

CORRIDOR ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC)
US 29 MEETING SUMMARY
THURSDAY, JUNE 3, 2025
6:30 PM – 8:00 PM

ATTENDEES

CAC Member and Public Attendees	
Chris Wilhelm	John Holden* - South Four Corners Citizen Association
Cicero Salles	James Williamson* - Williamson Lawn and Landscaping
Dan Wilhelm* - Interested Resident	Matthew Koch* - Interested Resident
Harriet Quinn* - Woodmoor-Pinecrest Citizens' Association	Sharon Canavan* - Northwood Four Corners Civic Association
Jay Elvove* - Montgomery County Civic Federation/North Hills of Sligo Creek Civic Association	Tim Soderquist
Joan Johnson* - Washington Area Bicyclist Association	

*Denotes CAC members

Montgomery County Staff and Consultant Team	
Jamie Henson	MCDOT BRT Implementation Manager
Nino Ranjo	MCDOT Project Manager
Joe Moges	MCDOT Chief – Division of Transportation Engineering
Jake Smith	STV
Kristin Hileman	STV
Sarah Johnson	STV
Sharron Lipford	Sensis
Fernando Snellings	Sensis
Victor Alvarez	Translator



PRESENTATION OVERVIEW

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

- Montgomery County BRT Implementation Manager, Jamie Henson, and Project Manager, Nino Ranjo, welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced the project team.
- New CAC representatives, Sharon Canavan from the Northwood Four Corners Civic Association and Joan Johnson from the Washington Area Bicyclist Association, were asked to introduce themselves and their associations.
- Sharon Canavan states that her association's main concern with the project is a lack of neighborhood accessibility.
- Joan Johnson stated that her association's main concern is making sure there is consideration of transportation that is not vehicle based (bikes, walking, wheelchairs).
- Jamie and Nino delivered the presentation and answered any questions attendees had.

PROJECT OVERVIEW

The Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) completed construction of the Flash BRT corridor along US 29 in October 2020. Flash is a bus rapid transit (BRT) system with features that improve transit speed and reliability. US 29 Flash is currently operating between Downtown Silver Spring and Briggs Chaney with weekend rush hour service to Burtonsville, the implementation of which is referred to as Phase 1. After the opening of Phase 1, MCDOT completed the US 29 Mobility & Reliability Study to identify improvements to the US 29 Flash that would further improve corridor travel time, increase pedestrian and bicycle access, and improve reliability for all transportation modes along the corridor. Based on this study, the median bus lane hybrid alternative was selected to move forward into design.

The Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) has initiated preliminary engineering activities, advancing design to the 35% completion level for Phase 2 of the US 29 Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) project. This phase incorporates the recommended median-running bus lane hybrid concept. The project study area encompasses the existing US 29 Flash BRT corridor, extending from Sligo Creek Parkway to Tech Road.

MEETING OVERVIEW

- Jamie and Nino provided a presentation of US 29 BRT expanding on the following:
 - CAC adjustments
 - Project background and overview
 - Recap of public feedback
 - Initial assessment of bicycle and pedestrian facility
 - Overview of public meeting activities
 - Next steps and engagement



FEEDBACK AND QUESTIONS FROM ATTENDEES

INITIAL ASSESSMENT OF BIKE/PED FACILITIES

- Question: How are utilities being considered?
 - *Response: We are attempting to design this project in a way that minimizes utility relocation.*
- Question: What master plan are we referring to?
 - *Response: The 2018 Montgomery County Bicycle Master Plan.*
- Question: Are we proposing the breezeway over the Northwest Branch?
 - *Response: The Bicycle Master Plan proposes a sidepath along the southbound side of US 29 and a breezeway sidepath along the northbound side of US 29.*
- Question: Does the Master Plan recommend two-way bike traffic on both sides of US 29?
 - *Response: Bike facilities which can accommodate two-way bike traffic are included in planning documents for some areas around Burnt Mills. These facilities would be difficult to implement, specifically going south.*
- Question: If this plan is not implemented, would there need to be a shared roadway with bikes?
 - *Response: The shared roads shown on the typical section are not applicable to US 29, they are applicable to County maintained roads providing alternative parallel running bike routes. On US 29, the rightmost lanes are currently intended to be shared per SHA guidance.*
- Question: Would we need additional ROW for only the BRT improvements?
 - *Response: The need for ROW acquisition is anticipated for some of the BRT improvements specifically where there are proposed left turns, points of transition, and in Burnt Mills. Much more ROW would be necessary if documented planned Bike/PED enhancements are implemented.*
- Question: Do we have any suggestions that are actually feasible?
 - *Response: We are trying to help people understand we cannot build the facilities as proposed in the Master Plans, but instead we are working to understand what types of facilities would be appropriate in each portion of the corridor.*
- Question: Are people using the connections of Northwest Branch for commuting or recreation?
 - *Response: Input provided by Joan Johnson of the CAC - Many people use it for commuting, but the park closes seasonally 6:00 PM – 6:00 AM which makes it hard for commuters to use it for commuting purposes.*
- Comment: In terms of sidewalks, is this what you plan to do on both sides of Colesville Road?
 - *Response: Not necessarily – what is being shown is what has been planned in various planning documents.*
- Comment: We already have the sidewalk that is being shown in the typical selection.
 - *Response: This is true in some parts of the corridor, but in many places, you are missing the buffer.*
- Comment: A consideration for reducing the need for bike/ped facilities is to have bicyclists and pedestrians use the BRT in areas where bike/ped facilities are difficult to implement.
 - *Response: While this is technically true, we want to consider the types of trips that people are taking and attempt to accommodate them with appropriate facilities.*
- Comment: If any parking is taken from the Trader Joes shopping center, you would likely have to



take the whole shopping center due to existing parking issues in the lot.

- Comment: Previous studies indicated that the managed lane approach performed best among the alternatives considered and should have been selected as the alternative that advanced.

OVERVIEW OF PUBLIC MEETING ACTIVITY

- The County recognized the importance of gathering meaningful feedback from the public and is proposing two interactive feedback activities for meeting participants.
 - One activity will focus on locations that should be carefully considered and critical connections in the network.
 - The other activity focuses on identifying the types of facilities that may be appropriate in constrained spaces.
- The CAC provided feedback and asked that the project carefully describe each activity.

OVERVIEW OF PUBLIC MEETING LOCATION CONCERNS

- Multiple comments: Participants requested an additional meeting that is found in the area where the project would be constructed.
 - Participants suggested a variety of locations including the White Oak Recreation Center, the Senior Center, and Pine Crest Elementary as possible locations.
 - Jamie noted that we attempted to meet at Blair HS, but the space was unavailable and that the project team felt it was important to meet prior to school letting out for the Summer.
 - Jamie noted that the project team considered other locations. There were a variety of concerns regarding access. Most of the locations noted would be difficult for participants with mobility challenges to access as they are more distant from transit along the US 29 corridor or there is not an appropriate pedestrian connection.

NEXT STEPS

- The public meeting for Phase 2 of the BRT will be held on Tuesday, June 10.
- The next CAC meeting will be held in late Summer/early Fall of 2025.
- Participants are encouraged to reach out to Nino Ranjo (Project Manager) with any additional feedback or questions.

MEETING SIGNOFF

Jamie and Nino thanked attendees for their time and questions.

