction of the light rail component; $5,612,000 was to clear the Georgetown Branch right-of-way, and $8,000,000 was the County's contribution to Carr Properties to facilitate its replacement of the Apex Building to allow for a more ample light rail station and an easement and tunnel under the new buildings for the Capital Crescent Trail.

The Executive's recommended funding schedule has been revised. The last payment to the State was to be $20 million in FY22. However, recognizing that the latest schedule would not have the Purple Line open in Montgomery County until mid-2023, the Executive is recommending deferring $5 million until FY23. At this writing the County and the State have yet to come to agreement on a revised schedule. Council staff recommends concurring with the Executive for now, but the funding split between FY22 and FY23 may be revisited later this spring; also correct the "Estimated Schedule" text to say that "Revenue service on the Purple Line in Montgomery County is scheduled to begin in 2023."
5. **Ride On Bus Fleet** (17-19). In his January 15 transmittal, the Executive proposed a substantial decrease of $22,365,000 (-20%) in the six-year expenditure for this program, which acquires new Ride On buses both to replace those that are retired and to expand the size of the fleet. However, Council staff has been informed that the Executive will be revising his recommendation as part of his March 15 CIP revisions. The T&E Committee will review his revised recommendation in April with the FY21 Operating Budget.

6. **White Flint Metro Station Access Improvements** (17-20). In 2018 the Council programmed a $3.5 million “placeholder” in FYs21-22 for the design of the White Flint Metro Station Northern Entrance. The placeholder was reduced to $2.9 million in last year’s Amended CIP. The Executive is now recommending reallocating it for:

- Modifying the four corners of the Rockville Pike/Old Georgetown Road intersection to eliminate the “hot” right turns and to reconstruct the sidewalks on each side of Rockville Pike in the vicinity of this intersection to create grass buffers.
- Building a sidewalk along Old Georgetown Road in the vicinity of the intersection.
- Expanding the bus bays on the east side of the Metro tracks.

These are useful short-term measures that would improve circulation and safety in the area around the White Flint Metro Station. The expenditure schedule by subproject is on ©14. Note that the scope of work is somewhat different than what appears on the PDF included in the January 15 transmittal. **Council staff recommends approval of the revised PDF on ©15.**

7. **White Flint Metro Station Northern Entrance** (17-21). Two years ago, the County asked WMATA to update its study of a decade ago for a second, north entrance to the White Flint Metro Station, and it was completed in the autumn of 2019. The order-of-magnitude cost to build the new entrance, which would be on the southeast corner of Rockville Pike and Old Georgetown Road, is $38.1 million. The cost does not include a pedestrian tunnel to an entrance on the west side of Rockville Pike, either to the northwest or southwest corners. **Sara Benson, WMATA’s study manager, and Michael Hance, the lead engineer for WMATA’s consultant, AECOM, will brief the Committee on the study and its findings and conclusions.**

The project is supported by the Friends of White Flint (see ©16), the Montgomery County and Greater Bethesda Chambers of Commerce, and the Planning Board (©1-2). All cite the need to construct this entrance to spur economic development in White Flint which, with the notable exception of Pike & Rose, has been fairly stagnant over the past decade.

In 2010 the grand bargain between the White Flint development community and the County was that a special taxing district would fund much of the internal transportation infrastructure in White Flint, that individual developers would construct improvements along their respective frontage (such as streetscaping), and that the County would fund transportation improvements connecting to the regional system, most notably Montrose Parkway East and White Flint Metro Station Northern Entrance. New developments—and all existing commercial property in existence prior to 2010—were to pay an annual special district tax, which, by policy was set at 10% of the general property tax; in return, transportation impact taxes and all Local Area Transportation Review requirements were waived.
A decade on, however, it is evident that the bargain is failing. The special district tax has not generated nearly the revenue needed to fund the first project undertaken—the White Flint West Workaround—that has proceeded due only to advances from the General Fund: $35 million to date and growing each year. On the County’s side, it has backed off on building Montrose Parkway East. The Lord and Taylor lawsuit has stymied attempts of the Lerner Corporation to redevelop the former White Flint Mall property, and, generally, the commercial real estate market has been slow for a long time. It is not clear that an investment in a northern entrance will jump-start commercial development, as is being claimed.

The Council is awaiting from the Executive a recommendation or a set of options that would right the tax district’s ship. Until decisions have been made as to whether to increase the special district tax rate, increase the assessable base for the tax, re-initiate transportation impact taxes, and/or revise each party’s relative financial responsibilities, it is premature for the County to fund the new entrance. Council staff recommends concurring with the Executive not to fund this project now. Hopefully this issue can be resolved this year, so that the project may be introduced as a CIP amendment later this year.

C. PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES/BIKEWAYS PROGRAM PROJECTS

1. ‘Consent’ projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consent Ped. Facilities/Bikeways Program projects (page)</th>
<th>Funding Change</th>
<th>Timing Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADA Compliance: Transportation (19-4)</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Glen Passageway (19-33)</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin Avenue Sidewalk (19-34)</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick Road Bikeway (19-36)</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>delayed into next FY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD 355 Crossing (BRAC) (19-48)</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Drive/MD 27 Sidewalk (19-57)</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Spring Green Trail (19-63)</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Improvements for Schools (19-65)</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Council staff recommends concurring with the Executive.

2. Bethesda Bikeway and Pedestrian Facilities (19-5). The 1994 Bethesda Sector Plan called for both surface and tunnel connections through the Bethesda CBD for the Capital Crescent Trail, and this recommendation was confirmed in subsequent updates to the Sector Plan. DOT has completed design of the Capital Crescent Surface Trail (CCST) along Bethesda Avenue and Willow Lane between Woodmont Avenue and 47th Street. It will consist of a two-way cycle track along the north side of Bethesda Avenue between Woodmont and Wisconsin Avenues, a protected at-grade crossing of Wisconsin Avenue at Willow Lane, and two-way bike lanes on the south side of Willow Lane between Wisconsin Avenue and 47th Street. The extension of the trail from the 47th Street/Willow Lane intersection to the Capital Crescent Trail on the Georgetown Branch is anticipated for completion in the summer of 2021, although it will not be fully useable until the Capital Crescent Trail itself is rebuilt and opened, presumably in 2022 or 2023. DOT will brief the Committee on the design of the CCST.

This project also includes funding for the Bethesda Loop Trail consisting of protected bike lanes on Woodmont Avenue between Norfolk Avenue and Wisconsin Avenue, protected bike lanes on
Montgomery Avenue between Woodmont Avenue and Pearl Street, and bike lanes on Norfolk Avenue/Cheltenham Drive between Woodmont Avenue and Pearl Street and on Pearl Street between Cheltenham Drive and Montgomery Avenue.

The overall cost of this project is $8,230,000 and is unchanged from the Approved CIP. The latest schedule for each segment is:

- CCST, Bethesda Avenue/Willow Lane between Woodmont Avenue and 47th Street: construction to start this summer.
- CCST, through Elm Street Park: construction to start in spring/summer 2021.
- Woodmont Avenue, between Miller Avenue and Montgomery Lane: construction to start this summer.
- Woodmont Avenue, between Montgomery Lane and Norfolk Avenue: construction to start in summer 2021.
- Montgomery Lane, between Woodmont and Wisconsin Avenues: construction to start in autumn 2020.
- Montgomery Avenue, between Wisconsin Avenue and Pearl Street: construction to start in summer 2021.

Council staff recommends concurring with the Executive.

3. **Bowie Mill Road Bikeway** (not in CIP). This project is near completion of facility planning, and so is a candidate for final design, land acquisition, and construction funding in the CIP. Council members Navarro and Riemer recommend its inclusion (C17). The project provides for a new 8-10’-wide shared use path approximately 3.3 miles in length along the northwest side of Bowie Mill Road from MD 108 to its intersection with Bready Road/Bluebell Lane, at which point it will shift to the southeast side. A traffic signal will be installed at this intersection to provide bicyclists and pedestrians with a protected crossing. The project will also provide an extension to the future North Branch Trail.

The shared use path would continue along the southeast side, past Bowie Mill Park and Sequoyah ES, to Muncaster Mill Road (MD 115). The path will then extend about 600’ southeasterly along Muncaster Mill Road to its intersection with Needwood Road, at which point it will meet the existing sidewalk that continues to Magruder HS. A signal at Muncaster Mill and Needwood Roads will be modified to include a pedestrian phase.

The estimated cost of the project is $20,706,000. If uninterrupted by fiscal constraints, it will take two years to design, two years for right-of-way acquisition, and two years to build: a total of 6 years from start to finish. The production schedule is shown below ($000):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Elements</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
<th>Year 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning, Design &amp; Supervision</td>
<td>4,395</td>
<td>1,122</td>
<td>1,123</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,072</td>
<td>1,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>1,091</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Improvements &amp; Utilities</td>
<td>3,146</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>2,317</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>12,074</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,801</td>
<td>6,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>20,706</td>
<td>1,122</td>
<td>1,123</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>9,190</td>
<td>7,801</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Council staff's recommended approach generally is not to fund the start of design for new projects right away, but to defer their start until FY23 or later. Most of the fiscal capacity in FY21-22 is tied up in projects that are under construction or long-planned to be underway in these two years. Also, the heaviest expenditures on such new projects would be 5-6 years out, so setting their start dates in FY23 or later will place the heavier spending beyond the six-year period. **Council staff recommends including this project in the CIP following the pattern in the production schedule but with final design starting in FY23, which would have construction starting in FY27 and completion by the summer of 2028 (©18).**

4. **BiPPA projects: General** (19-8), **Purple Line** (19-11), **Veirs Mill/Randolph** (19-14), **Wheaton CBD** (19-16), and **Fenton Street Cycletrack** (19-30). In aggregate, the Executive is proposing an increase in the six-year funding of these programs of $3,399 (+15.6%) over the Amended CIP approved last spring. The changes in each of the five PDFs are documented on ©19-20. **Council staff recommends concurring with the Executive.**

5. **Bikeway Program – Minor Projects** (19-19). This project funds a host of bikeway-related efforts. Traditionally its mission has been to fund preliminary engineering of new bikeway projects and to construct those improvements costing less than $1 million each. Smaller amounts are set aside each year for bike racks and bike route signing.

The Executive recommends increasing the six-year funding of this program by $585,000 (+6.0%), rising to $10,260,000 for the next six years. A new subproject is a shared use path on the west side of Layhill Road from Park Vista Drive to Baughman Drive (north of the Intercounty Connector interchange). **Council staff recommends concurring with the Executive.**

6. **Bradley Boulevard (MD 191) Improvements** (19-22). The project would reconfigure Bradley Boulevard between Goldsboro Road and Wilson Lane to have a 5'-wide bike lane in each direction, an 8'-wide shared-use path on the northeast side, and a 5'-wide sidewalk on the southwest side. There are no continuous bikeways or sidewalks in this one-mile segment now.

The project was first included in the CIP four years ago. It is divided into two phases: Phase I includes the sidewalk on the southwest side and the bike lanes, while Phase II includes the shared-use path and the associated drainage improvements. At that time the design of Phase I was to begin in FY21 and the phase would be completed in FY25, while Phase II was to be further in the future. The schedule in the Amended CIP approved last spring would have design of Phase I begin in FY21 and construction completed in FY27. The Executive is recommending a funding pattern that would retain this schedule. Neither the existing nor recommended PDF includes the construction funding for the shared use path and the associated drainage improvements. This cost is $2,461,000 and could be completed in one fiscal year.

The Council has received regular testimony from the South Bradley Hills Neighborhood Association in support of the project, including a recent petition signed by 164 persons. It is also supported by the Western Montgomery County Citizens’ Advisory Board. However, the Planning Board states that the project no longer meets best practices for bikeway design and recommends redesigning it before proceeding to construction (©3). The Washington Area Bicyclist Association also
believes it should be redesigned to meet the standards in the 2018 Bicycle Master Plan. It should be noted, however, that what is called for in that plan for Bradley Boulevard—a sidepath on the north side and conventional bike lanes—is precisely the scope of the project.

Council staff recommends concurring with the Executive, except to add the construction funding for Phase 2 in FY27, so both phases will be finished that year. The expenditure schedule would be as follows ($000):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Thru FY19</th>
<th>Est. FY20</th>
<th>6-Yr Total</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>FY24</th>
<th>FY25</th>
<th>FY26</th>
<th>Beyond</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plan/Design/Sup.</td>
<td>3,038</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,080</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>2,407</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,407</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,339</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Imps/Util.</td>
<td>2,160</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,160</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,940</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>8,860</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,202</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,202</td>
<td>5,658</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16,465</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9,849</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>1,344</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>6425</td>
<td>6425</td>
<td>6,616</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. **Capital Crescent Trail** (19-24). This PDF funds the reconstruction of the Capital Crescent Trail (CCT) from Silver Spring to Bethesda as part of the State’s Purple Line project. It also includes $3.8 million to design a trail tunnel starting at Elm Street Park and traversing beneath Elm Street, Wisconsin Avenue, and the new buildings that are replacing the former Apex Building. The design is nearly complete, but the Executive has not recommended adding funds to construct the tunnel, which is estimated at more than $50 million. DOT will have completed 70% design of the tunnel by the end of March, at which time a more accurate cost estimate should be available. Therefore, the Committee will schedule its review of this project in April, concurrent with its review of the FY21 Operating Budget.

