

**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments  
Oct 14 through Oct 28**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTrack #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
1	Mary Pat	Wilson	Montgomery County Public Schools	Confirmation of meeting with MTA, Planning Department and MCPS staff to review Purple Line issues related Silver Spring International Middle School.	Email	n/a	Schools	10/26/2009	Meeting was held Nov 4th with MTA & MCPS staff. MTA is developing alternatives for access for MCPS to consider. Design will be further refined during Preliminary Engineering
2	Mary Pat	Wilson	Montgomery County Public Schools	Confirmation of meeting with MTA, Planning Department and MCPS staff to review Purple Line issues related Rosemary Hills Elementary School.	Email	n/a	Schools	10/27/2009	Meeting was held Nov 10th with MTA & MCPS staff. MTA is developing alternatives for access for MCPS to consider. Design will be further refined during Preliminary Engineering
3	Anne	Martin	Bethesda - Chevy Chase Chamber of Commerce	In Bethesda to Chevy Chase Lake segment, reference to "pedestrian priority area" is repetitive, vague, and could limit flexibility in implementation.	Email	n/a	Bethesda	10/27/2009	Staff agrees. In Table 1 (4th column) will replace "pedestrian priority area" with "multi-modal activity center".
4	Anne	Martin	Bethesda - Chevy Chase Chamber of Commerce	In Bethesda to Chevy Chase Lake segment, it should be noted that Bethesda is a significant commercial and residential center and the "design should reflect and reinforce this urban destination and the gateway character of the area".	Email	n/a	Bethesda	10/27/2009	Staff agrees. In Table 1 (4th column) will add "design should reflect and reinforce this urban destination and the gateway character of the area".
5	Anne	Martin	Bethesda - Chevy Chase Chamber of Commerce	In Bethesda to Chevy Chase Lake segment and similar to the Silver Spring station comments in the "environmental" heading, can we note that this transit option and connection to Metrorail encourages transit and reduces automobile dependency?	Email	n/a	Bethesda	10/27/2009	An entire column is devoted to "connections" in Table 1. The staff thinks that column adequately reinforces this attribute of the Purple Line.

**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments  
Oct 29 through Dec 9**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTrack #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
6	Dan	Handwerker	Individual	There are only a few mentions of entry points to the trail. Once the trail is continued from Stewart Ave to the Silver Spring Transit Center, more pedestrian/bike access points at places like Talbot Ave, the east side of Rosemary Hills Elementary, Leonard Dr, or Rosemary Hills Drive would be very useful and would provide a much more convenient way for people living in that neighborhood to walk/bike to downtown Silver Spring and for shopping on 16th St. In addition, if a Purple line stop is built at 16th St, a trail entry point at Rosemary Hills Elementary school or east would also put more people in walking distance to that stop.	Email	n/a	Trail	10/29/2009	An access point to the Capital Crescent Trail in the vicinity of the Talbot Ave bridge would provide needed accessibility for residents. Opportunities to connect residential areas to the trail may occur at Michigan Ave and/or Lanier Dr on the southside of the tracks and at Hanover St to the northside of the tracks. Specific access points will be investigated further through the Preliminary Engineering phase.
7	Ilona	Blanchard	City of Takoma Park	<b>On page 8</b> , change references to Takoma Park Transit Center to Takoma / Langley Transit Center. <b>On page 29</b> , change reference from "joint use" path to "shared use path" and note that bike lanes are included - consistent with recommendations in Takoma Langley Draft Plan that SHA has now endorsed.	Email	n/a	Takoma	11/12/2009	"Joint use path" will be changed to "shared use path" to be consistent with bikeway types in the Countywide Bikeways Functional Plan. One instance occurs on page 27 and two instances occur on page 29. The text in minimum right-of-way sections of Table 16 (p27), Table 17 (p29), and Table 18 (p29) will be amended as follows: "...and includes a five-foot bike lane and an eight-foot shared use path based on SHA guidelines." In each of these tables the sentence beginning with "Could consider the alternative of a wider..." will be eliminated.
