

APPENDIX

A: Planning Process and Public Participation

The outreach strategy engaged stakeholders in this amendment's issues and included bicycle transportation advocates, pedestrian/walking advocates, park and trail (recreation) advocates, and environmental advocates. Due to the limited scope of the issues studied, staff established an informal working group consisting primarily of the groups most interested in the outcomes of this planning process:

- Bicycle transportation advocates
- Pedestrian advocates
- Park and recreation advocates
- Environmental advocates

In addition, staff developed an interagency technical working group of representatives from the County Executive, including the Department of Public Works and Transportation and the State, including the Maryland Department of Transportation and the State Highway Administration.

To engage residents and the general public staff held two public information meetings, on March 19 and April 2, 2008, to obtain comments and reactions to preliminary recommendations. This general approach was consistent with how we conducted the master plan process for the CBFMP in 2004-2005.

B: Themes

Several broad themes emerged during the planning process that shaped the analysis and staff recommendations and will influence the review of this amendment's options by decision makers and the public.

- **SHORT-TERM SOLUTIONS VERSUS LONG-TERM VISION** The planning process must not merely react to the approved highway design with quick fixes, but must offer long-term vision, 20-30 years in the future, that anticipates needs generated by local, regional, and global environmental and societal challenges.
- **ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION VERSUS MOBILITY AND ACCESS** Bikeways, like any land development—including ballfields and playgrounds—cause some environmental harm, such as tree loss, disrupted drainage patterns, adverse impacts to natural habitat, and damaged water quality from increased runoff. However, bikeways and trails also offer significant environmental and health benefits that are difficult to quantify. A commuting cyclist using a path or bike route equates to one less car on the road, which in turn means less air and water pollution. This conflict was, and remains, at the heart of the debate about a full-length ICC Bike Path as well as debates about bikeways and trails throughout the County.
- **TRANSPORTATION FUNCTION VERSUS A RECREATIONAL, AESTHETIC EXPERIENCE** Transportation cyclists often prefer the shortest and most direct connection. Recreational cyclists and other pathway users want an aesthetic, park-like experience for which a meandering pathway is appropriate.

These conflicting desires merge in this amendment because the most direct connection between future ICC Bike Path segments would pass through parkland, offering the best of both worlds. However, these direct connections sometimes travel through sensitive environmental resources. Moving the trail to parallel roadways keeps the transportation function high, but the aesthetic, park-like experience is low or non-existent. This amendment offers a choice between enhancing transportation function while reducing recreational value or selecting a path alignment that enhances recreational and transportation value while affecting environmental resources. In reality, both affect environmental resources; the former is indirect and diluted while the latter is direct and visible.

- **DIFFERENT ROUTES FOR DIFFERENT USERS** From the beginning this plan process sought to identify one route that accommodates all user groups—cyclists of all levels, hikers, walkers, and others. It became apparent during public meetings that one route would not satisfy all groups. Some wanted a hard surface trail, some did not want any facilities along roadways, and others wanted a natural surface trail (only hard surface was evaluated during the ICC Final Environmental Impact Statement [FEIS]). Some bicyclists value the most direct route, while others value on a park-like experience .
- **CHOICE TRAILS VERSUS SANCTIONED TRAILS** Choice trails result where connections are needed, and sanctioned trails are not planned. As a result, choice trails—typically created by residents—can damage sensitive natural resources. To prevent this, many user groups (particularly of natural surface trails) are asking the County to designate trail routes along the ICC corridor that would allow unsanctioned trails to revert to a natural state.
- **BICYCLE USE ON A LIMITED ACCESS HIGHWAY** Many transportation cyclists are asking the County and state to allow bicycles travel along the ICC shoulders. Current State law prohibits bicycle use on highways with speed limits 50 mph or higher, particularly those managed by the Maryland Transportation Authority (MdTA). Recent legislation authorizes the Transportation Authority chairperson to approve bicycle use of MdTA facilities. This law will be effect by the time this amendment is approved and adopted and it should be considered and reflected in any recommendations. However, the ICC is a co-sponsored by the MdTA and SHA and it will most likely be signed to prohibit bicycle access by on all highway approaches to minimize potential confusion with where cycling is permitted on the pathway within the highway right-of-way.
- **USE OF HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION ACCESS ROADS FOR RECREATION** Trail user groups have asked staff to consider converting ICC construction roads to pathways after SHA contractors are done. Staff studied this option, but rejected it for two reasons. First, most of the roadway will be built within the highway footprint and not require access roads. Second, where access roads are being built, they must be environmentally restored per commitments in the ROD.
- **CRITICAL CONNECTIONS FOR EASTERN COUNTY RESIDENTS** There was strong sentiment in public meetings for preserving critical connections that allow County residents living east of New Hampshire Avenue to enjoy park trails. Of particular concern is that eliminating hard surface trails through parkland and along the ICC in the Paint Branch and Northwest Branch stream valley parks, would block eastern County communities from safe and enjoyably links with the County trail system. Families are unlikely to use this amendment's alternative routes along parallel roads, particularly to reach the major park trails further west.