8. **Dale Drive Shared Use Path and Safety Improvements** (not in CIP). This project is also near completion of facility planning, and so is a candidate for final design, land acquisition, and construction funding in the CIP. It provides for a new 8'-wide shared use path approximately one mile in length along the north side of Dale Drive and Columbia Boulevard from Georgia Avenue (MD 97) to Colesville Road (US 29). The project also provides minor intersection safety improvements within the project limits to improve existing sight distance and crosswalks. It includes the “Alternative 1” concept to realign the intersections of Dale Drive, Columbia Boulevard, and Woodland Drive, as recommended by the T&E Committee last June.

The Council received testimony and correspondence advocating for the project; an example is on ©21-22. The Planning Board also recommends budgeting it (©2).

The estimated cost of the project is $8,449,000. If uninterrupted by fiscal constraints, it will take two years to design, somewhat more than two years for right-of-way acquisition, and two years to build: a total of 6 years from start to finish. The production schedule is shown below ($000):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Elements</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
<th>Year 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning, Design &amp; Supervision</td>
<td>2,156</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>2,312</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>1,244</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Improvements &amp; Utilities</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>3,499</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,909</td>
<td>1,590</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8,449</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>1,244</td>
<td>3,277</td>
<td>1,867</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As noted for the Bowie Mill Road Bikeway, Council staff’s general recommended approach is not to fund the start of design for new projects right away, but to defer their start until FY23 or later. Council staff recommends including this project in the CIP following the pattern in the production schedule but with final design starting in FY23, which would have construction starting in FY27 and completion by the summer of 2028 (©23).

9. **Falls Road East Side Hiker/Biker Path** (19-27). This project would ultimately build an 8’-wide hiker-biker trail along the east side of Falls Road (MD 189) from River Road to Dunster Road, about four miles. Most of this stretch of Falls Road does not even have a sidewalk, so the project would provide a safe pedestrian and bike connection to the many places of worship, schools, and businesses on or near Falls Road. Furthermore, it would link to hiker-biker trails at both ends, providing a continuous trail from Rockville to Great Falls.

The project was initially included in the CIP in 2008, with completion by 2015. The Executive has recommended, and the Council has concurred with deferring it several times since, primarily to create fiscal space for other projects in the CIP. The Recommended CIP would keep the project on the same schedule as in the most recently Approved CIP, with design beginning in FY21 and construction completed in FY26; still, this is an 11-year delay from the original schedule. The project cost of $25,471,000 has increased by $641,000 (+2.6%) from the Approved CIP. The County has received a Federal grant of $1,230,000 to help fund the design of the path, for which there is a $410,000 County match.

As with the Bradley Boulevard project, the Planning Board states that this project also no longer meets best practices for bikeway design and recommends redesigning it before proceeding to construction (©X). WABA also believes the design should be modified, presumably with a cycletrack and sidewalk rather than a shared use path. Unlike Bradley Boulevard, however, there is not a wellspring of support to construct it as soon as possible. The grant offers the opportunity to give this design a fresh look. The only requirement is that the project be constructed within 10 years.

Council staff recommends funding the design in FYs21-22 for $1,640,000 (the grant and its match), and that the land acquisition and construction costs be programmed “Beyond 6 Years” as a placeholder. Revise the project name to “Falls Road Bikeway and Pedestrian Facility.” A revised PDF is on ©24-25.

10. **Goldsboro Road Sidewalk/Bikeway** (19-39). This was a new project in the CIP two years ago, after having completed facility planning. The $21.1 million project was to reconstruct the section of Goldsboro Road between River Road and MacArthur Boulevard with two 11’-wide travel lanes, two one-way 5-6’-wide bike lanes separated from the travel lanes by flex posts, and a 5’-wide sidewalk. The project would cost $21,096,000 and would take about six years to design and build. In the Approved CIP, design would start in FY22 and construction completed by FY27.

Subsequent concerns about stormwater management has led DOT to re-scope the project, replacing the 5-6’-wide two-way separated bike lanes with a shared use path instead. The cost has been held stable for now; it will likely be revised once design is underway. However, the Executive is recommending a two-year deferral, with design starting in FY24 and project completion in FY29.
Council staff recommends not deferring this project. It is a key means of access for Bethesda residents to reach the MacArthur Boulevard Bikeway. Goldsboro Road in this section is a steep grade which is difficult and not particularly safe for all but experienced bicyclists. The expenditure schedule would be as follows ($000):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Thru FY19</th>
<th>Est. FY20</th>
<th>6-Yr Total</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>FY24</th>
<th>FY25</th>
<th>FY26</th>
<th>Beyond</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plan/Design/Sup.</td>
<td>3769</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3120</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Imps/Util.</td>
<td>1150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>15603</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10402</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5201</td>
<td>5201</td>
<td>5201</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21096</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15246</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>1102</td>
<td>6425</td>
<td>6425</td>
<td>5850</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. **Good Hope Road Sidewalk** (19-41). Two years ago, this was a new project to the CIP. It was to fund design and construction of a 4,500'-long, 5'-wide sidewalk along the west side of Good Hope Road in Cloverly between Windmill Lane and Rainbow Drive. There is no continuous pedestrian way along the road to bus stops and the Good Hope Recreation Center. The cost then was $4,065,000 and the sidewalk was scheduled for completion in FY22.

The Planning Board had recommended that this sidewalk instead be a shared use path at least 8'-wide, as called for in the Bicycle Master Plan (adopted in December 2018). The Executive agrees, and so the project now calls for such a shared use path at a cost of $4,730,000, a 16.4% increase in cost. The re-design of the project has delayed its completion by one year, to FY23. Although the Master Plan recommends the path be on the east side, the project still puts it on the west side. **Council staff recommends concurring with the Executive, except to change the project's name to “Good Hope Road Shared Use Path” to correctly reflect what would be built.**

12. **Life Sciences Center Loop Trail** (19-43). This project will build a 3.5-mile-long 8-12'-wide shared use path that would loop through the Life Science Center, the former Public Safety Training Academy (PSTA) property, the future Johns Hopkins development, and the Crown Farm. The Approved CIP programmed final design in FYs23-24 with construction in FYs25-26. The Recommended CIP would keep the design on schedule but would defer construction until FY27 or later.

DOT now estimates the production schedule to take 5 years: two years for final design, a year for land acquisition, and two years for construction. The cost is unchanged from the Approved CIP: $12,900,000. The production schedule, assuming final design would still start in FY23, is as follows ($000):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Thru FY19</th>
<th>Est. FY20</th>
<th>6-Yr Total</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>FY24</th>
<th>FY25</th>
<th>FY26</th>
<th>Beyond</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plan/Design/Sup.</td>
<td>2330</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1,330</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Imps/Util.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>9370</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,370</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,370</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12900</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>5,900</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>3,670</td>
<td>6,601</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Great Seneca Science Corridor Master Plan (adopted in 2010) split the development in this area in four phases. A decade later it has not proceeded beyond the small Stage 1: 400,000 additional square feet of commercial development and 2,500 additional dwelling units. Stage 2 would allow for another 2.5 million square feet of commercial development and 2,000 dwelling units. The conditions that must be met before proceeding to Stage 2 are:
Relocation of the PSTA to a new site. This has been done.

Achieve an 18% non-auto-driver mode share (NADMS). This has been achieved.

Program this trail for completion within the six years of a CIP.

Fully program the construction of the Phase 1 of the CCT from Shady Grove to Metropolitan Grove within the six years of a CIP or Consolidated Transportation Program (CTP)

Last autumn Councilmember Riemer proposed a minor master plan amendment that would split Stage 2 into two parts: the first part requiring the first three conditions, and the second part requiring the fourth (C26-27). Doing so would allow some of the 2.5 million square feet of commercial development and 2,000 additional dwelling units, a potentially major element in the Council’s newly minted Economic Development Platform. In February the Council approved a supplemental appropriation to begin the I-270 Transit Corridor Functional Master Plan that would also allow the Great Seneca Science Corridor Master Plan minor amendment to be approved in the first half of 2021.

Council staff recommends programming this project according to the production schedule noted above, and to note on the PDF that construction will be completed in FY27. If the minor master plan amendment remains unchanged on the Planning staff’s work program, and if this project is programmed for completion in FY27, then the third staging requirement will have been met by July 2021 and a portion of the Stage 2 development capacity can be unlocked then.

13. **MacArthur Boulevard Bikeway Improvements** (19-45). The project upgrades the MacArthur Boulevard bikeway between the Capital Beltway and the District of Columbia. The first stage of improvements, between the Beltway and Oberlin Avenue in Glen Echo, was completed in FY15. The improvements included widening the existing shared-use path to 8’, widening the roadway to 26’ to allow sufficient width for on-road biking, and providing a 5’-wide buffer between the road and the shared-use path. The second stage will construct the same improvements in the 2.1 miles between Oberlin Avenue and the District of Columbia boundary. This segment had been identified by the Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee of the National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board (TPB) as one of its twelve priority projects in the Washington region—the only one of the twelve that is in Montgomery County.

The project was first included in the CIP that was approved in 2016; at that time design was to occur in FYs19-20 and the construction would take place in FYs21-22. The CIP approved in 2018 delayed its completion by one year (after the Executive Leggett had recommended a 4-year delay). The Recommended CIP would delay it another two years, so that its completion would be 2025. The project’s cost estimate has increased by $1,247,000 (+7.1%) due to two years’ worth of construction cost inflation.

Council staff recommends authorizing the expenditure schedule in the table below (in $000), expressing a one-year delay, with completion in FY24. The Amended CIP approved last May had design starting in the current fiscal year, but effectively the project has been deferred by a year because of inaction. This bikeway is one of the most highly used in the county; completing it supports the Vision Zero initiative.
14. **MD 355-Clarksburg Shared Use Path (19-51).** This project will bridge a gap between two other trail projects. The 10'-wide Frederick Avenue Bike Path, which will run between Germantown and Stringtown Road along the west side of MD 355, is programmed for completion later this year. A Parks Department trail, the Little Bennett Trail Connector, would run along the east side of MD 355 from Snowden Farm Parkway to Little Bennett Park; it is currently recommended for design and construction beyond FY26. The MD 355-Clarksburg Shared Use Path would run along the east side of MD 355 between Stringtown Road and Snowden Farm Parkway.

The cost estimate two years ago was $8,539,000, but further engineering has produced plans for an 8-10'-wide path with a cost reduction of $2,141,000 (-25.1%). The Executive recommends starting design in FY24, which is at least a year sooner than the Approved CIP. The project would be completed in FY26. **Council staff recommends concurring with the Executive.**

15. **Metropolitan Branch Trail (19-54).** This project would construct an 8'-12'-wide hiker-biker trail roughly parallel to the CSX Metropolitan Branch between the Silver Spring Metrorail Station and Montgomery College’s Takoma Park campus. It is a part of a regional trail that eventually will extend through the District of Columbia to Union Station; several parts of the trail have been built. The project is divided into three segments. The southern segment will extend the existing trail from Montgomery College north along Fenton Street to King Street, and then west on King Street. The middle segment will extend the trail north along the CSX tracks beneath Burlington Avenue and next to Selim Road to Georgia Avenue. The northern segment will have the trail cross Georgia Avenue on a new bridge and continue along the tracks to the Silver Spring Transit Center.

Progress on this project has been halting. When the project was first programmed 10 years ago, the construction for the northern segment—and the design for all three segments—were to be completed by FY16. While the trail from the Transit Center to Progress Place is open, the segment around the Historic B&O Station and the bridge over Georgia Avenue has not yet been built. Four years ago, construction funding for the middle and southern segments was added to the PDF, and the construction on all three segments were to be finished by FY19. However, the project has been hampered by the inability to gain approvals from Montgomery Preservation, Inc. (MPI), the Maryland Historic Trust (MHT), WMATA, and CSX. Consequently, the project’s completion in the PDF has been delayed by two more years, to FY23. DOT recently reported that it has made progress with WMATA and CSX, but negotiations with MPI and MHT are still ongoing. **DOT staff have been asked to give the Committee an update. Council staff (reluctantly) recommends concurring with the Executive.**

16. **Seven Locks Bikeway and Safety Improvements (19-59).** For several years DOT evaluated potential sidewalk, bikeway, and safety improvements along the 3.3-mile stretch of Seven Locks Road between Montrose Road and Bradley Boulevard in Potomac. This is a complex project, the full cost of which would be about $70 million. It is divided into three phases:
- Phase I (northern segment): a hiker-biker trail on the west side of Seven Locks Road—plus on-road bikeways—between Montrose Road and Tuckerman Lane, a trail along Montrose Road between Seven Locks Road and its interchange with I-270, a second northbound lane on Seven Locks Road at Tuckerman Lane, and an exclusive right-turn lane from eastbound Tuckerman Lane to southbound Seven Locks Road. Duration, from start of design through construction: 5 years.

- Phase II (central segment): continuation of the hiker-biker trail and on-road bikeways on Seven Locks Road between Tuckerman Lane and Democracy Boulevard. Duration, from start of design through construction: 5 years.

- Phase III (southern segment): continuation of the hiker-biker trail and on-road bikeways on Seven Locks Road between Democracy and Bradley Boulevards. Duration, from start of design through construction: 5 years.

The only portion of the project funded in the CIP is Phase I. It has been in the CIP since 2012, but it has continually been delayed. Last year it was delayed by one more year, with design starting in FY22 and construction completed in FY26.