8	Reena	Matthews	State Highway Administration	<b>On pages 27 and 29</b> , reference should be made to the minimum 8 foot shared use path and minimum five foot on road bike lane to be constructed along University Blvd as part of the Purple Line project.	Email	n/a	University Blvd.	11/13/2009	See response to Comment #7
9	Kenneth	Chaison	Individual	Purple Line does not belong on the Trail - it not compatible and will create an unsafe condition for pedestrians.	CTrack	2009-1030	Trail	11/17/2009	The staff does not agree. We think there are numerous examples both in this country and in other countries where trails can coexist with trains. We do acknowledge that the trail environment will be different. There will be fewer trees and less shade. It will likely be a number of years before replacement trees will provide a significant mitigating effect. Every effort should be made during design and construction to provide for a safe trail that is as functional and green as is practical given the constraints at hand.
10	Scott	Gutschick	County Fire & Rescue Service	At what range of speeds will the Purple Line trains travel? Will trains travel at-grade, or in a tunnel, between Pearl Street and East-West Highway? Will trains have an automatic right-of-way (favored status) when encountering vehicular traffic at places where the tracks merge and share space with roadways such as the Fenton/Wayne intersection, Arliss/Walden intersection, and along Wayne Avenue, Piney Branch Road, and University Blvd.? Will trains have to stop at red traffic signals at intersections or will the signals turn red in all directions to allow trains to keep moving across intersections such as Piney Branch Rd./University Blvd.?	Email	n/a	Operations	11/17/2009	The average speed – including stops – is 25-30 mph. The fastest the train would likely go is somewhere around 45-50 mph. Trains will be at grade between Pearl Street and E/W Highway. It is our understanding that trains will be able to take advantage of extended green phases at those intersections where doing so would not significantly impact the traffic flow on the intersecting street. Arliss / Walden might fall into that category where an extended green phase is used. Wayne / Fenton likely would not. It is our understanding that there is a separate phase for the train envisioned for that intersection. Piney Branch and University Blvd. – we would assume at that intersection the train would likely be subject to the same phasing as other vehicles.
11	Steven	Kolarz	Maryland Transit Administration (MTA) Purple Line Consultant	<b>P.2</b> - The rendering of an LRV in Woodmont Plaza is not correct - we are limiting the tail tracks to the base of the steps. I recommend a different graphic. <b>P.4</b> - The bottom graphic appears to show University Blvd with 2 through lanes and shared left turns. This is not correct, we are proposing 3 through lanes with separate left-turn lanes. <b>P.11</b> - The rendering of an LRV in Woodmont Plaza is not correct - we are limiting the tail tracks to the base of the steps. I recommend a different graphic. <b>P.13</b> - Table 2 - Based on our current investigations, the existing ROW width between the east end of the tunnel and Pearl street is 32'. This would modify the 3rd and 4th lines. Minimum ROW needed by the Purple Line in this area would also be 32'. <b>P.15</b> - Table 5 - The current ROW varies from 66' to 100'. The Purple Line will similarly need 66' to 100'. <b>P.19</b> - Table 8 - The current ROW is estimated as 60' +/-. <b>P.23</b> - Table 12 - The current ROW is estimated as 40'+/-. <b>P.23</b> - Table 13 - The current ROW varies from 70' to 100'. Also, the word "and" is missing between "Wayne Avenue" and "Sidewalk." <b>P.23</b> - Table 13 - The third note reads "Separate left-turn lanes will be provided at signalized intersection, except the eastbound to northbound left-turn at Cedar Street." This is incorrect, the LPA would provide a separate left-turn lane from eastbound Wayne to northbound Dale. The LPA would not provide a left-turn from westbound Wayne to southbound Dale if the Dale Drive station is constructed. <b>P.24</b> - Reword "Bonifant Street traffic limited to eastbound direction" to "Bonifant Street traffic limited to one-way, away from Georgia Ave" to avoid confusion that the segment west of Georgia will be westbound. <b>P.28</b> - The left graphic appears to show University Blvd with 2 through lanes and shared left turns. This is not correct, we are proposing 3 through lanes with separate left-turn lanes. <b>P.31</b> - Ensure table matches changes noted above. <b>P.32</b> - Ensure table matches changes noted above.	Email	n/a	Editing	12/1/2009	These are factual corrections submitted by the MTA Purple Line Project Team. The staff agrees with all of the changes except the proposed change on page 24. The balance of the changes will be made. See the work session (March 4, 2010) staff memo (recommendation "e") related to language about Bonifant Street. On page 24, the referenced second and third bullets will be deleted as this is being received by MTA and MCDOT.

