CORRIDOR ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC)
MEETING #1 SUMMARY
APRIL 2, 2022
7:00 PM – 8:30 PM

ATTENDEES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAC Member Attendees</th>
<th>Montgomery County Staff and Consultant Team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marie Michelle Bunch</td>
<td>Sandra Marks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hector Change</td>
<td>Corey Pitts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eileen Finnegan</td>
<td>Joana Conklin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gail Fisher</td>
<td>Jamie Henson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gretchen Goldman</td>
<td>Tara Hofferth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Grunewald</td>
<td>Nadiya Kutishcheva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elise “Elizabeth” Rahimi</td>
<td>MCDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shane Pollin</td>
<td>Kittelson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Tantisunthorn</td>
<td>Sharp &amp; Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gail Fisher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June Henderson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis “Lou” Krupnick</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional member of the public attended the meeting.
Welcome and Introductions
- Project manager Sandra Marks welcomed everyone to the meeting and gave a brief overview of meeting expectations, zoom software, and project team.
- Introductions by the Corridor Advisory Committee (CAC) members included their name, what most interested in them in this study, and what the most important thing is to address along New Hampshire Avenue.
- The role of the CAC was provided along with a timeline of when they would be consulted during this planning project. The CAC will:
  - Provide input, guidance, and oversight in accordance with the Master Plan
  - Encourage community involvement throughout the project
  - Share information with the community
  - Build consensus

Program and Project Overview
- The New Hampshire Avenue corridor was identified as part of the Countywide Transit Corridors Functional Master Plan, adopted in Montgomery County in 2013.
- Several other corridors are simultaneously being implemented, including service on:
  - US 29, which is already operational
  - Veirs Mill Road, which is in preliminary design
  - MD 355, which is in preliminary design
  - North Bethesda, which is also undergoing a concept study
- BRT is categorized by enhanced vehicles, enhances stations, and enhanced operations
- This concept study is an early step in the overall implementation of BRT service along New Hampshire Avenue. Following this corridor study will be an Environmental Evaluation, Preliminary Design, Final Design, and ultimately construction. Funding has only been identified for the concept study so far.
- Consultant Jamie Henson covered what questions this concept study will address over the course of an 18-month schedule.

Goals and Objectives
- Jamie explained the process for developing goals, objectives, and metrics.
- The draft project goals for the New Hampshire Avenue project reflect program-wide goals. Objectives and metrics will be more tailored to the specific character and constraints of the corridor.
- The overall goals include:
  - Quality service: Provide a fast, reliable, efficient, and connected transit service.
  - Mobility Choices: Improve access to jobs, activity centers, and community facilities.
**Sustainable Solutions:** Minimize environmental impacts and utilize cost-effective design.

**Community Equity:** Provide improved and accessible transit service for underserved populations.

**Economic Growth:** Promote economic development with appealing and functional transit.

**Public Safety:** Improve safety of our streets and the livability and wellness of our communities.

**Corridor Overview**
- Jamie reviewed the Project Team’s understanding of the corridor developed through existing conditions analysis, highlighting a few key takeaways as outlined in the presentation slides.

**Engaging the Public**
- Jamie emphasized the important of public engagement as part of this concept study.
- This engagement is planned through:
  - Public meetings
  - Pop-up meetings
  - Community outreach meetings
  - Employer outreach meetings
  - Corridor Advisory Committee (CAC)
  - Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
  - Agency Advisory Committee (AAC)

**Next Steps**
- The Project Team will be completing Existing Conditions Analysis, refining Project Goals, Objectives, and Metrics, and continuing to engage stakeholder groups.
- Public Engagement will take place in May.
- Then the Project Team will proceed with developing initial corridor concepts.
- Please reach out to Project Manager, Sandra Marks (Sandra.marks@montgomerycountymd.gov) with any questions and visit the Project Website: [https://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/dot-dte/projects/newhampshireave/](https://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/dot-dte/projects/newhampshireave/)

**QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS**

As CAC members introduced themselves, they indicated their priorities for, concerns about, and connection to the New Hampshire Avenue BRT Study:
- Effective public transit
- Development alongside White Oak Science Gateway
• Dedicated/median bus lane, reaching Fort Totten
• Improve pedestrian safety
• Provide equitable service
• Transit should become more enticing to car users
• Pedestrian Safety at the Elton Road / New Hampshire Intersection and at the Powder Mill / New Hampshire intersection.
• With the forthcoming Hillandale Gateway Project, a better, safer transit system is needed.
• Better solutions for pedestrians and drivers
• Improvement of safety for pedestrians and cyclists
• BRT needs to reach riders within 2 miles of corridor, especially adjacent to White Oak. Consider 10-year growth of corridor (i.e. Viva White Oak)
• Transit Center at White Oak needs to be better defined
• Many employees at CHI Centers, Inc. who might have intellectual and developmental disabilities rely on Public Transportation.
• Hillandale Gateway is a community of sustainable buildings. Residents should have transportation alternatives to driving.
• New Hampshire Ave should be a multimodal corridor
• Concerned about safety along the corridor in Hillandale
• The local bus network should feed riders to BRT
• The FLASH US29 lingers too long at FDA
• There is too much congestion along New Hampshire Ave in Hillandale
• Better interconnection with Randolph Road is needed
• BRT is an alternative to single occupancy vehicles, especially with dedicated lanes

The CAC Members also asked a series of questions through the meeting:

• Q: How would riders reach the BRT service? Where would riders driving to the BRT park?
  A: Connectivity is an important component to the project. Most riders would likely walk or bike to the service. There is also parking at park and ride lots, specifically at Colesville.

• Q: But do people who work and live in the corridor commute very far? I live about 1.5 miles away from work but it’s not along the same road I live on.
  A: Once we look at origin and destination data, we will have a better understanding of the travel patterns.

• Q: What location are you considering for the public meeting?
  A: The first public meeting will be virtual. Future in person meetings will also have a virtual option.
• Q: Amharic is valuable for Southern Park of Corridor (Takoma Park). You should promote public meetings with direct mailing.
• A: Thank you, we are promoting meetings with direct mailing.

• Q: What are the details for the public meeting?
• A: Details have not yet been determined but email and direct mailers will be sent once we finalize the date.

• Q: At what point will the issue of dedicated lanes really be addressed?
• A: Project alternatives will consider dedicated lanes. Different options will be evaluated

One CAC member also suggested that there should be more CAC Meetings.

**POLL EVERYWHERE RESULTS**

Throughout the presentation, meeting attendees were polled for their input and perspective. The poll questions and results follow.

*Rank these goals according to which are the most important to you (placing your highest priority at the top).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality Service</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridor Safety</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility Choices</td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Equity</td>
<td>4th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Solutions</td>
<td>5th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Growth</td>
<td>6th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Are there other corridor concerns or characteristics that we should be thinking about?*

- transfers from BRT to Ride On
- Connection with trails (Sligo Creek?)

What is the value of this project to the residents who live north of Colesville? Is there value to users of the ICC, which crosses near Colesville?
Have you included the Army Research Lab on Powder Mill as part of the employment? Have you surveyed FDA employees—all 11k?

Clearly more road width will be necessary to accommodate these improvements, has there been any discussion with the SHA to do so?

interconnection between BRT corridors

Need for connectivity to the train (if have to stay MoCo, maybe go up eastern close to Takoma Metro?)

connectivity to development planned for Viva WO

Age of people along the corridor, considering transit users are also younger/older?

Should reconsider the 1/2 mile corridor zone to at least 1-mile to get the correct count of potential riders.

Extension of the BRT to Clovery.

balancing modes in limited right of way

Connecting south of current border to the metro

What about those coming from the north of the county or further north?

*How would you suggest engaging the community?*

Doing outreach at the high usage bus stops on NH.

In, say, Hispanic areas you might consider approaching churches that serve that segment.

Barbershops

outside grocery stores, restaurants

Signs at grocery stores

There’s a public library north of 29 on HWY 650

need to focus on how the area will look with the new development
Via the Neighborhood app

Churches

when you examine and depict existing conditions, can you include photos of New Hampshire at Powder Mill, at night, in the rain.... when there is a huge clog on the beltway ...and traffic is backed up for a mile?

Social media, messaging groups (Whatsapp)

You seem to have a good path established