The Executive recommends a schedule that would not have it be completed until FY28, a further two-year delay and 7 years later than initially programmed. No reason is given for this deferral; presumably it is to create fiscal space for other CIP priorities. The project’s cost has increased by $1,905,000 (+7.7%) due to the addition of lighting and construction cost inflation. If the design were to begin in FY22, a production schedule would have it programmed as follows ($000):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan/Design/Sup.</th>
<th>Thru FY19</th>
<th>Est. FY20</th>
<th>6-Yr Total</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>FY24</th>
<th>FY25</th>
<th>FY26</th>
<th>Beyond</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>3,972</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,972</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>1,004</td>
<td>1,039</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Imps/Util.</td>
<td>4,766</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,766</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,915</td>
<td>2,851</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>17,644</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17,644</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,724</td>
<td>10,920</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26,670</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26,670</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>3,155</td>
<td>8,106</td>
<td>11,989</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Council staff recommends keeping Phase 1 on schedule for completion in FY26, according to the above production schedule. Also, in the Fiscal Note, the total cost of all three phases should be reported as “about $70 million.”

17. Sidewalk Program Minor Projects (19-62). This program funds new segments of sidewalk. The process starts with a request from individuals, groups of neighbors, civic associations, and Citizens’ Advisory Boards. DOT evaluates and prioritizes the requests and constructs them as funds are available. The Executive recommends the six-year funding be increased by $3,914,000 (+24.3%) over the Amended CIP. The increases are in FY23, and in higher levels in FYs25-26 than in FYs19-20.

Council staff recommends concurring with the Executive for now. At CIP Reconciliation there may need to be a different spending pattern.

D. FACILITY PLANNING—TRANSPORTATION PROJECT (20-13)

This project funds the planning and preliminary engineering of road, transit, bikeway, and major sidewalk projects: it is the ‘gatekeeper’ for all new major transportation projects, except for BRT and
bridge replacements and rehabilitations. Facility planning is conducted in two phases: a feasibility study (Phase I), and a preliminary engineering study (Phase II). Once a project has proceeded through the preliminary engineering (a.k.a. 35% design) phase, its scope is well defined, and its cost estimate is reliable. Upon completion of facility planning is the appropriate time for the Council to decide whether the project should be funded for construction as planned or with revisions, or be rejected.

For FYs21-26 the Executive is recommending spending $12,800,000, a $410,000 (+2.8%) increase compared to the six years in the Amended FY19-24 CIP. The project is funded with various forms of current revenue, which means it competes with the Operating Budget for resources. Here are the significant changes the Executive proposes to the start times for studies already programmed:

- Middlebrook Road and Wisteria Drive road diets between Germantown Road (MD 118) and Great Seneca Highway (MD 119): accelerate one year, from FY22 to FY21.
- Metropolitan Grove Park & Ride: delay at least 6 years, from FY21 to after FY26.

A few years ago, the Greater Olney Citizens Association requested that North High Street in the Olney Town Center be extended from its dead end to Morningwood Drive, as called for in the Olney Master Plan (2005). It was included in the Facility Planning program in the Approved CIP, but it appears neither in the Facility Planning PDF nor as a stand-alone PDF in the Recommended CIP. DOT reports that it is currently in the concept development stage that will be completed by summer. A public workshop will be scheduled in early autumn to share with the community the concepts, potential impacts and costs. This project is anticipated to complete facility planning by the end of FY 2021, which means that it should be eligible for construction funding as an amendment to the CIP next year.

The Executive is recommending several new studies (see ©28). Their costs and start dates are:

- Long Branch Master Plan Bikeway/Pedestrian Connections: $935,000 starting in FY26.
- High Incident Network Facility Planning: $815,000 starting in FY26.
- MD 355 – Milestone to Clarksburg Road: $1,025,000 starting in FY21.
- Prioritizing MCDOT Capital Projects: $155,000 starting in FY21.
- Westlake/Rock Spring Complete Streets: $970,000 starting in FY26.
- PEPCO Pathway: $970,000 starting in FY26.
- White Oak Transit Center: $515,000 starting in FY22.

The description for the proposed “MD 355 – Milestone to Clarksburg Road” study acknowledges that the Countywide Transit Corridors Functional Master Plan calls for bus rapid transit to run in mixed traffic on MD 355 north of Shakespeare Boulevard (Milestone) to Clarksburg, and that no additional lanes will be added in this segment for a dedicated transit lane (see ©29). Therefore, adding a dedicated lane there is inconsistent with the master plan. To determine its general feasibility, this could be included in the scope of the Planning Board’s just-approved I-270 Transit Corridor Functional Master Plan study and incorporated into the master plan should it prove feasible.

Furthermore, project planning for the widening of MD 355 north to Clarksburg was included in the 2017 Council/Executive joint State Transportation Priorities letter, and that ask is repeated in the draft 2020 joint letter that the Council will be reviewing over the next two weeks. If SHA agrees to fund
the project planning study, a dedicated BRT lane could be evaluated as part of that more comprehensive study.

Council staff recommends approving the Facility Planning-Transportation PDF recommended by the Executive, except to delete the "MD 355 – Milestone to Clarksburg Road" study. This would reduce the funding for the project by $1,025,000 and reduce its FY21 Current Revenue appropriation by $225,000.
February 18, 2020

The Honorable Sidney Katz  
President, Montgomery County Council  
Council Office Building  
100 Maryland Avenue, 5th Floor  
Rockville, Maryland 20850

RE: County Executive’s Recommended FY21 Capital Budget and FY21-26 Capital Improvements Program

Dear President Katz:

At its regularly scheduled meeting on February 6, 2020, the Planning Board discussed the County Executive’s Recommended FY21 Capital Budget and Amendments to the FY21-26 Capital Improvements Program (CIP) and voted to transmit the following comments for the County Council’s consideration. The staff memo for the Board’s discussion and the CIP priorities letter that we transmitted to the County Executive in September 2019 are enclosed for your reference.

Our specific recommendations are as follows:

1. Capital Crescent Trail Tunnel project: Create a new project with design and construction funding for the Capital Crescent Trail Tunnel and program construction to be completed by the time the Capital Crescent Trail Mainline, between Elm Street Park and the Silver Spring Transit Center, is opened. The Planning Board also recommends that the County reconsider lower-cost tunnel alternatives, to potentially reduce overall project costs.

2. Capital Crescent Trail missing sections: If the Capital Crescent Trail Tunnel project will not be completed by the time the Capital Crescent Trail Mainline is open, three efforts need to be advanced:
   a. Outfit the bicycle parking storage area that was constructed as part of the 7272 Wisconsin Avenue project (the site of the former Apex Building);
   b. Connect the Capital Crescent Trail Surface Route to the Capital Crescent Trail Mainline through Elm Street Park; and
   c. Construct the approximately 100-foot portion of the Capital Crescent Trail Tunnel Route between 7272 Wisconsin Avenue and the JBG Property to provide access to the bicycle parking station that was constructed as part of 7272 Wisconsin Avenue.

3. White Flint Metro Station North Entrance (P501914): Retain the White Flint Metro Station North Entrance (P501914) project and allocate the total budget in the amount of $34 million to advance planning, design and construction. At a minimum, staff is recommending that the current CIP funding...
levels from the FY20 budget ($2.9 million) be retained to continue work on this project. This project is important to improve access to transit within White Flint and for the area to achieve its development potential. At a time when Montgomery County is facing economic challenges, a regional housing crisis, and is trying to respond to county initiatives on climate change and Vision Zero, this project is needed for the following reasons:

a. New access would likely incentivize potential high density residential and commercial development on the Metro site and surrounding areas, including the Pike District. This is an area where housing, including affordable housing, and job growth need to occur if Montgomery County is going to continue to thrive;
b. The north entrance is a key transportation project supporting the White Flint Sector Plan Vision and economic development in this vitally important urban center; and
c. It would provide a tangible, public sector commitment to developers to encourage investment, and to retain and strengthen existing development and governmental entities located in this area (including the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and the National Institutes of Health).

Equally, if not more important in the near-term, we agree with the County Executive’s addition of the White Flint Metro Station Access Improvements (P502106) project and believe funding for this shorter-term project should be maintained in addition to restoring funding for the longer-term north entrance project. This new project will improve pedestrian safety within the immediate vicinity of the Metro station. The Board feels that these two projects, collectively, are key to supporting economic development and continued growth in the White Flint area.

4. Dale Drive Pedestrian Improvements: Create a new project with design and construction funding for the Dale Drive Pedestrian Improvements project and complete design and construction for this project within the current CIP. Given the high volumes on this key minor arterial in north Silver Spring, we want to note both the importance of this project from a Vision Zero perspective to give residents a safe space to walk and roll, and the need to advance this pedestrian/bike project identified and linked to the SHA Georgia Avenue improvements advanced in the Forest Glen/Montgomery Hills Sector Plan.

5. Bus Rapid Transit: Veirs Mill Road BRT project (P501913): Advance the Veirs Mill Road BRT project to a greater degree than recommended by the County Executive within the current six-year CIP. The Veirs Mill corridor is one of WMATA’s priority transit corridors with consistently high ridership, is the subject of a recently adopted master plan that identified the critical need for improved conditions, is included in the Vision Zero high injury network and is located largely within several equity emphasis areas. Advancement through 35 percent design is recommended within the current six-year CIP cycle at a minimum. The project description form (PDF) should be amended to specify that station access improvements, including continuous sidewalks with wide buffers from the street, parallel bikeways and more frequent safe crossings, will be implemented as part of the project.

6. Bicycle-Pedestrian Priority Area Improvements – Veirs Mill / Randolph (P502003): Amend the project to include the following projects: sidewalks on the south side of Veirs Mill Road between Schoolhouse Circle and Glorus Place, Ferrara Avenue to Randolph Road, and Gridley Road to
Gaynor Road and the north side of Veirs Mill Road between Havard Street and Robindale Drive. Additional projects include crossing improvements on Veirs Mill Road such as signalized crossings and high-visibility crosswalks, improved lighting, and bikeways such as sidepaths, separated bike lanes, neighborhood greenways and protected intersections. Also note in the PDF that since the Pedestrian Impact Statement was completed, the boundaries of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Priority Area were extended to Robindale Drive and the Wheaton Central Business District by the Veirs Mill Corridor Master Plan.

7. **Bicycle-Pedestrian Priority Area Improvements – Wheaton CBD (P502002):** Increase CIP funding for this project PDF. There are five or more Wheaton CBD bikeway projects within this BiPPA area (all of these bikeway projects as summarized in the PDF and identified in the Planning Board’s Top 100 transportation priorities) and there is insufficient funding in the existing project PDF for all planned Wheaton CBD bikeway projects. Staff suggests adding funding in the middle years (FY23 and FY24) of the current CIP.

8. **Re-evaluate the Falls Road East Side Hiker/Biker Path (P500905) within the priority context of the Bicycle Master Plan and reduce acceleration of this project. While this project was fully designed over 10 years ago, its design no longer meets best practices and the Bicycle Master Plan recommends that the design be revisited before advancing to construction. This project has been idle for many years and continually gets pushed back. Deferring this project a few years until after FY23 or FY24 could free up some funds for more timely projects, such as the Capital Crescent Trail Tunnel in Bethesda/Chevy Chase and the Dale Drive Pedestrian Improvements in Silver Spring.

9. **Re-evaluate the Bradley Boulevard (MD 191) Improvements (P501733).** This project design no longer meets best practices and the Planning Board joins Planning staff in recommending the design be revisited before advancing to construction.

10. **Bicycle-Pedestrian Priority Area Improvements – Purple Line (502004):** The Planning Department, as a partner in the Purple Line Corridor Coalition, has been tasked with evaluating pedestrian and bicycle connectivity to the Purple Line stations. As part of that effort, Planning staff has developed preliminary recommendations for improving station access (see Enclosure). The following projects would contribute substantially to improving access at the Lyttonsville, 16th Street, Long Branch and Piney Branch Road stations. The Planning Board therefore recommends modifying the PDF to include these bikeway projects:

   a. Two-way separated bike lanes on Lyttonsville Place between Brookville Road and Lyttonsville Road to improve access to the Lyttonsville Purple Line station, Capital Crescent Trail and to provide a buffer between the road and the sidewalk;

   b. Two-way separated bike lanes on the north side of Piney Branch Road between University Blvd and New Hampshire Avenue to improve bicycle connectivity to the Piney Branch Road Purple Line station, the Northwest Branch Trail and to provide a buffer between the sidewalk and Piney Branch Road (note: this extends slightly into Prince George’s County);
c. Upgrade sidewalks along publicly owned property: 1) north side Piney Branch Road fronting the Long Branch Community Center and Library, 2) south side of Piney Branch Road fronting Long Branch – Garland Neighborhood Park, 3) south side of Piney Branch Road fronting New Hampshire Estates Neighborhood Park, and 4) east side of University Boulevard fronting New Hampshire Estates Neighborhood Park; and

d. Convert the northbound curb lane on 16th Street between Colesville Road and Georgia Avenue to two-way separated bike lanes to improve access to the 16th Street Purple Line Station and to provide a buffer between the sidewalk and 16th Street.