**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments  
Oct 29 through Dec 9**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTRAK #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
12	Monica	Meade	MTA	<p><b>On Page 9:</b> Stating that grass tracks will reduce runoff may be technically correct but it is not a pervious surface since the turf and soil are laid over the concrete in which the tracks are set. I guess it is like a green roof – the grass will absorb some of the water. I just don't want people to think we are claiming it is pervious surface.</p> <p><b>Page 17:</b> Lyttonsville – after our last community focus group in this area we are looking at moving the station farther east – so it would not be immediately east of the Lyttonsville Place bridge. Also bus connections and Kiss &amp; Ride might be up on Brookville Road near Walter Reed Annex if the station is moved.</p> <p><b>Page 23:</b> the PL will be on the south side of Bonifant west of Georgia, then transition to the north side while crossing Georgia. Also – we still don't know what the traffic configuration will be (i.e. will it be one way with a lane of parking, or two way, no parking?) Also the statement that there will be no parking on the north sides is true, but it doesn't say that the PL will be in dedicated lanes on the north side. Sort of unclear.</p> <p><b>Page 31:</b> I thought it was a little confusing where the PL and trail are on either side of the CSX to say we need ROW of 160 ft. Sounds like we are suddenly need a lot of space. But I guess you are talking about public or transportation ROW – not just PL.</p>	Email	n/a	Editing	12/2/2009	<p><u>On page 9</u> - Staff agrees that the statement regarding grass tracks needs to be better qualified. County Council is on record as supporting grass tracks and that is noted in the Draft Plan on page 7. Staff agrees that if the grass tracks are proposed over impervious surfaces runoff will not infiltrate back into the groundwater table. Further information is needed on the depth and absorption capacity of the soil within the grass tracks to quantify runoff rates. The reference to grass tracks under the "environment" column on page 9 will be deleted. Page 31 - yes, the 160 ft ROW is for the Purple Line, CSX tracks, and WMATA tracks. <u>On page 17</u> - language is included on pages 11 and 31 noting that there are expected to be some modifications at the project proceeds through preceeds through preliminary engineering and subsequent phases. <u>Page 23</u> - see the work session (March 4, 2010) staff memo (recommendation "e") related to language about Bonifant Street.</p>
13	Evan	Glass	South Silver Spring Neighborhood Association	Supports Purple Line station stop at Wayne Avenue and Dale Drive	CTRAK	2009-1079	Dale Drive Station	12/7/2009	<p>Staff's response to the request by MTA to reconsider the County position on the inclusion of a station at Dale Drive is that a number of issues still remain to be addressed and we therefore recommend no change to the wording in the Draft Plan. The ridership estimate reflects a Dale Drive station with almost double the weekday boardings in 2030 as the Fenton Street (Library) station. We question that estimate given the land use in the immediate vicinity of these two stations. MCPS has expressed a concern about access and safety and the MTA is working to address their concerns. Therefore, we continue to recommend that the station not be constructed in the initial phase but to design an alignment that will make it possible to add a station in the future. There is concern about the adequacy of an eight foot shared use path for the Green Trail. We need to afford the MTA an opportunity to weigh in on the potential for providing for a wider Green Trail in this area and the extent to which potentially achieving that objective is related to the location of a station platform. Conversely, there has been more support for a station expressed by the community since the announcement of the LPA. The staff believes it is accurate to say that the community is still divided but there are more individuals that have actively come forward to say it would be short sighted to not have a station. It should also be noted that community remains divided on the relationship between a station and the potential for additional density in the area immediately near the station.</p>
14	Mike	Madden	MTA Purple Line Project Manager	Includes a combination of above comments from Mr. Kolarz and Ms. Meade. Specific comments not included in e-mail from Mr. Kolarz include the following: <b>Page 9</b> - Any mention of grass tracks reducing runoff should be removed. Though possible, this effect is not certain at this time. <b>Page 17</b> - It is currently under study to move the Lyttonsville Place station further east at the request of community members. If this move takes place, the bus bays and kiss and ride will also move to Brookville road near the Walter Reed Annex. <b>Page 23</b> - The Purple Line will be on the south side of Bonifant Street west of Georgia Avenue, then transition to the north side east of Georgia Avenue. The configuration east of Georgia Avenue is pending County approval - whether it is a lane of traffic and a lane of parking, or two lanes of traffic. It may help clarify to add that while there will not be parking on the north side of Bonifant Street, the Purple Line transitway will be there. <b>Page 28</b> - the left graphic appears to show University Blvd. with two through lanes and shared left turn lanes. This is not correct. We are proposing three through lanes with separate left turn lanes. <b>Page 31</b> - ensure that the table matches the changes noted above. <b>Page 31</b> - perhaps it should be noted that though a total ROW width of 160' will be needed, the ownership will be a combination of WMATA, CSX, and MTA uses. <b>Page 32</b> - ensure table matches changes noted above.	Letter	n/a	Editing	12/7/2009	See responses to comments 11 and 12 above.

