

## US 29 Public Meeting Summary

On Tuesday, October 7, 2025, the Montgomery County Department of Transportation's (MCDOT) US 29 Flash Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Phase 2 project team held their latest community engagement event in Silver Spring, MD from 6 – 8:00 p.m. at Montgomery Blair High School. The public meeting was open to all and gave participants an opportunity to discuss and ask questions about the preliminary design plans for Phase 2 of the US 29 BRT project.

The US 29 project team presented [large-format roll plots](#) illustrating the 35% preliminary design for the full extent of the project corridor. These detailed maps showed existing roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian infrastructure, along with proposed roadway modifications, future traffic signal locations, and potential property and easement needs. Attendees were invited to review the displays and provide written comments and suggestions directly on the roll plots for the project team's consideration.

A detailed [presentation](#) discussing the 35% preliminary design was given by project manager, Niño Ranjo followed by an open question and answer session. Topics of discussion included a recap of the last session of outreach, a walkthrough of how to read the plans, and the summary of impacts. The [meeting displays](#) and roll plots were used to answer many of the participants' questions, and the attendees appreciated being able to see potential impacts and proposed acquisitions and easements.

**Meeting Date:** Tuesday, October 7, 2025, 6 – 8:00 p.m.

**Meeting Location:** Montgomery Blair High School cafeteria, 51 University Blvd. E, Silver Spring, MD

**Number of Attendees:** 60+ attendees

## Comments and Participation

Attendees were encouraged to submit comments, thoughts, and suggestions on the roll plot, via a physical comment form at the public meeting, and/or online through [MCDOT's comment form](#) (open until November 15, 2025) on the [US 29 Flash BRT project webpage](#) or [project email](#).

The comment and suggestion themes listed below were major topics of discussion for the participants who were at the meeting.

### Property Acquisition:

During the question-and-answer session, multiple attendees expressed concerns regarding the scope and impact of proposed property acquisitions along the US 29 BRT corridor. A key area of concern involves the segment near Granville Drive, where the proposed alignment indicates property needs on adjacent properties. Another area of concern is in Burnt Mills, where the proposed alignment indicates property needs of commercial properties.

Some attendees proposed that the project team re-evaluate the proposed BRT lanes in this area, suggesting shifts in the alignment that would reduce impact to adjacent property. Specifically, attendees recommended relocating the impacting BRT station infrastructure to the north, which could potentially accommodate the infrastructure footprint with fewer impacts to private property.

### **Safety:**

There were numerous comments regarding safety and multiple concerns for pedestrians, cyclists, and drivers along US 29 and surrounding areas. Overall, commenters seek measures to reduce vehicle conflicts, improve pedestrian/cyclist safety, and address environmental hazards. Specific concerns included:

- Pedestrian safety: Need for wider sidewalks, barriers, crosswalks (including near Crestmoor Drive, Southwood Drive, Lorain Avenue, Burnt Mills, and NW Branch trail), and improvements near student-heavy areas.
- Traffic safety: Concerns about high vehicle speeds at Four Corners and Granville on-ramp; suggestions include adding signals and traffic calming measures.
- Cyclist safety: Concerns near US 29 just past Hastings Drive.
- Bus and commuter safety: Improve access for Ride On bus riders and adding lights at Crestmoor.
- Flooding concerns: Potential road and area flooding in Burnt Mills.

### **Congestion:**

Concerns were noted regarding the potential to increase vehicle congestion particularly in and around Four Corners and at Sligo Creek Parkway. Attendees expressed concerns that project elements such as lane narrowing, signal timing, and turning conflicts could add additional vehicle delay.

Some attendees were concerned that removing the slip-lane from US 29 to Lockwood Road might increase congestion.

### **Potential Improvements to Consider:**

Attendees suggested additional improvements to the proposed BRT facilities including adding two-way BRT lanes south of Stewart due to low traffic in those areas. Some attendees suggested an additional station north of Sligo Creek.

### **Support for Various Project Elements:**

Several commenters expressed support for elements of the Flash BRT project. They favor two-way bus lanes, expanding service to Howard County, and adding more bike lanes. It was noted that many

believe current Flash service is insufficient, and the addition of bus lanes is a step in the right direction.

**Crestmoor Drive to Northwest Branch:**

The addition of sidewalk space between Crestmoor Drive and the Northwest Branch was generally appreciated. There are still questions about bicyclist and pedestrian safety in this area and how modifications are going to be made (lane narrowing, removing turn lanes, etc.) to incorporate the safety features.

**Flash BRT Usage:**

A few attendees expressed skepticism about transit demand and the necessity of the service. Some participants feel current ridership doesn't justify another bus service and requested further investigation of potential ridership.

**Construction:**

Construction concerns are primarily over impacts and logistics. Local businesses worry about potential negative impacts during construction while others are worried about snow removal that often uses the median for snow storage.

**Consider Previous Alternatives:**

Some attendees suggest advancing alternatives considered in the Mobility Study. Specifically, they would like to consider congestion pricing for vehicles to support system efficiency.

**Expected Next Steps/Action Items**

- Winter 2025/2026: Mandatory Referral
- Winter 2026: Bicycle/Pedestrian Feasibility Results