12. Prioritize Addressing School Over-Crowding: When considering options for meeting the County Executive’s recommended $100.3 million affordability reconciliation (including the $200 million the County Executive recommends delaying from years one through four of the CIP to years five and six), the County Council should encourage the Board of Education to prioritize projects that provide school capacity solutions for the county’s overcrowded schools. During the current fiscal year, there are four cluster service areas and 13 individual elementary school service areas that are in residential development moratoria in accord with the county’s Subdivision Staging Policy’s adequacy standards. If the Board of Education’s requested CIP is fully funded, the four cluster moratoria would be relieved, and only four individual school service areas would be in moratorium FY21. The Planning Board also recognizes the importance of projects to improve school safety, to renovate facilities, and to provide system maintenance. Therefore, the Planning Board encourages the County Council to find ways to fund as much of the Board of Education’s CIP request as possible.

13. Re-Prioritizing Transportation Priorities: The Planning Board encourages the County Council to balance fiscal responsibility and transportation priorities, including favoring projects with a focus on Vision Zero impact and projects linked to the Purple Line/Capital Crescent Trail completion, estimated for FY23. In order to fit these project recommendations, we support the reduction or delay of other projects not discussed in this letter in order to advance these more critical projects. The Planning Board previously submitted to the County Executive a list of Top 100 transportation priorities (see Enclosure which includes the Planning Board letter dated September 24, 2019) to assist in this re-prioritization process. As a start, the two projects identified in items 8 and 9 in this letter should have budget shifts/cuts to focus on re-design, not construction, within this CIP. In addition, several new projects included in the County Executive’s recommended CIP, including the MD 355 BRT and facility planning on the New Hampshire Avenue BRT and North Bethesda BRT, while critical to the overall transportation growth and direction within Montgomery County, can be delayed by a couple of years to allow other more time-sensitive projects to be completed.

Minority Report by Commissioner Patterson: It is important to note that Commissioner Patterson had a different perspective on re-prioritizing transportation priorities. It is her opinion that the County Council and County Executive should determine what the reprioritization of transportation projects is at this time. As the County grows and projects are completed, flexibility is needed to re-prioritize transportation projects in real time. It is her opinion that several projects shown in Table 3 (see
Enclosure), such as the Glen Road bridge project, are needed to keep transportation flowing, to provide critical road connections for communities within the county that do not readily have access to transit, and to ensure route alternatives in the event of an emergency or closure of routes such as I-270 and MD 355.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. The staff report to the Planning Board is enclosed for further background information. If you have any questions or comments concerning our review, please call Steve Aldrich at 301-495-4528.

Sincerely,

Casey Anderson  
Chair

Enclosure: Staff Report to the Planning Board, February 6, 2020 (includes Planning Board letter to County Executive re: CIP Priorities, September 24, 2019)

cc: Shebra Evans, President, Board of Education, Montgomery County Public Schools  
   Jack Smith, Superintendent, Montgomery County Public Schools  
   Glenn Orlin, Deputy Director, Montgomery County Council  
   Christopher Conklin, Director, Montgomery County Department of Transportation  
   Gwen Wright, Director, Planning Department  
   Robert Kronenberg, Deputy Director, Planning Department  
   Tanya Stern, Deputy Director, Planning Department  
   Jason Sartori, Chief, Functional Planning and Policy Division, Planning Department  
   Eliza Hisel-McCoy, Chief, Area 1 Division, Planning Department  
   Carrie Sanders, Chief, Area 2 Division, Planning Department  
   Richard Weaver, Chief, Area 3 Division, Planning Department  
   Carl Morgan, Capital Improvements Program Manager, Parks Department
MEMORANDUM

February 27, 2020

TO: Transportation and Environment Committee
   Councilmember Vice President Tom Hucker, Chair
   Councilmember Hans Riemer
   Councilmember Evan Glass

FROM: Councilmember Craig Rice

SUBJECT: Department of Transportation FY21-26 Capital Improvements Program
          Boyds Transit Center

I urge you to support accelerated funding for the Boyds Transit Center (P138703) in the FY21-26 Capital Improvements Program. With the site remediation scheduled to be completed in FY22, design and construction should be funded to ensure a completion date of FY23.

The Boyds Transit Center project provides site remediation along with the design and construction for a critical bus loop and expanded parking lot at the MARC station. The bus loop is especially important to connect our up-county residents with public transportation. Currently, buses cannot be accommodated at the Boyds MARC station, thereby eliminating this as a choice or an incentive for individuals to get out of their cars.

This project facilitates the critical connection to public transportation for the fastest growing area in Montgomery County. The Cabin Branch development alone will provide 1800 new residences in the coming years. Up-county public transportation relies solely on a bus system that can connect to efficient mass transit options. The Boyds Transit Center is critical to the overall public transportation system that will meet the needs of up-county residents.

Acceleration of funding will deepen our commitment to provide transit choice to an area that lacks options when it comes to public transportation. I urge you to accelerate funding to the Boyds Transit Center to provide desperately needed mass transit options as quickly as possible to the up-county area.
Subject: FY 21-26 CIP: Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) System Development P501318
Funding for New Hampshire Avenue BRT Planning

Dear President Katz and fellow Councilmembers,

The Executive Board of the Hillandale Citizens Association is writing with an appeal to approve the funding to plan the New Hampshire Avenue BRT beginning in FY22 with completion in FY24. We further encourage Council to consider accelerating this planning effort. With development plans now going forward in Hillandale, transit improvements are critically needed for our suburban area.

The 2014 White Oak Science Gateway Master Plan (WOSG) granted added density/development opportunities to transform the New Hampshire Avenue Corridor based on having the BRT. This BRT line will serve the growing Food and Drug Administration White Oak Campus on New Hampshire Avenue along with supporting the large transit oriented Hillandale Gateway project, the first of many planned developments in the area that is currently in the approval phase. Now is the time for the County to begin to fulfill its promise of transit infrastructure to support the area’s development which is not constrained by staging requirements.

The New Hampshire BRT route provides an important link in the East County transit network by connecting the Route 29 BRT in White Oak with the Purple Line station in Langley Park and terminating at Metro’s Green & Red Lines at Fort Totten. Connecting these key transportation hubs will improve opportunities and transit times for East County residents and workers.

Adding to the urgency of moving the New Hampshire BRT forward is providing a transit solution to the current traffic conundrum on New Hampshire Avenue in Hillandale. The County’s Planning Commission is in the process of reviewing plans for the Hillandale Gateway project, the current plan for which has been expanded beyond the Master Plan and base zoning to accommodate bonus density for affordable housing and additional commercial space. The expanded density will increase the traffic burden without efficient transit options for both the many anticipated new residents along with existing residents. The obvious disconnect between the infrastructure and the development must be addressed in order to support the County’s Vision Zero, pedestrian and bike master plans.

Given the dearth of transit options in the New Hampshire corridor, residents rely on auto transportation primarily, causing the overcrowding and resultant accident rate on New Hampshire Avenue. Given the imminent development in the Hillandale area, moving ahead with planning and development of the New Hampshire BRT is critical in order to support the County goals for safety and livability.

This transit investment is necessary to begin to achieve the transformational goals of the White Oak Science Gateway Master Plan. Please approve the requested funding, and if possible, accelerate the timing.

Thank you for considering our request and thoughts on this important infrastructure issue.

On behalf of the Hillandale community,

Andrew Harris
President, Hillandale Citizens Association
andrew3harris@gmail.com
February 26, 2020

Montgomery County Council
Council Office Building
100 Maryland Ave
Rockville, MD 20850

Re: Transportation projects in the FY 21 Capital Budget and FY 21-26 CIP

Dear Council President Katz and County Councilmembers:

We, the undersigned, are writing to express our support for the following amendments to the FY 21 Capital Budget and FY 21-26 Capital Improvements Program.

Fully dedicated bus rapid transit lanes on Route 29: Montgomery County has been studying a bus rapid transit (BRT) network for nearly a decade. The first line of the planned countywide network is set to open this May without the fully dedicated right of way that is necessary for bus rapid transit to truly be rapid. The highest quality of service is necessary to show county residents what BRT can do, and why the rest of the network must be funded and built.

The proposed CIP includes $2 million for preliminary engineering of BRT on Veirs Mill Road and $14 million for BRT system development, which includes New Hampshire Avenue and the North Bethesda Transitway. Aside from Route 29, no priority BRT corridor construction funding has been identified — financing for the full 82-mile network remains elusive. This means at least another six years of study without any action, and with a bus rapid transit line that isn't actually rapid.

Together, the $16 million budgeted for preliminary engineering along these three future BRT lines can be put to better, more immediate use by diverting it to the construction of dedicated median BRT lanes on the southern portion of Route 29.

The 2013 Countywide Transit Corridors Functional Master Plan called for dedicated lanes on the Route 29 corridor, and this promise of gold standard BRT should be fulfilled. Two years ago, the County Council commissioned a study evaluating dedicated bus lanes in the southern portion of Route 29, which should be shared with the Council immediately so that resources can be prioritized on the existing BRT corridor — instead of continuing feasibility studies for unfunded BRT routes.

White Flint northern Metro entrance: Provided the reasons above, we also support diverting the $15 million allotted to preliminary engineering of BRT on MD-355 to fund a second entrance at the north of the White Flint Metro station.
A 2015 report found that Montgomery County's most successful office clusters are in walkable, transit accessible locations. Marriott's move from an industrial office park to downtown Bethesda showcased this trend. Business leaders have testified that the second Metro entrance is a must to attract prospective office tenants.

Those who live or work within a half-mile walkshed of transit are significantly more likely to use it. Achieving the staging requirements in the White Flint Master Plan is dependent upon new investments in transit accessibility. Simply put, the northern Metro entrance is necessary for an economically vibrant Pike District. As Montgomery looks to keep itself competitive with Northern Virginia, county leadership must prioritize smart growth infrastructure.

**Express bus service on northern MD-355 and Veirs Mill Road:** While pursuing gold standard BRT on MD-355 and Veirs Mill Road, we should mirror the success of Ride On extRa and provide express bus service on northern MD-355 and Veirs Mill Road. We should also update the existing bus/right turn only stencils on Veirs Mill Road, pursue a countywide redesign and upgrade of Ride On, and seek funding sources for the BRT system.

Veirs Mill Road is the highest ridership bus corridor in the state of Maryland, and is also vital to bridging the east-west socioeconomic divide. At the same time, residents in Gaithersburg, Germantown, and Clarksburg have dire, unmet transportation needs. One of the highest daily travel flows in the region is from Clarksburg to Germantown, with 4,000 to 5,000 daily trips on all modes. Ride On extRa Route 101 along MD-355 increased ridership by 11 percent and reduced travel times by 25 percent.

Improving our transit system is important for climate, equity, and economic development goals. Transportation is our number one source of greenhouse gas emissions. Commute times are one of the best indicators of socioeconomic mobility, and people who rely on bus service have some of the longest commutes in the county. Our economic growth has stagnated.

We must take bold action to create change, and these three priority investments — funding dedicated lanes on Route 29 for Gold Standard BRT, a second entrance to the White Flint Metro Station, and express bus on Veirs Mill Road — will demonstrate the boldness that Montgomery County residents and businesses want to see.

Thank you for your attention to this important matter.

Signed,

Denisse Guitarra
Maryland Conservation Advocate
**Audubon Naturalist Society**
Julio Murillo  
Government & Strategic Relations Specialist  
CASA

Nanci Wilkinson  
Chair, Environmental Justice Ministry  
Cedar Lane Unitarian Universalist Church

Jane Lyons  
Maryland Advocacy Manager  
Coalition for Smarter Growth

Diane Hibino and Kathy McGuire  
Co-Presidents  
League of Women Voters of Montgomery County

Walter Weiss  
President  
Montgomery County Faith Alliance for Climate Solutions

Michael DeLong  
President  
Montgomery County Young Democrats

Shruti Bhatnagar  
Chair  
Sierra Club, Montgomery Group

Margaret Schoap  
Organizer  
Transit Alternatives to Mid-County Extended

CC: County Executive Marc Elrich
Director Conklin:

Later this year, the County will be opening “Flash US 29,” a new express bus service on US 29. Flash US 29 will provide upgraded and frequent service from Burtonsville to the Silver Spring CBD, running in the shoulders in the northern section and in mixed-traffic south of Tech Rd. This new service will be an unalloyed improvement for transit riders in the corridor, and we commend the Department for your work on getting the project this far. However, the lack of dedicated lanes in the most congested area of the route will make it difficult for the service to reach its full potential for speed, reliability, and, consequently, increasing ridership.

The 2013 BRT Master Plan envisioned a gold standard BRT system with a network of dedicated bus lanes—especially on busy corridors like US 29. To better fulfill the master plan vision, the council asked MCDOT to study the “Smoot-Emerson” proposal, which would bring dedicated lanes into the southern portion of the US 29 corridor. The study was first requested by policy makers in May 2017. The study was eventually funded out of existing Facility Planning funds. We have come to understand that the study is substantially complete.

As part of our review of the County’s BRT projects on March 5, we request that the Department update the Transportation and Environment Committee on this study. The Council has written in the past about “BRT Creep”, whereby BRT is watered down to the point of not being useful. Enacting plans for dedicated bus lanes is crucial for a successful BRT system. A fuller picture of the US 29 BRT project will assist the Committee in making more informed decisions on all of the proposed routes. We hope you can work with the council to bring gold standard BRT to the US 29 system and the whole BRT network.
Thank you for your attention to this matter. Please let us know if you have any questions about this request.