**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments  
Oct 29 through Dec 9**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTrack #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
15	Don	Slater	Individual	Include station at Dale Drive for planning and construction. Lives 100 yards from Purple Line. Would choose to ride from the Dale Drive station.	CTrack	2009-1081	Dale Drive Station	12/8/2009	See previous comment on Dale Drive station issue.
16	Philip	Downey	Individual	Support stop at Dale Drive. Live 1/4 mile from proposed stop. Opposed to midrise and high rise buildings.	CTrack	2009-1080	Dale Drive Station	12/9/2009	See previous comment on Dale Drive station issue.
17	Tina	Slater	Various Individuals Residing in East Silver Spring / Wayne Avenue Area	<p><b>We, the undersigned 177 residents, are writing in strong support of a Purple Line station at Wayne Ave &amp; Dale Drive.</b> We have recently learned that the MTA's analysis shows such a station will improve the cost-effectiveness data for the proposed Purple Line transit project. Now that the Governor has approved the Locally Proposed Alternative, which would travel at grade on Wayne Avenue through Silver Spring, we urge the Planning Commission, the County Council, the District 20 Delegation, and our Representative to support the building of such a station, and to include that station in the initial construction phase of the Purple Line.</p> <p>The proposed PL Medium LRT alignment is at its heart an infrastructure project that will serve the Maryland suburbs and integrate various transit modes for the next 75 years. We look forward to a future that could include a vibrant performing arts center at Dale Drive and a community taking advantage of the option to leave the car behind, whether traveling to the Metro, to classes at College Park, to jobs in Bethesda, or to shop or visit the library in downtown Silver Spring.</p> <p>A stop at Wayne and Dale would provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the advantage of a light rail stop in our neighborhood to offset the impacts of the Purple Line (which will travel in front of closely spaced homes, requiring strips of property to be taken from some front-yards)</li> <li>• a convenient connection to the Metro Red Line, helping to reduce to rush-hour congestion</li> <li>• service to audiences attending programs at the renovated Old Blair Auditorium</li> <li>• a station that students and employees at both the Silver Spring International Middle School and Sligo Creek Elementary School can use</li> <li>• a walker-friendly station situated halfway between Wayne/Fenton and Wayne/Manchester Place; note that the grade is very steep between Sligo Creek and the proposed Manchester Place station and thus would be a difficult uphill climb for residents of our neighborhood</li> <li>• a walkable neighborhood station that will provide more 'eyes on the street'</li> <li>• enhanced property values</li> </ul>	CTrack	2009-1080	Dale Drive Station	12/9/2009	See previous comment on Dale Drive station issue.

**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments  
Dec 10 through Feb 12**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTRAK #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
18	Michael	Evenson	Individual	Against Purple Line on Master Plan alignment. It will result in the destruction of trees and the loss of recreational space. Purple Line belongs on a roadway - not the trail right of way. Planning is ignoring the need to directly serve the Naval Medical Center.	CTRAK	2009-1084	Primarily Future Capital Crescent / Interim Georgetown Branch Trail	12/10/2009	Staff does not agree. The selected Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) is along the Master Plan alignment. This is consistent with the County Council and Planning Board recommendations. The needs of the National Naval Medical Center (NNMC) have not been ignored. The MTA conducted an analysis of serving the NNMC via both Jones Bridge Road and the Master Plan alignment (see the following link - <a href="http://www.purplelinemd.com/images/stories/purpleline_documents/Medim%20BRT%20Variations.pdf">http://www.purplelinemd.com/images/stories/purpleline_documents/Medim%20BRT%20Variations.pdf</a> .) Access to and from NIH/NNMC via transit will be improved under the LPA when compared to existing service.
