

## 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), Tina Schneider (M-NCPPC, Environmental Planning), Doug Redmond (M-NCPPC, Parks – Environmental Stewardship), Stephanie Yanovitz (SHA), Bob Simpson (DPWT)

---

### 1. Meeting Began

Each person in attendance including staff introduced themselves.

### 2. Presentation – Chuck Kines

Mr. Kines presented an overview of ICC Limited Functional Master Plan Amendment. He discussed the history of the project, the schedule, and next steps in the process.

### 3. Review Maps

Since there were only seven people in attendance, Mr. Kines walked the group to each station and explained the problem areas for the bikeway/sidewalks/trails along the ICC alignment on each map. 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 provided at the meeting.

#### **Figure 2: Needwood Road and Vicinity**

*Need to study a connection along the gas line from the ICC to Beach Drive.*

We will look into this connection, which is located a few thousand feet east/south of Needwood Road.

*Add bike lanes to Needwood Road to connect to Beach Drive, which would connect to the Rock Creek Trail.*

Planning staff will examine the possibility of implementing the master planned bike lanes as part of a project to upgrade bike facilities along Needwood Road between the ICC and Redland Road.

*On Muncaster Mill Road (MD 115), keep the bicycle trail on the west or south side of the road.*

This alignment is likely the only one we'll consider. A shared use path on the north side is problematic due mostly to topography. In addition, a shared use path already exists along the south

side of MD 115 between Applewood Lane and Shady Grove Road, so optimally we'd continue this path to Needwood Road.

*Shady Grove Road on the west side of the road is very constrained.*

Agreed. The only option for upgrades to the road would be to widen the east side sidewalk from 5 to 8'. And finding the extra 3' is going to be difficult. The road already occupies the master planned ROW between MD 115 and Midcounty Highway, so the extra 3' will have to come from the median, or from narrowing travel lanes (how this proposal relates to new road code not yet investigated)

*What happens to the ROW through the parkland especially with private and public land (development)? Will this answer show in all of the master plans?*

The ROW not used by the selected highway alignment will become parkland. If the ICC trail alignment through these areas are removed from master plans (as recommended by the Planning Board), there obviously would not be any bike trail impacts to private lands adjoining the parkland. If the master planned ICC trail alignment remains policy after this MPA process, the proximity to private property will be part of the decision-making process, and how the bike trail relates to private land will need to be examined more closely during facility design.

*Midcounty Highway bicycle trail from Shady Grove Road to the proposed ICC interchange with Midcounty Highway seems like a better and more feasible option than a trail along Shady Grove Road to Muncaster Mill Road (MD 115).*

This alignment makes the most sense, on paper. The only unknown is whether residents along Applewood Lane would support a bike route through their neighborhood (because the trail would terminate in this vicinity heading east). It's possible we may recommend both, based on different destinations/connectivity.

*Can the existing road bed in the North Branch north of MD 115 be used as a mountain biking trail?*

This is beyond the scope of this plan, but planning staff will pass along this comment to Department of Parks for inclusion in the Upper Rock Creek Trail Corridor planning process.

### **Figure 3: Northwest Branch and Vicinity**

*How are Community Stewardship projects being coordinated (Layhill Road (MD 182) and ICC)?*  
Planning staff will investigate.

*Could the construction access roads be used for horses?*

Has not been studied to-date. While it's highly unlikely construction access roads might be paved to create hard surface trails, utilizing these corridors for natural surface (pervious) trails may be possible. Staff will study. Mountain bikers have also asked about this idea.

*Could horse trails and natural surface trails be parallel to the bike path in the ICC right-of-way?*

Horse trails are not currently being studied, but it's a valid comment. Equestrian concerns have not been part of any ICC trail discussions to-date. We will coordinate with the Department of Parks staff to develop a response.

*It is difficult to accommodate various groups that have different needs and requirements.*

*Different routes for different user groups?*

Until now, it's been assumed that all user groups will use the same route. But it's quite possible that a result of this master plan effort will be different routes for different user groups, i.e., a shared use path along Bonifant Road for east-west off-road cyclists, a natural surface path connection via the Indian Spring/Poplar Run trail connection for hikers, etc.

*Would Layhill Road (MD 182) and Wintergate Road have a signal to facilitate crossing?*

Will check ROD and/or ask SHA.

*Prefer shared use path to be on the east side of Layhill Road (MD 182) for consistency with existing path north of Norbeck Road.*

Agreed. More ROW and fewer obstructions exist along the east side.

*Possible rail to trail project convert trolley museum truck alignment to shared use path.*

This will be studied within the Northwest Branch Master Plan process. However, keep in mind that more than half of the existing track bed will be retained for the new track alignment.

*The area has many hills that are challenging for some bikers, whether on Bonifant, Notley, or Alderton. Would going through the park be easier?*

Topography is a challenge for any alignment; the hills along the master planned Matthew Henson trail alignment between the ICC and Alderton Road are part of what would make an ADA-compliant trail connection here difficult.

*Implementing a shared-use path along the roads would help bikers negotiate the hills. Options that use existing roads would generally have a shared-use path; the one exception being considered is the low-volume section of Alderton Road between Alderton Lane and the Matthew Henson trail.*

#### **Figure 4: Paint Branch and Vicinity**

*The intersection of New Hampshire Avenue (MD 650) and Randolph Road needs to be improved.*

Agreed. And extending the bike lanes from the north along MD 650 to this intersection will be a recommendation of the plan amendment. But other bicycle and pedestrian safety improvements may also be needed.

*Why did the County not look at Old Columbia Pike as a route for the bicycle trail?*

This road is master planned for bike lanes, and adding a shared use path (making the road a dual bikeway) would be difficult due to limited ROW. Plus the state's proposal is also part of the US 29 bikeway so serving both regional trails with a common north-south connection appears appropriate.

*The bike lanes on New Hampshire Avenue (MD 650) are substandard.*

We will investigate whether the bike lanes meet AASHTO guidelines and discuss with SHA.

*The shared use path should be placed on the north side of Randolph Road for consistency with the path on the west side of New Hampshire Avenue (MD 650).*

A shared use path (in the form of an 8' wide sidewalk) exists along north side of Randolph Road between Fairland Road and MD 650. Tree trimming is needed to widen the travel space, which is compromised currently due to overgrown brush.

*The shared use path should be placed on the south side of Fairland Road for consistency with the path on the east side of US 29.*

Because of the Special Protection Area, a path along the south side is the only alignment being considered.

*Need for attention to cross from the north side of Randolph Road to the south side of Fairland Road.* Planning staff will evaluate the crossing as part of this planning effort.

### **Overall Comments**

*How will the ICC impact existing trail systems?*

The Department of Parks has been studying this issue closely. The ICC bike path notwithstanding, the ICC planning process incorporated the sanctioned trail systems. In fact, in numerous locations SHA lengthened bridge spans to accommodate trails passing underneath (Rachel Carson Greenway, for example). Some of the “people’s choice” trails will be affected.

*Could there be a dual trail such as a paved trail with a gravel trail beside it for pedestrians, bicycles, and horses similar to the Washington and Old Dominion Trail (W&OD).*

Unlikely because this concept would require more space than available in most areas. Planning staff will investigate.

*One idea for the bike path along the ICC would be similar to the character and design of the Baltimore and Annapolis (B&A) Trail.*

The trail experience along the B&A, a rails-to-trails conversion, utilizes existing rights-of-way and a pre-graded alignment. This type of experience will only be available in short stretches along the ICC corridor where right-of-way and grades permit.

### **Meeting Concludes**