Sincerely,

Hans Riemer  
Councilmember, At-large

Evan Glass  
Councilmember, At-large
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Elements</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>FY22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>White Flint Metro Station Access Improvements ($000)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NE/SE Corners</strong> Slip Ramps &amp; New 5' Sidewalk with Grass Buffer along East Side of MD355</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Management</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction (Slip Ramps)</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction (Sidewalk)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NW/SW Corners</strong> Slip Ramps &amp; New 5' Sidewalk with Grass Buffer along West Side of MD355</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Management</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction (Slip Ramps)</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction (Sidewalk)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sidewalk along Old Georgetown Rd</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Management</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction (Sidewalk)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expanded bus bays on east side of Metro</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Management</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>2900</td>
<td>1450</td>
<td>1450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
White Flint Metro Station Access Improvements
(P502106)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SubCategory</td>
<td>Mass Transit (MCG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Area</td>
<td>North Bethesda-Garnet Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Last Modified</td>
<td>01/06/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administering Agency</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXPENDITURE SCHEDULE ($000s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total FY 19</th>
<th>Est FY 20</th>
<th>Total 6 Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning, Design &amp; Sup</td>
<td>720,000</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>4,504,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>220,000</td>
<td>220,000</td>
<td>1,220,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,900,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,920,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,724,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FUNDING SCHEDULE ($000s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total FY 19</th>
<th>Est FY 20</th>
<th>Total 6 Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G.O. Bonds</td>
<td>2,900,000</td>
<td>2,900,000</td>
<td>2,900,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPROPRIATION AND EXPENDITURE DATA ($000s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 21</th>
<th>FY 22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appropriation FY 21</td>
<td>2,900,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriation FY 22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Appropriation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure / Encumbrances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unencumbered Balance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year First Appropriation</td>
<td>2,900,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last FY's Cost Estimate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This project provides for the preliminary engineering and construction of access improvements to the White Flint Metro Station. Access is currently limited to the southern end of the platform. Planned improvements funded for design and construction include modifications of the intersection of Old Georgetown Road and Rockville Pike and sidewalk and streetscape improvements on the frontage of roads connecting the White Flint Metro Station entrance to surrounding areas.

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

This project is needed to improve the mobility and safety for all facility users within the project area by improving the walking routes to the Metro station platforms. The project may also reduce existing conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles. Currently, transit users, pedestrians, and bicyclists cross MD 355 (Rockville Pike) and Old Georgetown Road to access the Metro station. Traffic volumes and speeds on MD 355 can be high, and pedestrians must cross over seven lanes of traffic.

LOCATION

MD 355 (Rockville Pike) at Old Georgetown Road/White Flint Metro Station

COORDINATION

Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, Maryland State Highway Administration, Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority
Good evening. My name is Amy Ginsburg, the executive director of Friends of White Flint, a nonprofit organization whose only mission is the transformation of the Pike District into a vibrant, transit-oriented community.

The 2,000 supporters of Friends of White Flint, including property owners, residents, businesses, employees, and customers, want the promise of the White Flint/Pike District to be fulfilled. That promise includes much-needed economic development and a stellar quality of life for residents, a promise that starts with the funding of essential CIP projects.

One of the underlying tenets of the White Flint sector plan is transit-oriented development. Needless to say, it is difficult to have transit-oriented development without transit, which is why we are extremely disappointed funding was eliminated in the CIP for a northern entrance for the White Flint metro station.

A northern metro entrance significantly expands the metro walkshed, and it is critical to encouraging development in the Pike District. With the second entrance, the offices on Executive Boulevard, retail, and some large multi-family apartments become part of the metro station walkshed. This entrance is instrumental to fulfilling the wonderful vision of a sustainable, transit-oriented, walkable community, and Friends of White Flint strongly urges you to fund the second metro entrance in this year’s CIP budget.

Additionally, while walking and biking in the White Flint area continues to grow, many more want to walk and bike to work, retail, and residences but are stymied by dangerous infrastructure. Much more needs to be done to make the White Flint area as walkable as possible as quickly as possible. It is imperative that we make walking and biking along Route 355, Old Georgetown Road, and the Pike District side streets safe and accessible.

Through the CIP, the County sets its long-term priorities. Show that your priorities are multi-modal transit and Vision Zero. Demonstrate that your priorities are transit-oriented development that encourages new development and economic development. Demonstrate your support for the transformation of the White Flint area through this CIP by fully funding a second metro entrance and essential pedestrian and bicycle improvements.

Thank you.
MEMORANDUM

February 27, 2020

TO: Members of the T&E Committee

FROM: Councilmember Nancy Navarro
Councilmember Hans Riemer

SUBJECT: Bowie Mill Road Bikeway Project

The Bowie Mill Road Bikeway project consists of a 3.3 mile long, fully separated bike path that would link Olney to nearby schools, parks, trails and transit. As the County continues to look for opportunities to use its transportation infrastructure to stimulate economic development, this project embodies that goal as it would provide access for residents to transit, schools, and businesses, while also providing a recreation amenity that connects two parts of the County. Now that the Needwood Road Bikeway is complete, it is imperative that the Bowie Mill Road Bikeway project move forward as quickly as possible.

In 2016, we requested that funds be included in the FY 17-22 CIP for facility planning for this bikeway. MCDOT has recently completed this process and is able to prepare a reasonable cost estimate, which would allow this project to be a candidate for inclusion in the CIP for design, land acquisition and construction funding. The facility planning process was not completed in time to be included in the County Executive’s recommended CIP, but it is our understanding that the facility planning process is now complete, therefore we are writing to respectfully request that the committee consider this project for inclusion in the FY 21-26 CIP.

This project is consistent with many of Montgomery County’s goals, including providing safe multi-modal transportation options for our residents for our Vision Zero goals and as well as giving our residents transportation options that will help reduce our carbon footprint. Thank you for your consideration of this request.
Bowie Mill Road Bikeway

This project provides for the design and construction of a new eight to ten feet wide sidepath for 3.3 miles along Bowie Mill Road from Olney Laytonsville Road (MD 108) to Muncaster Mill Road (MD 115) and continues along Muncaster Mill Road to Needwood Road. The project also provides a new pedestrian bridge over Rock Creek North Branch for continuation of the sidepath along Bowie Mill Road.

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

The Montgomery County Bicycle Master Plan, approved in November 2018, recommends a sidepath along Bowie Mill Road. The project is a critical connection in the existing bicycle network between the existing trails and important destinations including Needwood Road Bike Path, North Branch Trail, the Inter-County Connector (ICC) Trail, Shady Grove Metro Station, Sequoyah Elementary School, Colonel Zadok Magruder High School, and Olney Town Center.

STATUS

Preliminary Design Stage.

OTHER

This project supports the Vision Zero initiative which aims to reduce injuries and fatalities on all roads.

LOCATION

Olney & Vicinity; Upper Rock Creek.

ESTIMATED SCHEDULE

Design is scheduled to start in FY23 with construction to start in FY27. Completion in summer 2028.

COORDINATION

Maryland-National Capital Park & Planning Commission, Maryland State Highway Administration, Utility Companies.
General BiPPA ($000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General BiPPA</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>FY24</th>
<th>FY25</th>
<th>FY26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY19-24 Amended</td>
<td>$411</td>
<td>$966</td>
<td>$1,634</td>
<td>$1,118</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY21-26 CE Rec.</td>
<td>$411</td>
<td>$1,366</td>
<td>$1,634</td>
<td>$1,118</td>
<td>$1,030</td>
<td>$1,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+$400</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+$730</td>
<td>+$1,030</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Change highlights:
- FY 22
  - Increased funding for spot improvements to facilitate Vision Zero including APS/CPS signal upgrades (to make signals accessible to persons with disabilities).
- FY25
  - Note: Additional funding level ($1,030) is the average annual expenditure of the Approved FY20 budget for FY21-FY24.
  - Added funding for additional improvements in Glenmont BiPPA
  - Added funding for planning in the next round BiPPA area (placeholder for future BiPPA designation by the Council/Executive)
  - Continued funding for spot improvements to facilitate Vision Zero
- FY26
  - Note: Additional funding level ($1,030) is the average annual expenditure of the Approved FY20 budget for FY21-FY24.
  - Added funding for design in the next round BiPPA area (placeholder for future BiPPA designation by the Council/Executive)
  - Continued funding for spot improvements to facilitate Vision Zero

Fenton Street Cycletrack ($000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fenton Street Cycletrack</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>FY24</th>
<th>FY25</th>
<th>FY26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY19-24 Amended</td>
<td>$2,670</td>
<td>$1,392</td>
<td>$83</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY21-26 CE Rec.</td>
<td>$699</td>
<td>$355</td>
<td>$3,016</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>-$1,971</td>
<td>-$1,037</td>
<td>+$2,933</td>
<td>+$75</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Change highlights:
- FY 21
  - Shifted construction funding for Phase II & III to FY 23.
- FY 22
  - Shifted construction funding for Phase III & IV to FY 23.
- FY 23
  - Most construction funding moved to this year. Utility scheduled for FY 21/22.

NOTE: This change has been made to reflect a realistic timeframe for construction.

Wheaton CBD BiPPA ($000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wheaton CBD BiPPA</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>FY24</th>
<th>FY25</th>
<th>FY26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY19-24 Amended</td>
<td>$535</td>
<td>$384</td>
<td>$95</td>
<td>$53</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY21-26 CE Rec.</td>
<td>$535</td>
<td>$384</td>
<td>$95</td>
<td>$53</td>
<td>$616</td>
<td>$1,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+$616</td>
<td>+$1,352</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Change highlights:
- FY 25
  - Added construction funding for Amherst Ave Cycletrack
FY 26
  - Added construction funding for Amherst Ave Cycletrack

Veirs Mill/Randolph BiPPA ($000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Veirs Mill/Randolph BiPPA</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>FY24</th>
<th>FY25</th>
<th>FY26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY19-24 Amended</td>
<td>$334</td>
<td>$336</td>
<td>$247</td>
<td>$1,226</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY21-26 CE Rec.</td>
<td>$334</td>
<td>$336</td>
<td>$247</td>
<td>$1,226</td>
<td>$535</td>
<td>$535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+$535</td>
<td>+$535</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Change highlights:
- FY 25
  - Added funding for Veirs Mill Rd sidewalk (south side) between Matthew Henson Trail & Ferrara Rd (construction).
  - Added funding for Randolph/Bushey Dr intersection improvements (design)
- FY 26
  - Added funding for Selfridge Road pedestrian connection (construction)
  - Added funding for Randolph/Bushey Dr intersection improvements (construction)

Purple Line BiPPA ($000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purple Line BiPPA</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>FY24</th>
<th>FY25</th>
<th>FY26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY19-24 Amended</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$672</td>
<td>$1,011</td>
<td>$2,034</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY21-26 CE Rec.</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$922</td>
<td>$2,011</td>
<td>$3,034</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>+$250</td>
<td>+$250</td>
<td>+$1,000</td>
<td>+$1,000</td>
<td>+$1,000</td>
<td>+$1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Change highlights:
- FY21:
  - Added $150k for area-wide improvements in Takoma/Langley, Long Branch, & Piney Branch/University for rapid response for Vision Zero.
  - Added $100k for neighborhood greenway improvements to link to Purple Line stations.
- FY22:
  - Added $122k for area-wide improvements for rapid response to Vision Zero.
  - Moved other projects earlier in the budget.
- FY23:
  - Added $161k for area-wide improvements for achieving Vision Zero.
  - Moved other projects earlier in the budget.
- FY24:
  - Added funding for Long Branch Trail to Sligo Creek Trail bridge & trail connection (design).
  - Added funding for the Long Branch Community Center Trail.
  - Added funding for the Glenside Neighborhood Greenway & Pedestrian improvements.
  - Added funding for Carroll Ave (MD 195) Cycletrack
- FY25:
  - Added funding for Carroll Ave (MD 195) Cycletrack
- FY26:
  - Added funding for Long Branch Trail to Sligo Creek Trail bridge & trail connection (construction).
Testimony by Corinne Hart
FY 21 Capital Budget and FY21-26 CIP
County Council Hearing

February 5, 2020
Third Floor Hearing Room
100 Maryland Avenue, Rockville, MD

Dear Council President Katz and Councilmembers,

My name is Corinne Hart and I live on Dale Drive in Silver Spring. I am here today to urge you to include funding for a sidewalk on Dale Drive between Colesville Road and Georgia Avenue. As many of you know, my community has been advocating for pedestrian safety improvements on this part of Dale Drive for many years. While we are grateful for the traffic calming infrastructure that was recently installed, it was meant to be only one part of a more robust solution. In fact, without a sidewalk, the bump out curbs actually force bikes, people in wheelchairs, and people pushing strollers to walk directly into traffic to get around them. Even with the traffic calming, there have already been several crashes this year in just one month alone.

I am here not only to advocate that you include funding to finish this project, but also to share our experiences of how challenging it is to get basic pedestrian infrastructure installed on a County road. I started my advocacy when I was on maternity leave with my first daughter - she is now two and a half years old and I now am on maternity leave with my second daughter. Navigating the road on foot with two children versus one is even more terrifying.

In 1994 retired NASA engineer, Leonard Hardis, was hit and killed by a driver as he walked along Dale a few blocks from his home. For over 25 years, residents have been asking the County to solve this issue that puts their lives at risk. In 2008 funding was included in the CIP to fund a sidewalk on Dale, but it was removed in 2016 without any consultation with the community.