C: Acronyms and Definitions

CBFMP	Countywide Bikeways Functional Master Plan
CBP	County Bike Path (master planned route of SP-40 in CBFMP)
CPTP	Countywide Park Trails Plan
CIP	Capital Improvement Program
CTP	Consolidated Transportation Program
DEIS	Draft Environmental Impact Statement
DPWT	Department of Public Works and Transportation
FEIS	Final Environmental Impact Statement
FY	fiscal year (per M-NCPPC calendar)
HOA	homeowners association
ICC	Intercounty Connector
ICCLFMPA	Intercounty Connector Limited Functional Master Plan Amendment
M-83	Midcounty Highway (M-83 is the master plan identification)
MOU	memorandum of understanding
ROD	federal Record of Decision
SHA Plan	SHA's Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan (approved as part of the ICC Record of Decision and functioning as the State's alternative to the master planned County Bike Path)
SHA	State Highway Administration
SP	shared-use path
SWM	stormwater management
WSSC	Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission

D: Master Plan Amendment Schedule

OCTOBER 2007

Planning Board reviews and approves the Purpose and Outreach Strategy report

NOVEMBER-JANUARY 2007

An intergovernmental technical committee is established and the committee members chosen. Staff conducts research, collects and analyzes data, and develops initial recommendations with the technical committee. The technical committee obtains feedback on the initial recommendations from the advisory committee

MARCH 2008

Preliminary recommendations are drafted for comment at two public meetings

MARCH-APRIL 2008

Two public meetings: March 19 in Spencerville and April 2 in Derwood

MAY 2008

Staff Draft Plan Amendment is presented to the Planning Board

JUNE 2008

Planning Board holds public hearing

JULY and SEPTEMBER 2008

Planning Board worksessions

SEPTEMBER 2008

Transmit Planning Board Draft Amendment to the County Council

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Rollin Stanley, Director
Montgomery County Planning Department

Mary Bradford, Director
Montgomery County Department of Parks

Daniel K. Hardy, Acting Chief
Transportation Planning

Jorge Valladares, Chief
Environmental Planning

PROJECT STAFF

Charles S. Kines, Project Planner, Transportation Planning
Katherine Holt, Transportation Planning
Ronald Vaughn, Transportation Planning
Tina Schneider, Environmental Planning
Khalid Afzal, Community-Based Planning
Bill Barron, Community-Based Planning
Lyn Coleman, Department of Parks
Tanya Schmieler, Department of Parks
Carole Bergmann, Department of Parks
Rob Gibbs, Department of Parks
Doug Redmond, Department of Parks
Norma Kawecky, Department of Parks

CONTRIBUTING STAFF

Larry Cole, Transportation Planning
Candy Bunnag, Environmental Planning
Andrea Stone, Environmental Planning

INTERAGENCY COORDINATION

Bob Simpson, Department of Public Works and Transportation
Gail Tait-Nouri, Department of Public Works and Transportation
Stephanie Yanovitz, Maryland State Highway Administration

Intercountry Connector Limited Functional Master Plan Amendment
BIKEWAYS AND INTERCHANGES
PLANNING BOARD DRAFT

Montgomery County Planning Department
8787 Georgia Avenue
Silver Spring, Maryland 20910