19	David	Saltzman	East Bethesda Citizen Association	The Purple Line cost at \$100 million per mile is prohibitive and funds a project that does not serve the Naval Medical Center. The ridership estimates are questionable and there are too many stations. The cost are exorbitant and the time savings are minimal. The Purple Line is not Green - trees will be destroyed and the electricity to run the system will come from burning coal. Any benefits related to the reduction in air pollution or traffic will be either non-existent or minimal based upon the MTA's own conclusions.	CTRAK	2009-1084	Project Overall	12/10/2009	1) The costs and number of stations are comparable to other new projects recently funded by the FTA - especially given the inner-suburban location of the Purple Line. As part of the Purple Line financial plan, the State has to demonstrate the feasibility of paying for all existing transit systems and to pay for the Purple Line. 2) The estimated weekday ridership is significantly higher than that of other new projects. The time savings are also significant as there is an estimated 10,000 new transit trips every weekday by 2030. This is essentially the same level of estimated new transit trips for the Phase I Metrorail extension to Dulles.
20	Dean & Karen	Cooper	Individual	Support stop at Dale Drive. Live within walking distance to station.	CTRAK	2009-1084	Dale Drive Station	12/10/2009	See Comment # 13
21	Byrne	Kelly	Individual and MPAG Member	There is a need to analyze an aerial alignment in the Silver Spring CBD and also in the Takoma Langley Crossroads area. This alternative has not been examined at the same level of detail as the surface and tunnel options.	Written Statement / Testimony submitted via e-mail - see number 60 below.	N/A	Aerial Alignment	12/10/2009	The staff does not believe an aerial alignment is feasible from a cost standpoint nor desirable from an urban design standpoint. The MTA examined the feasibility of an aerial crossing in the Takoma Langley Crossroads area (it was included as part of the Light Rail and BRT High Investment Alternatives) and found the dedicated lanes on University offered close to the same travel time benefits at much less cost. The City of Takoma Park supports an at-grade Purple Line.
22	Deborah	Vollmer	Individual	The Georgetown Branch Trail is a linear park that needs to be preserved. The plan for two tracks - as opposed to one - will create environmental and safety issues. The Purple Line Draft Functional Plan ignores the BRAC expansion at Naval Medical. Why can't the Purple Line be constructed underground as part of the stimulus program? If funds are not available, a more reasonable approach is to use buses on Jones Bridge Road and/or East West Highway.	CTRAK	2009-1091 and 2009-1095	Future Capital Crescent / Interim Georgetown Branch Trail	12/10/2009	The selected Locally Preferred Alternative is along the Master Plan alignment. This is consistent with the County Council and Planning Board recommendations. Montgomery County has envisioned using the Georgetown Branch rail corridor as a combined rail transit and shared-use path since purchasing the right-of-way from CSX Transportation, Inc. in 1988. In January 1990, the County approved and adopted the Georgetown Branch Master Plan Amendment. This master plan amended a prior Georgetown Branch plan of 1986 and established as County policy the intent to construct, operate, and maintain a trolley and adjacent trail between Bethesda and Silver Spring on the Georgetown Branch right-of-way. A secondary intent was to provide recreational opportunities. While there are trade-offs, the Purple Line will provide a vital east-west transportation link that improves accessibility and mobility throughout the corridor. It increases transportation choices for those who cannot or choose not to travel by automobile and reduces travel times for people living and working within the region. It supports plans for economic development, community revitalization, and transit-oriented development, while providing an alternative to driving which could reduce greenhouse gas emissions. At the same time, the Purple Line project will preserve and complete the Interim Capital Crescent Trail. The Capital Crescent Trail will be paved between Bethesda and Silver Spring, have a minimum width of 10 ft and 2 ft shoulders on either side, and provide connections to existing trails such as the Rock Creek Hiker-Biker Trail and the Metropolitan Branch Trail. The Purple Line project will employ best practices to preserve the tree canopy, reduce noise and visual impacts, and provide safe at-grade crossings. While the trail will be different – there will be fewer trees and tree cover and some homeowners may lose direct access from the property to the trail – the trail will be improved, safe, functional and still very much a resource for the County.