Since then, my neighbors and I have been actively organizing to increase safety on Dale Drive for pedestrians, bicyclists, and the elementary and middle school aged children who wait every morning on this busy road with no sidewalk for their school buses. For example,

- We formed the Dale Drive Safety Coalition, which has over 200 members.
- We’ve submitted a petition to the County with hundreds of signatures asking for safety improvements.
- We’ve testified here at Council hearings, at the Planning Board, and attended County meeting after meeting.
- We organized the Dale Drive Safety Walk, which was attended by over 100 people, including many of you and other County officials.
We’ve spoken with the County Executive, the heads of MCDOT, the heads of the Planning Department, many of you, your staff, T&E Committee staff, and the police department.

We’ve organized email campaigns resulting in countless neighbors writing to County officials asking for help, and;

Several local news outlets have even covered pedestrian safety challenges on this road.

And yet... the Dale Drive path is still not included in the CIP and has no funding beyond completing 35% design.

This section of Dale Drive is completely residential. It has no sidewalks and no bike lane. You are forced to walk on the shoulder, which is completely impassable in some places due to parked cars.

In a recent MCDOT survey, over 80% of residents who live on or near Dale said that they support a sidewalk or multi-use path. Many people also responded saying that they use Dale to walk or bike to nearby churches, parks, local businesses, and downtown Silver Spring. It will also be a route to access the Purple Line and the path is listed in the County’s Bicycle Master Plan.

I urge you to restore funding in the budget to complete the Dale Drive project and address the concerns that residents have been raising with the County for over twenty years.

The County needs to take action before someone else gets seriously hurt or killed.

Thank you.
### Dale Drive Shared Use Path and Safety Improvements

**Category:** Transportation  
**Subcategory:** Pedestrian Facilities/Bikeways  
**Planning Area:** North & West Silver Spring

**Date Last Modified:** N/A  
**Administering Agency:** Transportation  
**Status:** Preliminary Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Element</th>
<th>Total FY19</th>
<th>Thru FY20</th>
<th>Est. FY21</th>
<th>Total 6 Years</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>FY24</th>
<th>FY25</th>
<th>FY26</th>
<th>Beyond 6 Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning, Design &amp; Supervision</td>
<td>2,156</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,353</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>2,312</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,952</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>1,244</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Improvements and Utilities</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>1,244</td>
<td>3,499</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>3,499</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,449</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,305</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>644</strong></td>
<td><strong>709</strong></td>
<td><strong>708</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,244</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FUNDING SCHEDULE ($000)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GO Bonds</th>
<th>Total Funding Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8,449</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**APPROPRIATION AND EXPENDITURE DATA ($000)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriation FY21 Request</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>Year First Appropriation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appropriation FY22 Request</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Last FY's Cost Estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Appropriation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures/Encumbrances</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unencumbered Balance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Project Description

This project provides for the design and construction of a new eight-foot wide shared use path approximately 1 mile of length along the north side of Dale Drive from Georgia Avenue (MD 97) to Colesville Road (US 29). The project also provides minor intersection safety improvements within the project limits to improve existing sight distance and crosswalks.

### Service Area

Silver Spring

### Project Justification

There are only short segments of sidewalk scattered within the project limits but no continuous pedestrian facilities on this section of Dale Drive, where several school bus stops are located. This section of Dale Drive is also the last missing link of pedestrian facilities on Dale Drive and a connection to the future Purple Line Station on Dale Drive and Wayne Avenue, as well as the Sligo Creek Trail. The Montgomery County Bicycle Master Plan, approved in November 2018, recommends a shared use path or sidewalk to be added for this section of Dale Drive.

### Status

Preliminary Design Stage.

### Other

This project supports the Vision Zero initiative which aims to reduce injuries and fatalities on all roads.

### Other Disclosures

A pedestrian impact analysis has been completed for this project.

### Location

North & West Silver Spring

### Estimated Schedule

Design is scheduled to start in FY23 with construction to start in FY27. Completion in summer 2028.

### Coordination

Maryland-National Capital Park & Planning Commission, Maryland State Highway Administration, Utility Companies.
**PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

This project provides funds to develop final design plans, acquire right-of-way, and construct approximately 4 miles of a 4-foot bi-directional bike/bike path along the eastside of Falls Road from River Road to Dunster Road. Falls Road is classified as a major highway and has a number of side street connections along the project corridor. The path will provide pedestrians and cyclists safe access to communities along this project corridor, and will provide a connection to existing pedestrian facilities to the north (Rockville) and to the south (Potomac).

**LOCATION**

Falls Road from River Road to Dunster Road

**ESTIMATED SCHEDULE**

Final design to start in FY21. Property acquisition to start in FY22 and take approximately three years to complete. Utility relocations will start in FY22, and construction will start in FY25 with completion in FY28. The project may be re-accelerated in the FY23-28 CIP once the design is completed.

**COST CHANGE**

Cost increase necessary to update design.

**PROJECT JUSTIFICATION**

This project provides access to public transportation along Falls Road. The path will provide pedestrian access to the following destinations: bus stops along Falls Road, Bullis School, Ritchie Park Elementary School, Potomac Community Center, Potomac Library, Potomac Village Shopping Center, Potomac Promenade Shopping Center, Heritage Farm Park, Falls Road Golf Club, Falls Road Park, and a number of religious facilities along Falls Road. The 2002 Potomac Subregion Master Plan calls for a Class I (off-road) bike path along Falls Road from the Rockville City limit to MacArthur Boulevard. The path is a missing link between existing bicycle facilities within the City of Rockville and existing path along Falls Road south of River Road.

**OTHER**

Montgomery County Department of Transportation has completed Phase 2 facility planning, preliminary design, with funds from the annual bikeway program. The project will help the County achieve its Vision Zero goals to reduce deaths and serious injuries on County roadways to zero by 2030.

**FISCAL NOTE**

Construction cost estimate is based on design that was completed in 2009. Final construction cost will be determined after final design is completed. Federal Aid in FY21-22 includes the Transportation Alternative Program (TAP) grant in the amount of $1.23M.

**DISCLOSURES**

Pedestrian Facilities/Bikeways
A pedestrian impact analysis has been completed for this project.

COORDINATION

Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC), State Highway Administration, Utility Companies, Department of Environmental Protection, Department of Permitting Services, Washington Gas, Pepco, Verizon, Maryland Department of Natural Resources; Special Capital Projects Legislation will be proposed by the County Executive.
MEMORANDUM

To: Councilmembers  
From: Hans Riemer  
Re: Supporting growth in the core of our biohealth cluster  
Date: October 21, 2019

At our recent retreat, we touched on the need to re-examine the Great Seneca Science Corridor staging plan and reinvigorate the Corridor Cities Transitway (CCT), which the State has unfortunately abandoned.

On Tuesday, the Council will review the work program for the Planning Board. As an action item on our vision to promote economic development in the County, I propose that we add a master plan amendment to revise Stage 2 of the Great Seneca Science Corridor Master Plan to the Planning Board’s workplan. The goal of this revision will be to simultaneously push forward on the CCT as well as remove an effective moratorium on new development in the heart of our County’s biohealth sector.

The way to get the CCT back on track is to propose a realistic funding plan. In recent years there has been a lot of discussion, driven by private property owners, about a potential tax district to fund a portion of the CCT. Blending a tax district with federal and state funding could give us a realistic request to the state capital budget program.

The master plan, approved in 2010, set limits on how much development would be allowed according to four stages. The first stage of development allowed for an additional 400,000 square feet of commercial and an additional 2,500 housing units over what was existing and already approved when the plan was adopted in 2010. Our understanding is that the commercial development allowed in Stage 1 has all been claimed by property owners who have filed plans. (However, it is unclear how much of that is actually moving forward.)
The master plan amendment would reconsider solely Stage 2 of the plan. There are four requirements for Stage 2 to proceed that, when met, will release another 2.3 million square feet of commercial development and 2,000 housing units. Those requirements are:

1. Relocating the Public Safety Training Academy;
2. Attaining a non-auto driver mode share (NADMS) of 18%;
3. Fully funding the construction of the Life Sciences Center (LSC) Loop Trail within the six-year capital improvements program; and
4. Fully funding construction of Phase I of the CCT (Shady Grove to Metropolitan Grove) within the six-year County or State capital improvements program.

The good news is that the first two staging requirements have been met, and the third can be met—effective July 2020—if the FY21-26 CIP keeps the LSC Loop Trail on its current schedule.

The proposed master plan amendment would split Stage 2 in two parts: Stages 2a and 2b. Stage 2a would require meeting the first three staging requirements, while Stage 2b would also require full construction funding of Phase I of the CCT. As noted above, the requirements of Stage 2a should be met by next summer, allowing some portion of the 2.3 million square feet of commercial development and 2,000 housing units to be available for development approvals. The size of the Stage 2a portion would be decided as part of the master plan amendment.

Concurrently we should task the Department of Transportation, working with the Department of Finance, the Maryland Department of Transportation, and businesses and potential developments along the CCT alignment between Shady Grove and Metropolitan Grove, to develop an implementation and financing plan for the CCT within the next 12-18 months. The financing plan could anticipate Federal, State, and local contributions.
Long Branch Master Planned Connections – This project will complete Facility Planning Phase 1 for the bike/ped connections identified in the Long Branch Sector Plan (Approved & Adopted, November 2013).

High Incident Network Facility Planning – This project will work with the Division of Traffic Engineering and Operations and Sidewalk Section to identify projects within the High Incident Network that require additional resources to complete. This project will then complete Facility Planning for those projects.

MD 355: Milestone to Clarksburg Road – This project will complete Facility Planning Phase 1 for the extension of dedicated transit lanes along MD 355 from the Milestone Development to Clarksburg. The currently adopted Countywide Transit Corridors Function Master Plan (2013) identified the need for dedicated transit lanes along MD 355 from Bethesda to Shakespeare Boulevard. Increased development and growth in Clarksburg have created demand for expansion of multimodal transportation alternatives such as dedicated transit lanes.

Prioritizing Capital Projects – The County Executive seeks to develop a process for prioritizing transportation capital projects. The current backlog of transportation priorities and fiscal realities require the ability for agencies to quantitatively evaluate project benefits, impacts, and returns through a data-driven process.

Westlake/Rock Spring Complete Streets – This project will complete Facility Planning Phase 1 of the “Complete Streets” roadway redesign of the Rock Spring Drive/Fernwood Road/Westlake Terrance central spine recommended in the Rock Spring Sector Plan (Approved & Adopted, December 2017).

Pepco Pathway – The current pathway is intended to be a natural surface trail with intersection improvements provided by the Division of Transportation Engineering and Operations. This project will identify a segment of the natural surface trail to complete Facility Planning for conversion to a hardened surface multiuse trail. This pathway is identified in the Montgomery County Bicycle Master Plan (Approved and Adopted, December 2018).

ADA Design Guidelines – The Department of Transportation continues to be a leader in implementing progressive transportation infrastructure. These projects while often touted for improving safety and traffic operations can present challenges for the disabled community. Development of a design guide would allow for the creation of consistent direction for DOT staff and consultants as well as private developers. Developing these guidelines by identifying best practices and working collaboratively with the disabled community will provide for the continued excellence in transportation excellence Montgomery County has become known for.

White Oak Transit Center – This project will complete Facility Planning Phase 1 for a more substantial transit center in the White Oak area. The current “White Oak Transit Center” is comprised of a pair of upgraded bus stops and minor streetscape improvements. The existing transit center does not provide for optimal bus circulation, passenger transfers, or expansion to accommodate future BRT corridors. The implementation of the US 29 FLASH and the planning and design (FY22) for the New Hampshire Avenue BRT along with future growth in White Oak and at FDA warrant an upgraded facility that better serves the changing demands of the redeveloping area.
### Table 6
Corridor 3 Recommendations, MD 355 North

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Dedicated Lane(s)?</th>
<th>R.O.W.</th>
<th>Maximum Additional Transit Lanes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MD 355</td>
<td>Redgrave Place</td>
<td>Little Seneca Creek</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD 355</td>
<td>Little Seneca Creek</td>
<td>Shakespeare Blvd</td>
<td></td>
<td>250</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seneca Meadows Pkwy</td>
<td>Corridor Cities Transitway</td>
<td>Observation Dr</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shakespeare Blvd</td>
<td>Observation Dr</td>
<td>MD 355</td>
<td></td>
<td>123</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD 355</td>
<td>Shakespeare Blvd</td>
<td>MD 118</td>
<td></td>
<td>250</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD 355</td>
<td>MD 118</td>
<td>Game Preserve Rd</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD 355</td>
<td>Game Preserve Rd</td>
<td>Just south of O'Neil Dr</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD 355</td>
<td>just south of O'Neil Dr</td>
<td>1,250 ft south of Shady Grove Rd</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD 355</td>
<td>1,250 ft south of Shady Grove Rd</td>
<td>Ridgemont Ave</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD 355</td>
<td>Ridgemont Ave</td>
<td>Indianola Drive</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD 355</td>
<td>Indianola Drive</td>
<td>1,000 ft south of Indianola Drive</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD 355</td>
<td>1,000 ft south of Indianola Drive</td>
<td>270 ft north of N. Campus Dr</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD 355</td>
<td>270 ft north of N. Campus Dr</td>
<td>Church St</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Dedicated Lane(s)?</th>
<th>R.O.W.</th>
<th>Maximum Additional Transit Lanes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seneca Meadows Parkway</td>
<td>East Branch of Corridor Cities Transitway</td>
<td>MD 118</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldenrod Lane</td>
<td>MD 118</td>
<td>Observation Drive</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation Drive</td>
<td>Goldenrod Lane</td>
<td>Middlebrook Road</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlebrook Road</td>
<td>Observation Drive</td>
<td>MD 355</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Reflects the minimum right-of-way, and may not include land needed for spot improvements such as turn lanes and stations.*
MEMORANDUM

March 3, 2020

TO: Transportation and Environment Committee

FROM: Glenn Orlin, Senior Analyst

SUBJECT: FY21-26 Capital Improvements Program (CIP)—transportation: mass transit and pedestrian facilities/bikeways projects, and Facility Planning—Transportation

PURPOSE: Worksession—ADDENDUM

The recommendations in the main packet for this worksession are based on the merits of each individual project. However, considering the Committee’s recommendations on February 27 and the recommendations in the main packet for this worksession, the cumulative result is that the transportation CIP would be about $85 million higher than the Executive. Even though, if all these recommendations were approved, spending on the transportation portion of the CIP would still be less than in the Amended FY19-24 (which was about $106 million higher), an increase of $85 million may be inordinate given the other needs in the CIP.

