

Agenda

1. Introductions
2. Presentation of Plan Amendment background – Chuck Kines
3. Review maps, offer comments, ideas, and suggestions
4. Meeting Concludes

Staff: Chuck Kines (M-NCPPC, Transportation Planning), Dan Hardy (M-NCPPC, Transportation Planning), Katherine Holt (M-NCPPC, Transportation Planning), Jose Dory (M-NCPPC, Transportation Planning), Tina Schneider (M-NCPPC, Environmental Planning), Rob Gibbs (M-NCPPC, Parks – Environmental Stewardship), Stephanie Yanovitz (SHA), Bob Simpson (DPWT), Gail Tait-Nouri (DPWT)

1. Meeting Began

2. Presentation – Chuck Kines

Mr. Kines presented an overview of the ICC Limited Functional Master Plan Amendment. He discussed the history of the project, the schedule, and next steps in the process. There were several questions asked during the presentation, which are documented in each mapping section below or as part of the overall comments section.

3. Review Maps

Each participant was encouraged to write down comments on the map, or on post-it notes, or discuss with the facilitator their concerns who then wrote them down on paper pads on easels.

The following are questions and concerns raised in the meeting noted in italics with responses to the questions, added by transportation planning staff after the meeting.

Figure 2: Needwood Road and Vicinity

Why does the bike path not follow the old highway alignment through the park?

For the same reasons – environmental/parkland/natural resource impacts – the old highway alignment was not selected for the highway, many planners believe it is not suitable for a hard surface trail either

Why doesn't it follow the highway alignment towards Midcounty Highway?

See previous response. (move to Rock Creek section)

Need standards for shared use paths.

Yes, the existing path along the road is substandard. The plan will recommend upgrading this path to county standards, 8' wide minimum.

Consider using the shoulder of the ICC for bike travel

Not allowed under current state law .We will investigate the potential for long-range consideration with MDOT.

Increased traffic speeds on Needwood Road is an issue

Not part of scope for this master plan effort, but will forward concerns to DPWT.

Shared use paths by pedestrians and bikes are a problem. The uses should have separate facilities. Some bicyclists prefer the road

Needwood Road is master planned for both on-road and off-road bikeways

In addition to multiuse trail, a better shoulder or bike lane is needed on Needwood Road.

See previous response.

At Redland Road crossing with the ICC, there is not a bike facility on Redland.

No existing bikeway, but master planned for bike lanes.

Need connectivity to the Rock Creek bicycle trail.

The county is currently considering funding the construction of a new trail connector along Needwood Road between the ICC Bike Path and Beach Drive to be implemented concurrently with the State's project, to create a loop for recreationalists.

What will be built along the " proposed bike route " on Redland Road and the other locations?

The master plan will recommend a shared use path, in order to accommodate all potential trail users.

Keep the bike path on the original path. (Comment made by several attendees)

Do not route any path through Cashell Estates. The ICC has already taken half of this community.

Make the bike and pedestrian path as direct as the ICC rather than longer alternate routes.

Are we connecting both Muncaster Mill Road (MD 115) and Needwood Road? Why not both? Which path alignment goes on the master plan if removed the master plan alignment through parkland?

Consider widening the shoulder of the ICC for bicycle use.

See similar comment and response above.

A path along Needwood Road will be good for runners. We may want to route races or group runs from Shady Grove Metro to Needwood/ Rock Creek path.

Hiker biker path from ICC and Shady Grove Road to Redland Road to facilitate amenities to the future bike route envisioned for Redland. In addition, there can be community access (which exists on planning maps) to this path.

A connection between Shady Grove and Redland Roads will be included in the future MidCounty Highway extension (and connection to ICC) project.

Alternately, from Shady Grove Road and ICC intersection (Point A) to Redland Road (Point B) a natural surface trail is proposed with access from the communities.

Does the bike path on Georgia Avenue (MD 97) and on Emory Lane need to be widened? A shared use path should be at least ten feet or more especially with 10 to 20 mph.

Widening the path along Emory Lane is not being considered. The future path along MD 97 (to be constructed by SHA as part of the ICC project) will also be 8' wide.

There is not a good route to the center of Olney (MD 97 and MD 108).

A master planned shared use path along MD 97 – between Olney and Glenmont -- will be implemented with the future Georgia Avenue Transitway

There is easy access to stores on Georgia Avenue (MD 97) bike path route such as Starbucks.

Emory Lane from the ICC northwest is a good existing bike path.

Emory Lane from the ICC southeast is not a very good road at this point and it is unsafe!!

A hard surface trail connection between the ICC and Lake Frank along Emory Lane and Muncaster Mill Road will be studied in more detail as part of the Upper Rock Creek Trail Corridor planning effort.

If all bikes are on one side of the road, drivers from the side roads and driveways won't look where they don't expect cars!

Bike routes should be planned for and accommodate cyclists commuting at 15-20 mphs.

Figure 3: Northwest Branch and Vicinity

Bonifant Road is too narrow for biking.

Connect the Matthew Henson Trail with the ICC going west.

Keep bikeway along the right of way (ROW).