**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments  
Dec 10 through Feb 12**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTRAK #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
22	Deborah	Vollmer	Individual	The Georgetown Branch Trail is a linear park that needs to be preserved. The plan for two tracks - as opposed to one - will create environmental and safety issues. The Purple Line Draft Functional Plan ignores the BRAC expansion at Naval Medical. Why can't the Purple Line be constructed underground as part of the stimulus program? If funds are not available, a more reasonable approach is to use buses on Jones Bridge Road and/or East West Highway.	CTRAK	2009-1091 and 2009-1095	Future Capital Crescent / Interim Georgetown Branch Trail	12/10/2009	Double tracking is necessary to provide more line capacity to accommodate forecast demand, make it much easier to respond to travel time delays created by operating in mixed traffic or non-exclusive right of ways (schedule adherence would suffer with single track segments), and allows for more efficient and cost-effective operations related to emergency responses, preventative and unscheduled maintenance, and other factors like weather, disabled trains, etc. MTA has determined that single tracking will not reduce the loss of trees due to construction staging requirements. Furthermore, there is room for the double tracks according to MTA project engineers. This was acknowledged in the Georgetown Branch Master Plan Amendment. It is true that the trail experience will be different and that the affect of replanting and other mitigation actions will take time.
23	James	Crilley	Individual	Oppose a double track Purple Line because of destruction of linear park, concerns about noise and safety, and additional development at Connecticut Avenue. There are jobs in Prince George's County. The Purple Line project's emphasis on providing access to jobs in Bethesda is exaggerated. We can not afford the Purple Line - it is too expensive. There are significant questions about the ridership estimates.	CTRAK	2009-1095	Future Capital Crescent / Interim Georgetown Branch Trail	12/10/2009	The selected Locally Preferred Alternative is along the Master Plan alignment. This is consistent with the County Council and Planning Board recommendations. Also, see Comment #19 about costs and ridership, Comment #22 about impacts to the Capital Crescent Trail, and Comment #22 about double tracking.
24	Pat	Burda	Town of Chevy Chase	Choosing light rail with its huge price tag limits the state's ability to meet other pressing transit needs. The light rail route completely misses the new Walter Reed National Military Medical Center at Bethesda. There are inaccuracies in the State's analysis of the Jones Bridge Bus Rapid Transit alternative. The Purple Line is incompatible with the trail - over 17 acres of trees will be cut down and the path limited to a width of ten feet where it will share a corridor with trains traveling 45 mph running every 3-6 minutes. The Draft Functional plan is inconsistent with the single track approach of the currently adopted plan. The trail should be on the south side adjacent to the Town as in the initial designs. Why was this changed? We have safety concerns about the planned crossing at Lynn Drive, the width of the trail, and the trail through the tunnel.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Project Overall	12/10/2009	The Staff agrees that additional study is needed to identify approaches to either eliminate or mitigate the hazard created by the at-grade crossing at Lynn Dr. MTA has agreed to work with the Town of Chevy Chase to design a safe at-grade crossing of the Purple Line at Lynn St. They have indicated that both a physical barrier, which forces pedestrians to turn and look in the direction of the tracks, and possibly pedestrian signals, which warn pedestrians that the light rail vehicle is approaching, are examples of steps that could be taken to address this issue. The travel speed for the Purple Line in the westbound direction is estimated to be 40-45 mph at the Lynn St at-grade crossing. Additional discussion of this important issue is presented in the staff memo. Overall, the maximum travel speed is estimated to be nearly 45 mph. Between Bethesda and Silver Spring, the average travel speed -- including stops -- is estimated to be 31 mph and the maximum travel speed is estimated to be 50 mph between Bethesda South Station and the Silver Spring Transit Center. To buffer pedestrians from the light rail vehicle, the 10 ft shared-use path will be separated both vertically and horizontally from the tracks. Horizontal separation will be achieved with a landscaped buffer of up to 11 feet. Vertical separation will also be achieved by elevating the shared-use path and landscaped buffer above the tracks, with a fence between the landscaped buffer and the tracks. The Capital Crescent Trail is located to the north of the Purple Line tracks between Jones Mill Road and Wisconsin Ave due to a more favorable topography that permits the trail to be on average about four feet above the rail along segments where there are no changes in elevation required for transition into a tunnel or underpass without incurring significant additional expense. The staff believes that the MTA was responding in part to stakeholder concerns about the need to provide as much separation as possible between the trail user and the train to improve the trail user experience. The staff also believes that the topography on the south side along the Town of Chevy Chase boundary is such that additional costs would be incurred to construct the trail on the south side relative to the north side. MTA has presented this change at numerous public meetings. Based on policy direction provided by the County Council (see page 7 of the Functional Plan), we intend to seek opportunities to widen the trail to a minimum of 12 ft and a maximum of 16 ft through Preliminary Engineering, where existing right-of-way is available and the cost and loss of trees is not significant.