In that context, Council staff is sharing three alternative recommendations in this addendum. If all these recommendations were accepted, the increase over the Executive’s recommendations would be about $27.5 million, not $85 million:

- **Observation Drive Extended.** The Executive recommends delaying the start of design for Phase I by one year (from FY21 to FY22), and the completion of Phase I by at least 3 years (from FY26 to at least FY29). On February 27 the Committee agreed with Council staff not to delay the project from its schedule in the FY19-24 CIP. However, this would add about $42 million in spending in the FY21-26 period over the Executive.

An alternative would be to delay the start of design for Phase I by one year from FY21 to FY22, as recommended by the Executive, but to defer the completion of the completion of Phase I only by one year (from FY26 to FY27). This option would add only about $15.7 million in spending in the FY21-26 period over the Executive. Below are the expenditure schedules for the Executive’s recommendation, Council staff’s main recommendation, and Council staff’s alternative recommendation ($000):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>6-Yr Total</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>FY24</th>
<th>FY25</th>
<th>FY26</th>
<th>Beyond</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>115,593</td>
<td>23,432</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,158</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>8,843</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>92,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council staff - main</td>
<td>115,593</td>
<td>65,634</td>
<td>1,158</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>1,648</td>
<td>26,550</td>
<td>25,547</td>
<td>9,800</td>
<td>49,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council staff - alternate</td>
<td>115,593</td>
<td>39,084</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,158</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>1,648</td>
<td>9,800</td>
<td>25,547</td>
<td>76,509</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Key word: #transportationcip
- **Goldsboro Road Sidewalk/Bikeway.** The Executive recommends a two-year deferral, with design starting in FY24 (instead of FY22) and project completion in FY29 (instead of FY27). In the main packet Council staff is recommending not deferring the project. However, this would add nearly $13 million in spending in the FY21-26 period over the Executive. An alternative would be to defer the project by one year, with design starting in FY23 and project completion in FY28. This option would add only about $6.5 million in spending in the FY21-26 period over the Executive. Below are the expenditure schedules for the Executive’s recommendation, Council staff’s main recommendation, and Council staff’s alternative recommendation ($000):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>6-Yr Total</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>FY24</th>
<th>FY25</th>
<th>FY26</th>
<th>Beyond</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>21,096</td>
<td>2,396</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>1,102</td>
<td>18,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council staff - main</td>
<td>21,096</td>
<td>15,246</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>1,102</td>
<td>6,425</td>
<td>6,425</td>
<td>5,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council staff - alternate</td>
<td>21,096</td>
<td>8,821</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>1,102</td>
<td>6,425</td>
<td>12,275</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Seven Locks Road Bikeway and Safety Improvements.** The Executive recommends deferring completion of Phase I (the only phase budgeted) by two years, from FY26 to FY28. In the main packet Council staff is recommending not deferring the project. However, this would add about $13 million in spending in the FY21-26 period over the Executive. WABA recommends that this project be re-designed to reflect recent “best practices” for bikeway design; in particular, cycle tracks instead of bike lanes. An option is to retain only the design funding in the project to enable development of a new bike/ped concept for this road. (Only Phase I between Montrose Road and Tuckerman Lane is programmed.) Below are the expenditure schedules for the Executive’s recommendation, Council staff’s main recommendation, and Council staff’s alternative recommendation ($000):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>6-Yr Total</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>FY24</th>
<th>FY25</th>
<th>FY26</th>
<th>Beyond</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>26,760</td>
<td>5,764</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>2,099</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>20,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council staff - main</td>
<td>26,760</td>
<td>26,760</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>2,640</td>
<td>3,155</td>
<td>8,106</td>
<td>11,959</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council staff - alternate</td>
<td>26,760</td>
<td>1,989</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24,771</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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MEMORANDUM

March 4, 2020

TO: Transportation and Environment Committee

FROM: Glenn Orlin, Senior Analyst

SUBJECT: FY21-26 Capital Improvements Program (CIP)—Bus Rapid Transit projects

PURPOSE: Worksession-ADDENDUM #2

DOT Director Conklin has transmitted the attached memos describing: (1) the progress and strategy for proceeding with the MD 355, Veirs Mill Road, and US 29 BRT projects; and (2) the summary findings of DOT’s US 29 Mobility Study, which examined means of providing either a dedicated lane or managed lanes for BRT on US 29 between White Oak and Silver Spring.

DOT has been requested to provide a brief summary of these two memos, but because of the complexity of these topics, the Committee plans to schedule a separate meeting a few weeks from now to explore these issues in much greater depth. The Committee’s recommendations on the four BRT PDFs that are part of the Recommended FY21-26 CIP will be postponed until that meeting.

1 Key word: #busrapidtransit
MEMORANDUM

March 3, 2020

TO: Tom Hucker, Chair
Transportation and Environment Committee
Montgomery County Council

FROM: Christopher R. Conklin, Director
Montgomery County Department of Transportation

SUBJECT: Implementation of BRT Projects

BRT is critical to our County’s economic development and our ability to accommodate future growth in a responsible way. The importance of BRT as a new transit mode has been recognized regionwide, as evidenced by the development of projects of this type throughout the area’s jurisdictions. In the Metropolitan Washington Council of Government’s Visualize 2045 Plan, BRT is the top infrastructure strategy that “would have the potential to significantly improve the region’s transportation system performance compared to current plans and programs”. Montgomery County’s portion of the fiscally constrained long-range plan assumes implementation of BRT projects on MD355, Veirs Mill Road, US29, New Hampshire Avenue, and the North Bethesda Transitway.

The MD355, Veirs Mill Road, and US29 BRT projects will also play a critical role in meeting our Vision Zero goals, as they will strive to incorporate pedestrian and sidewalk connections and safe crossings in 14 identified High Incidence Areas along more than 40 collective miles of corridor that they serve.

In the proposed FY21-26 Capital Improvements Program (CIP), an additional $15 million has been added to complete Preliminary (35%) Design and environmental work for the MD355 project from Clarksburg to Bethesda. The County Executive has also supported completion of Preliminary Design on the Veirs Mill Road BRT project. The work on both projects will be critical to securing funding for their final design and construction. At the same time, study has continued on improvements to US29 to leverage investment that is being made now on FLASH service for that corridor. Results of that analysis look promising but still need to be vetted with the community and MDOT/SHA. This memo provides an overview of the status
of several county-led BRT projects, and how the planned technical work links to the strategic plans to fund and implement the projects. Key points include the following:

- The County Executive has proposed $15 million in the FY21-26 CIP to complete Preliminary (35%) design and NEPA on the MD355 BRT corridor. MCDOT plans to enter this project into the Federal New Starts program, which could cover up to 50% of the project’s implementation cost. In order to do so, it is critical that the requested preliminary design funding be maintained in the CIP to show the County’s commitment to the project, and to complete the engineering and environmental timeline requirements set by FTA.

- The Veirs Mill Road BRT project is currently in design with the $3 million of CIP funding appropriated in summer of 2019. Preliminary (35%) design and NEPA will be complete by the end of 2021. The County plans to enter this project into the FTA Small Starts program within the next year. Small Starts could cover up to 80% of the project’s implementation cost. Continuation of design and environmental work is critical to showing the county’s commitment to this project for entry into Small Starts. A request for Final Design funding is likely to be made in the second half of FY21 or FY22.

- The US29 Mobility Study, which examined improvements to the US29 FLASH currently under construction, shows encouraging results but has not yet completed the community input process. Additionally, discussion is needed with MDOT/SHA to encourage financial participation and policy approval of this project. Pending these discussions, we anticipate that a funding request for design would be included as a CIP amendment sometime in FY21 or for FY22. If the project were to advance, a request for construction funding would likely occur as part of the FY23-28 Capital Improvements Program.

- An internal workgroup has been examining funding and financing mechanisms for the BRT program and their work is anticipated for discussion with council within the next 6 months. The group is looking at a number of Federal, State, and Local initiatives that could fund and/or finance the projects. Most new funding sources would require an 9-24 month lead time before the county would begin to see revenues that could be used toward the projects.

MD 355 BRT History and Status

FLASH on MD355 will provide a new transit service with greater travel speed and frequency between Bethesda and Clarksburg that will help accomplish the following:

- Enhance transit connectivity and multimodal integration along the corridor as part of a coordinated regional transit network;
- Improve the ability for buses to move along the corridor (bus mobility) with increased operational efficiency, on-time performance/reliability, and travel times;
- Address current and future bus ridership demands;
- Attract new riders and provide improved service options for existing riders as an alternative to congested automobile travel through the corridor;
- Support approved Master Planned residential and commercial growth along the corridor;
• Improve transit access to major employment and activity centers;
• Achieve Master Planned non-auto driver modal share;
• Provide a sustainable and cost-effective transit service; and
• Improve the safety of travel for all modes along the corridor.

In the northern portion of the corridor, the service will provide a much-needed high-quality transit option for communities not served by the Metrorail Red Line. The northern portion also provides connections to two Montgomery College campuses (Rockville and Germantown). The southern portion of the project will be transformational for the corridor and will help realize the master-planned vision of MD355 becoming a more urban walkable boulevard that creates a sense of “place” in the neighborhoods it traverses. BRT on this corridor is critical for the county to be able to responsibly accommodate growth without adding more roads or outstripping the capacity of the Metrorail system.

Project History

Planning for BRT on MD355 began under the leadership of the Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT) in 2014. Per the County’s request, the State had allocated $6.5 million for planning on the corridor. The County would have preferred to be the project lead, but MDOT decided to retain leadership with the County as a project stakeholder. Between 2014 and 2017, MDOT’s planning work focused on refining the Alternatives Retained for Detailed Study – at the end of their work, there was still no Recommended Alternative presented. In order to accelerate planning on the project, particularly since the State withdrew financial support, MCDOT took over in 2017 and completed the Alternatives Analysis in Summer 2019.

Basis of Design Alternative

In Summer 2019, the MD355 FLASH alternatives analysis was presented to County Council and there was a stated preference from the Council and other stakeholders for Alternative B Modified. This alternative would include median BRT lanes for most of the corridor. The southern portion of the corridor (south of Rockville) would be dual-lane median lanes, and the northern portion would be a single reversible or bi-directional lane. However, per the County Executive’s request, Council did not formally recommend an alternative at that time because MCDOT was in the process of developing a Request for Information (RFI) to solicit input from private industry on project design and delivery. The thought was that there could be information resulting from the RFI that could change the trajectory of the project and thus the potential Recommended Alternative. At the same time, Council also approved $3 million to begin preliminary engineering on the entire corridor. The Department then initiated design activities consistent with Alternative B Modified, recognizing that the ultimate Recommended Alternative could change slightly as a result of the RFI responses.
Results of the Request for Information (RFI) Process

The RFI process was very interesting and informative. It was released on September 23, 2019 and included 25 questions where the Department was seeking guidance. A copy of the RFI is included as a supplement to this memo. Submitting firms did not need to answer all questions, rather just the ones that fell within their area of expertise. MCDOT held an Industry Forum on October 14, 2019 where we discussed the RFI and the project corridor. Roughly 50 people attended the Forum in person or via an online livestream. MCDOT then met with nine firms during one-on-one sessions to further discuss the RFI and answer any additional questions. RFI responses were due on December 6, 2019 and we received 14 submissions.

The RFI has created a "buzz" within the industry, which is a very positive outcome. The submissions were diverse in nature, including content on project delivery, procurement, and finance. We heard from firms across the country who work on BRT projects internationally. While there were a few design suggestions included, none were seen by MCDOT to be a significant departure from or improvement on the Basis of Design. There is significant interest in the project, both from a technical and financing perspective and the responses have helped us shape our next steps on the MD355 FLASH project, as well as the larger BRT program.

Next Steps for the MD355 Project

One of the results of the RFI is that MCDOT concluded that we need more specialized transit expertise than available through our standard engineering on-call contract. We would benefit from access to firms who work on transit projects like ours across the country and in other parts of the world. Following our review of the responses we have decided to procure a basic ordering agreement with firm(s) to provide services related to transit planning, policy, technology and design. This procurement will not be solely focused on the MD 355 corridor, as it will provide resources for us to use on any future transit project, including efforts to improve Ride On, Flex, and other service concepts that may emerge. This is an important shift in strategy for us, as we recognize that transit projects will continue growing as a significant part of the MCDOT's portfolio. We are currently preparing the Transit Services Request for Proposals for advertisement in the Spring of 2020.