Notley Road to Matthew Henson Trail is critical, connect to Glenmont.

Notley Road to Layhill Road should be impervious surface for long distance recreational cyclists.

An off-road path is better.

SHA plan not aesthetic

Don't eliminate the master planned alignment along ICC ROW from the Master Plan. We may want or need them later.

I moved to Olney for the ICC bicycle trail as it was in the Master Plan. Put it all back in!

Any natural surface trail that will be used as the ICC path alternate must allow bicycles.

In general, the ICC should have fewer lanes so that a real bikeway can be built. Someone mentioned an access road, which is a great solution.

Why did the Planning Board eliminate the shared use path through parkland? Aren't parks more for pedestrians (and bicycles) than for autos?

My preference would be to use the proposed alternative route along Vierling Drive (blue dots) so that one can connect to the Matthew Henson Trail.

A participant drew on the map a connection from the intersection of Bel Pre Road and Layhill Road (MD 182) down Layhill Road (MD 182) to the Matthew Henson Trail and continue south on Layhill Road (MD 182).

The orange and blue dots (from the ICC on Notley Road, Bonifant Road, and to the Trolley Museum) alignment is best for long recreational riders.

Figure 4: Paint Branch and Vicinity

Why is there not a bike path included in the alignment?

SHA proposed reducing the highway project ROW footprint, parkland impacts, and impervious surface. The Planning Board supported this proposal during project planning reviews in 2005. This master plan amendment will establish County policy.

Why can't the bike alignment follow the highway?

Can or will the alternative be built at the same time the ICC is built? However, our preference is still a path to be built for pedestrian use.

This study is policy-level, providing guidance to future facility planning. There are no funded improvements along alternative routes.

Current conditions are not efficient

Make the bike path a natural surface on the old ICC alignment or use blue stone dust or a similar permeable product. The bike path should use the planned ICC alignment from New Hampshire Avenue to US 29 with stone dust or other permeable surfaces. There should be funding for efficient, permeable bike path along the old ICC alignment.

This concept will be considered and addressed in the master plan amendment.

Will there be wildlife, hiker, and bicycle crossings under the ICC? The concern is the deer in the special protection area going from one side of the ICC to the other side.

Yes, the highway is being design to accommodate wildlife migration patterns, to the extent possible and bridges will be provided to accommodate those existing and planned north-south trail connections in the Countywide Park Trails Plan.

Connectivity to existing and proposed bicycle routes is important.

The interchange at New Hampshire Avenue (MD 650) and the ICC will have which road going over top of the other road.

ICC goes under MD 650

There should be a deer protection area near New Hampshire Avenue (MD 650).

Not part of this study, but will pass along concern to appropriate agency staff.

Let the bike path go through the special protection area instead of the cars. Let the cars travel along the SHA proposed bike route.

What's the cost of incremental damage of having the bike path or not having a bike path? [This person lives in Peach Orchard and wants to go to Bethesda.]

New Hampshire Avenue (MD 650) sidewalk is in bad condition and is unsafe for everyone except motorists.

Upgrades to MD 650 sidewalks are being studied

An equestrian enthusiast drew a trail on the map which loosely follows the existing ICC alignment. Her comment was that she will see a few cyclists using the same trail.

Good Hope Road is too narrow and has high volumes. It would need lots of improvements to allow cyclists to use as an alternate ICC route.

The ICC bridges should be wider through the special protection area to allow room for the path.

Accommodations for a future path were not included in the final approved highway design through this area.

Why can't an eight foot path be located in the three hundred foot ROW?

How much more run off will occur if the bike path is within the ICC ROW?

The bike path should be a pervious surface within the ICC ROW.

Placing a cyclist on Randolph Road is a bad idea.

What side of Randolph Road will the path be located?

An 8' sidewalk exists on the north side between Fairland Road and New Hampshire Avenue

There is a safety concern about people crossing Randolph Road to get to the other path along Fairland Road and New Hampshire Avenue (MD 650).

Briggs Chaney is a more direct route and should be improved. Is there room for improvement for Briggs Chaney bicycles?

Yes, and this will be studied.

SHA proposal is not bicycle friendly.

Bicycles should be allowed on the shoulders ICC without paying a toll

Bicycles should have an exclusive lane on the ICC.

The shoulders on the ICC should be widened to six feet on one side of the road.

Could the ICC have smaller lanes to get extra width for a path (i.e. 11 foot lanes)?

The Fairland Road bike route adds 2-3 miles to the ICC bicycle route if it is not on the ICC alignment.

Randolph Road is not a good road to ride a bicycle on since there are several drive cuts, which causes dips in the sidewalk making the rider go up and down.

Don't make the bike go way out of the way such as the proposed alternative alignments. Let the bike go in the special protection area near the ICC if not in the ICC ROW.

New Hampshire Avenue and Randolph Road is not a safe route for cyclists. Pedestrians and cyclists should not share a single ROW.

The proposed bikeway is not efficient. It should be directed from A → B → A.

I second the idea of putting the bike path next to the ICC.



This photo of New Hampshire/Orchard north view is inadequate for biking and walking. Move the sign posts and telephone poles from the sidewalk area.