24	Pat	Burda	Town of Chevy Chase	We think the tracks should extend less than 100 feet into the Woodmont East plaza. We are in favor of grass tracks and are concerned that funding constraints may result in this feature being dropped from the project scope. The Functional Plan does not address how Coquelin Run is to be protected. We do not think the Purple Line will necessarily improve access to jobs at the Walter Reed Annex and we need more information on the transition for passengers to and from the Purple Line and the Red Line in Bethesda. We are concerned about the proximity of the train to Rosemary Hills Elementary School. The general principles as outlined on page 10 of the plan are important. The Town expects the County and State to uphold the promise that the trail will be completed with the Purple Line. In summary, we do not like this transit mode on this alignment and have other serious concerns regarding specific issues raised in the Functional Plan.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Project Overall	12/10/2009	MTA has agreed to investigate the feasibility of shifting the Capital Crescent Trail to the west and aligning with Hanover St to have less of an impact on Rosemary Hills ES. This concept will be refined during the Preliminary Engineering phase. Walter Reed Annex is within 1/4 mile of the nearest station, generally considered a walkable distance. MTA believes it is possible that tracks will not extend more than 100 ft into Woodmont Plaza. It is appropriate to address environmental impacts to Coquelin Run in the FEIS, but not in the Functional Plan.

**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments  
Dec 10 through Feb 12**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTRACK #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
25	Pam	Browning	Save the Trail Coalition	Organization has over 18,000 signatures on petition opposing Purple Line on the trail. The Planning Board has received over 2,000 emails opposing the trail alignment for the Purple Line. The Draft Functional Plan is cursory in content - so much so that it is dishonest by failing to acknowledge the environmental degradation to the trail and adverse impacts to neighboring communities. Draft plan does not mention that double tracking is a change to current plan. Seventeen acres of forest along the trail will be destroyed. The draft plan fails to note County Council's recommendation that single tracking be studied. If we are to have a Purple Line along the trail, we urge the Planning Board to recommend that it be single tracked. Attachments included photos of trail, Analysis report of American Forests, and letter to Federal Transit Administrator Peter Rogoff.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Future Capital Crescent / Interim Georgetown Branch Trail	12/10/2009	The draft plan should be revised to state that the double tracking along the entire segment is a change to the currently adopted plan. The staff recommends that the following footnote be cited at the end of the background section and added to bottom of page 7: "All of the build alternatives examined in the AA/DEIS included a fully bi-directional transitway (two lanes or two tracks) from Bethesda to New Carrollton. This Functional Plan includes that design element. The Georgetown Branch Master Plan - January 1990 - included segments between Bethesda and Silver Spring that were single track segments. The MTA has begun working on mitigation efforts on the trail with the Town of Chevy Chase. Environmental impact and mitigation will also be the focus of the FEIS.
26	Arlene	Bruhn	Individual	Draft Plan does not discuss widespread ecological harm the preferred alignment will cause nor does the plan provide specific mitigation. The proposed alignment will require bulldozing three miles of existing trail and 17 acres of surrounding forest. Trees will not be replanted along a double tracked Purple Line. See page ES 4 of the DEIS. Grass and shrubs will not replace a work-engine forest of 100 year old specimen beech, sycamores, and tulip poplars. Put the Purple Line on or under the street.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Future Capital Crescent / Interim Georgetown Branch Trail	12/10/2009	See Comment #22 (item 2) regarding impacts to the trail. Placing the Purple Line on East West Highway was examined by the MTA and found to be not practicable because of right of way constraints and traffic volumes. Placing the Purple Line in a long tunnel was found to be cost prohibitive.