At the same time, we are continuing design activities consistent with the Basis of Design for the entire corridor between Bethesda and Clarksburg. As discussed at your committee last summer, we recognize that the County Council has not officially adopted this as the Recommended Alternative and are ready for the Council to confirm its preferred alternative at any time. We also plan to engage a consultant to provide strategic insight into the ongoing design activities and identify progressive design solutions. We do not anticipate changes to the overall median concept, but are seeking ways to accomplish it more efficiently and effectively.
We also plan to work with property owners to establish a different approach to providing the needed right-of-way where redevelopment is anticipated. Right-of-way is one of the most significant cost drivers in the project due to the disconnect between the master planned right-of-way and the land that is needed more immediately if the project is to be constructed in the next 5-10 years. Previously, we were pursuing “advanced dedication” where an owner would provide right-of-way ahead of their redevelopment schedule, but without a guarantee that the project would be built. We are now exploring the concept of contingent contracts, where the owner would agree to provide the right-of-way to the County at a nominal cost, but only if the project is actually proceeding to construction. This approach significantly reduces the risk for land owners.

We are also exploring whether the land value provided to the County could be included as part of a local match to other federal grant funds. Last year, the Planning Board has expressed interest in working with property owners/developers to pre-dedicate land for the BRT so that the cost is not borne by project and we believe this approach is consistent with the Planning Board’s desire. We believe this is a critical element that will reduce the overall project cost and make the project more feasible from a financial and constructability perspective.

The County Executive’s Recommended FY21-26 CIP includes an additional $15 million in FY21-23 to complete Preliminary Design on the MD355 FLASH project from Bethesda to Clarksburg. At the end of this 3-year period, 35% design and environmental analysis will be completed. The department’s plan for this project is to enter it into the Federal New Starts Capital Investment Grant (CIG) Program, which could potentially provide 40-50% of the project’s estimated $821 million of final design and construction funding. Once the project is entered into the pipeline for this critical Federal funding, the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) requires that Preliminary Design and environmental clearance (NEPA) be completed within 2 years of entering the program, and it is critical that the design funds be available in the CIP to be able to meet this requirement.

During this 3-year period, MCDOT will also determine the project delivery method to be used to complete design and construction (e.g. design-build, public-private-partnership, etc.). Critical to this next step is that we will also be actively working on a funding strategy for completing the project (i.e. funding the non-Federal portion), as well as implementing the broader BRT program outlined in the Master Plan. More information on the funding and financing strategy is included later in this memo.

The graphic below illustrates MCDOT’s planned timeline for advancing the MD355 FLASH project through Preliminary Engineering. At the end of this timeframe in FY24, the project will be ready to enter Final Design and move into Construction, pending availability of funding. In order to remain on the schedule shown below, it is critical that Council approve the County Executive’s requested $15 million in design funding for FY21-23.
Veirs Mill Road BRT History and Status

FLASH on Veirs Mill Road will transform mobility options with the implementation of a 7-mile, premium, branded, limited-stop BRT service. This new service will improve transit travel time and increase opportunity for a broad range of users, including a significant number of minority and low-income riders living along a highly congested corridor. The project will improve passenger transit mobility by connecting riders to high density housing and employment centers and will also provide a connection to the Montgomery College Rockville campus. The Veirs Mill Road corridor experiences some of the highest existing transit volumes in Montgomery County and for that reason has long been considered for transit enhancements. This project has great potential to address racial equity by both improving service to a community that relies upon transit and by providing access to educational and employment opportunity through improved connections to Montgomery College, Wheaton, Silver Spring and the core of the region.

Project History

Planning on the Veirs Mill Road BRT project began almost 10 years ago, also under the leadership of the State. Funding for the initial planning phases was provided by the County to MDOT under the State Transportation Participation Program. Unfortunately, the State process was protracted, with the determination of a Recommended Alternative being made about 6 years after project planning began. In late 2017, the County Council adopted a Recommended Alternative for the corridor that includes BRT infrastructure (new vehicles, stations, transit signal priority) and queue jumps at several congested intersections. At that time, design funding was provided in the CIP for the project, but due to financial capacity constraints, it was pushed out several years, resulting in a short period of inactivity on the project.
Current Project Status

In Summer 2019, realizing the importance of high-quality transit on Veirs Mill Road, the County Executive and County Council decided through a supplemental appropriation to accelerate $3 million of funding for the BRT project. The full $3 million was appropriated to allow the contracts to be issued for completion of Preliminary (35%) Design on the project in FY20-21.

Next Steps

The Veirs Mill Road BRT project is currently being designed with the $3 million appropriated in 2019. One of the early design tasks is to review the recently completed Veirs Mill Road Corridor Master Plan to identify safety improvements from that plan that can be implemented as part of the BRT design. Every transit rider is a walker or biker at some point in their journey, and we believe the BRT projects should strive to improve the pedestrian and bike infrastructure as much as possible to enhance safe connections to transit. Preliminary design will be complete by the end of 2021, at which time the project will enter the final design and construction phase, pending necessary funding. MCDOT has already begun discussions with the Federal Transit Administration about entering the project into the CIG Small Starts program, which funds transit projects under $300 million (estimated project cost for Veirs Mill BRT is approximately $80 million). Small Starts can fund as much as 80% of a project's capital cost, so entering Veirs Mill into the pipeline and completing Preliminary Design would be a huge step towards making this project a reality.

The graphic below illustrates MCDOT's planned timeline for advancing the Veirs Mill Road FLASH project through Preliminary Engineering. At the end of this timeframe in FY21, the project will be ready to enter Final Design and move into Construction. Due to the size and scale of the project, we do not anticipate private funding being a part of the implementation strategy, but Federal New Starts funding could provide a significant contribution towards final design and construction. Given the timing of getting new funding strategies in place, we anticipate a budget request no later than the FY23-28 CIP to complete final design of the project so that it can then be advanced into construction.

Veirs Mill Road FLASH Implementation Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FTA Small Starts Application</th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary (35%) Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Documentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalize Project Funding Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine Project Delivery Method</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begin Final Design/Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
US29 FLASH Improvements

FLASH on US29 is currently under construction and will be open this year. We are excited for the dramatic transit investment that is being made on this corridor – beautiful new stations with near-level boarding and off-board fare collection, 60-foot articulated vehicles, pedestrian and bike improvements, and Transit Signal Priority are all part of the improvements that are being made to public transportation along US29. One-third of the project is being funded by USDOT under a Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER) grant, and winning this grant was key in making the project a reality. In addition, the TIGER grant was the impetus for the County becoming an FTA Direct Grantee, which allows us to submit applications directly for discretionary grants rather than having to do so through the State.

The County’s original TIGER grant application included the implementation of managed lanes on much of US29 in order to provide travel time and reliability improvements for the BRT service and other High Occupancy Vehicles. However, since the County was awarded only $10 million of the requested $30 million of Federal project funds, the scope needed to be reduced to work within the available funds, and managed lanes were removed from the project at that time. Recognizing that the ultimate implementation of bus priority is critically important to the corridor, MCDOT continued studying managed lane and bus lane concepts through the US29 Mobility Improvements Study. A summary of the preliminary results of this study are included as a supplemental memo.

We are encouraged by the preliminary results of this study. Given the status of the work, the need for public engagement, and the need for more specific conversations with MDOT/SHA regarding the design and implementation of a project like the one outlined in the mobility study on US 29, we anticipate that a funding request for design would be included as a CIP amendment sometime in FY21 or for FY22. If the project were to advance, a request for construction funding would likely occur as part of the FY23-28 Capital Improvements Program.

Funding and Financing Strategy

Over the last several months, MCDOT and the Department of Finance have been leading an internal workgroup looking at various funding and financing strategies for the Phase 1 BRT program, which would include the following projects:

- MD355 BRT
- Veirs Mill Road BRT
- US29 FLASH Improvements
- New Hampshire Avenue BRT
- North Bethesda Transitway
- Great Seneca Science Corridor Priority Transit Strategy
The group started out with a list of more than 100 potential new and existing funding sources to fund BRT, and is in the process of whittling this down to a list of 10-15 sources for consideration, including contingency planning if preferred sources are not attainable. These sources are comprised of a variety of Federal grant, State, and Local initiatives. Any new sources of funding will have a lead time of 9-24 months before revenues could start to be realized. In addition, the workgroup has been evaluating various project financing methods, including Federal infrastructure loan programs and private financing mechanisms. We anticipate discussion with Council on this work within the next 6 months.

Key Takeaways

In summary, MCDOT has been working in earnest to advance the BRT program over the last several years, and the County Executive’s proposed budget reflects his commitment to implementation of the BRT network. In fact, the County Executive has been encouraging MCDOT to further accelerate its work. We urge Council to approve the requested funding to advance design on MD355 Flash and to continue support for the Veirs Mill Road BRT project design through the already appropriated funding.
MEMORANDUM

March 3, 2020

TO: Tom Hucker, Chair
Transportation and Environment Committee
Montgomery County Council

FROM: Christopher R. Conklin, Director
Montgomery County Department of Transportation

The US 29 Mobility Study’s focus was to identify improvement(s) on US 29 to complement the investment the County made in the US 29 FLASH project and improve transit, carpool, and overall corridor travel time and reliability performance. In addition, the study identified additional pedestrian and bicycle access improvements to the US 29 corridor beyond those included as part of the US 29 FLASH project.

The study examined two corridor alternatives. The first is a Median Busway alternative from Tech Road to Sligo Creek Parkway. This alternative sought to add dedicated bus lane(s) in the median of US 29. Dual and single-lane guideway segments were added through a combination of median reconstruction, lane repurposing, and lane narrowing. The concept also requires the addition of six traffic signals as well as turn restrictions/prohibitions. North of Tech Road the US 29 FLASH would continue to utilize the bus on shoulder currently in place and south of Sligo Creek it would travel in mixed traffic.

The second alternative examined the implementation of a Peak Period Bus/HOV lane concept. This concept would create a bus and HOV lane in the innermost lane of US 29 from Musgrove Road to Southwood Avenue and from Sligo Creek Parkway to Spring Street. The Bus/HOV lane would be created through peak period shoulder conversion and peak period lane repurposing. In addition, targeted intersection improvements were also identified to resolve critical hot spots. These improvements are located at Greencastle Road, Tech Road, Stewart Lane, MD 650, I-495, and Sligo Creek.
The results of the alternatives comparison show that results for the Median busway are mixed while the Bus/HOV lane concept provides substantial improvement over the No-Action conditions. In the morning peak direction (southbound), the Median Busway and Bus/HOV lane concepts provide travel time savings for transit. However, travel times for general traffic are increased by nearly 50 percent in the Median Busway alternative and only marginally increased in the Bus/HOV lane alternative. The Bus/HOV lane alternative also improves HOV vehicle travel times.

Travel times in the evening peak direction (northbound) increase for all modes in the Median Busway alternative; a result of the backup created by repurposing lanes in the Four Corners area. The amount of additional travel time for buses (and all traffic) resulting from congestion between Silver Spring and Sligo Creek Parkway is greater than the time saved in the Median busway. In the Bus/HOV lane concept, travel times are improved for all modes.

Figure 1: AM Peak Travel Time (Southbound)
Conceptual costs and impacts were identified for each of the alternatives. The Median Busway alternative has a conceptual construction cost of $106 million to provide 4.6 miles of guideway. The alternative would require approximately 10 acres of additional right-of-way. This alternative would also require design waivers from MDOT for the reduced lane widths as well as additional environmental permitting for the new bridge over the Paint Branch and Northwest Branch. The Bus/HOV lane alternative would cost $75 million to implement the Bus/HOV lanes ($50M) and intersection and spot improvements estimated at $25M over 4.6 miles. The Bus/HOV lane alternative would have significantly less right-of-way needs (2.5 acres). Both alternatives would require some utility relocations, a design waiver for not providing a bicycle facility along US 29 south of MD 650, and other various permit approvals.
Next Steps

At this time the study findings have not been shared with the community to collect feedback on a preferred alternative. We plan to hold a public workshop this Spring to share these results, answer questions, and collect feedback on the community preference.

A draft report is being prepared to document the study purpose, alternatives, analysis, and results. Results of the Spring public workshop will be incorporated into the report after it occurs. The study report will be added to the project website and shared publicly.

Initial conversations with MDOT/SHA have occurred during the study and the reaction to concepts have been positive. MCDOT is looking to schedule a follow up to discuss the results. Upon identifying a preferred alternative MCDOT would like to discuss opportunities for coordination and State funding participation on this project.

Ultimately, if a project(s) is identified at the conclusion of this work MCDOT would then seek County funding for design and implementation. No funding strategy has been identified at this stage, but potential sources include County, State, and potentially Federal funds.

We are encouraged by the preliminary results of this study. Given the status of the work, the need for public engagement, and the need for more specific conversations with MDOT/SHA regarding the design and implementation of a project like this on US 29, we anticipate that a funding request for design would be included as a CIP amendment sometime in FY21 or FY22. If the project were to advance, a request for construction funding would likely occur as part of the FY23-29 Capital Improvements Program.