Overall Comments

Set a goal for the LAB bike-friendly rating and adhere to their standards

Bike paths need to serve recreation bikers and commuter bikers. Concepts are different, routes may be different and stand and county need to provide both. The proposed alternative routes serve neither commuters nor recreational cyclists. Commuters want efficient routes to destinations. Recreational bikes want beautiful routes that meander through the natural topography. Both want safe, well maintained routes. The comments above represent many equestrian riders as well. Connectivity between parkways or linear greenways is essential for both efficiency and pleasure.

What is being done about New Hampshire Avenue (MD 650) from the ICC?

The group does not like the safety and sustainability of the roads.

Are there restrictions or moratoriums on surfaces being built? (i.e. permeable)

Yes, there is an 8% impervious limit in the Upper Paint Branch Special Protection Area for proposals subject to County laws.

If the County Council says place the bike path in the ICC ROW, will the M-NCPPC place the bike path in the ROW?

Yes, the Council establishes the final recommendations for functional master plans.

Are any funds coming from the State?

No funds are currently programmed other than the 7.7 miles of bikeway being built as part of the ICC highway project..

Could you skirt the special protection areas and go through the communities?

The special protection area includes residential communities; an alternate path that avoids the SPA entirely would need to be south of Fairland Road or north of Spencerville Road.

What about one less car lane on the ICC and give it to the cyclists?

There is no good alternative for the bike path in the Paint Branch area.

Rockville has public meetings and has a follow up meeting with the public to report back the information to everyone. Will there be this type of feedback loop?

A follow-up public meeting is not scheduled but opportunities for information exchange will continue. We will post meeting comments on our website and inform those who sign in of subsequent Planning Board actions. Our current schedule calls for a Staff Draft plan publication in May, a Planning Board public hearing in June, and Planning Board deliberation in July. A Planning Board Draft plan will be transmitted to the County Council and the Council will hold another public hearing to consider comments on the Planning Board Draft before deliberating in public session.

One lane should be taken from Randolph and New Hampshire Avenue (MD 650) to be used to create a bike path.

Should a natural surface trail be an alignment for the plan?

Different routes for different trail user groups will be considered and studied where agency staff agrees multiple routes are needed and offer the best connections.

Why did they decide on an alternative route for the bikeway?

To reduce costs, park property impacts, and natural environmental impacts

What percent cost is added to the highway and how wide?

During the planning process the cost of completing a path along the master plan alignment was estimated at between \$50 and \$100M

Could the trail be placed on the ICC construction access roads after the ICC is built?

Unlikely, due to the fact that the design and construction process will, to minimize environmental impacts, generally result in the final roadway being built over the temporary access roads. If there are specific areas where future public access is most important, we would consider asking the state and federal agencies to revise the design and construction process to facilitate such access.

WRITTEN COMMENTS SUBMITTED AT MEETING

Survey Results

There was ample notice of the public meeting.

Strongly agree 1
Agree 1
Neutral 2
Disagree 1
Strongly disagree

The time of the meeting was convenient.

Strongly agree 2
Agree 3
Neutral
Disagree
Strongly disagree

The location of the meeting was convenient and suitable.

Strongly agree 3
Agree 2
Neutral
Disagree
Strongly disagree

How did you hear about the meeting?

Newspaper
Mailing 2
Friend 1 (Chuck Kines)
List serve: 3 WABA email; FDA
Other:

What do you like about each route on the maps?

I did not like anything about the routes on the maps.

I liked that the maps allowed visualization of routes on a reasonable scale.

What do you dislike about each route on the maps?

Most of the routes on the maps are unusable.
Lack grade information that is important to biking.

Do you know of a better route to connect Point A to Point B on each map that is not shown? If so, keep in mind that we are trying to avoid environmentally sensitive areas.

I would prefer that the ICC be reduced by a lane so that a true bikeway on each side can be created. Riding on a sidewalk is hazardous because of driveways, sharing with walkers, dogs, etc is dangerous when a cyclist is traveling at 15-20 mph. Cycling commuters and long distance cyclist want to ride on the road. The route that connects to Matthew Henson Trail is okay as an alternate route.

Keep it along the ICC.

Needwood:

C-D seems reasonable, but does not accommodate travel to the south. A-B SHA proposal would be difficult route for intermediate or beginners – some grade difficulty and narrow – high traffic areas.

It looks like the ICC was part of A to B. Why not the bikeway only A to B? I like C-D, too.

Northwest Branch:

Connect to Matthew Henson Trail

Unless there is a major endangered species, why not put the bikeway next to the ICC with barriers? Notley/Bonifant is preferred. Why not add a feed to Matthew Henson? I ride this section. Why not connect to both bike paths? This makes both bike paths more useful.

Paint Branch:

Preferred route would be either current alignment or Briggs Chaney and Good Hope Road, although, Good Hope Road is difficult. New Hampshire and Randolph are undesirable.

Both Alternatives are absurd. Put the bikeway on the ICC a little more damage won't matter.

Comments:

Presenters did well at explaining process and current thinking.

4. Meeting Concludes