27	David	Salzman	Individual	The proposed plan works against the County's quality of life and should be modified. The trail should be located on the south side of the tracks. Between Bethesda and Connecticut Avenue, there are far more residences on the south side and they are (on average) closer to the right of way. The support columns carrying East West Highway over the right of way leave more room to the South. But there is no defensible reason derived from engineering why the two tracks cannot be split to pass the supports and still leave the trail to the South.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Future Capital Crescent / Interim Georgetown Branch Trail	12/10/2009	See Comment #24 (item 3) regarding location of the trail on the north side of the tracks to the west of Connecticut Avenue.
28	Mary Anne	Hoffman	Individual	The trail will be destroyed by an ill-conceived transit project. The Draft Plan is embarrassing in the extent it skirts over serious issues of environment, safety and public opinion. The Purple Line plan is unsafe, damages the environment, and ignores public opinion. The State and County cannot afford the Purple Line. We need to remember the efforts of Justice Douglas on behalf of the C&O Canal towpath.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Project Overall	12/10/2009	See Comment #22 (item 2) regarding impacts to the trail. Environmental impact and mitigation will also be the focus of the FEIS.
29	John	Anderson	Individual	The safety of county residents should be a primary consideration before anything is done in this rush to build a Mass Transit Train Line so close to our homes and the Trail. This plan destroys our communities quality of life, safety and cohesion. Do not allow these amendments to the Master Plan. The ridership projections are based upon 2025 not 2012. Far more people would benefit from the Corridor Cities Transitway. Transportation links already exist to Silver Spring, College Park, and to New Carrollton. The Purple Line benefits the developers and not the citizens of the county.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Project Overall	12/10/2009	Safety has been and will continue to be a focus of the planning for the Purple Line. We think there are locations where additional information is needed and we believe the MTA is committed to work with the stakeholders to address the issues through PE and Final Design. Examples include the at grade crossing at Lynn Drive, widening the trail where possible, access at Rosemary Hills ES, Silver Spring International MS, and Sligo ES, and the Green Trail. We do not believe these issues - alone or in combination - form a basis for either rejecting or substantially modifying the current plan. Ridership estimates (for year 2030) indicate that more people will board the Purple Line than the Corridor Cities Transitway. FTA requires ridership estimates to be based on 20 year planning horizons. Residents will benefit from the Purple Line in many ways - one of which is more reliable and reduced travel times to reach major activity centers across the southern segment of the County.

**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments  
Dec 10 through Feb 12**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTRAK #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
30	Terri	Lukas	Chevy Chase West Neighborhood Association	The Association took a position against building the light rail on the trail for a variety of reasons but principally because it sacrifices the trail for an ill conceived mass transit project that will not reduce congestion in our community of Bethesda Chevy Chase. This functional plan does not resemble a plan but is another "PR" piece from the County. The aerial photos are not meaningful. The plan does not reveal how space is to be used to build this project. The trail being elevated in the tunnel over the train is a notorious engineering feature that will result in the trail becoming an obstacle course. The plan is one more deception by the County about this project.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Project Overall	12/10/2009	See Comment #22 regarding impacts to the trail. There are an estimated 19,200 new daily transit trips due to the Purple Line. Many of these trips would otherwise be vehicular trips on congested roadways. While MTA is still studying the vertical clearance in the Wisconsin Ave tunnel, there are likely to be a few locations where the vertical clearance is as little as 8 ft. In general, vertical clearance will be 9-10 ft. AASHTO recommends 8 ft. Regardless, staff acknowledges that this is not an ideal situation, but rather is a tradeoff between the trail user experience and the desire to eliminate an at-grade crossing at MD 355.
31	Peggy	Turnbow	Individual	My home is very close to the trail - the right of way extends into my back yard. That is the way the homes were built back then because no one thought there would be two trains coming through here. Trains running by here every three minutes will ruin my property values and I won't be able to get on the trail. There may be vibrations when the trains pass - in the yard and in the house. Attachment included photo of residence and back yard.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Project Overall	12/10/2009	While some residents living adjacent to the Capital Crescent Trail will no longer have direct access to the trail from their home, access to the trail will continue to be provided by a ramp located on the north side of the trail, just to the west of Edgevale Ct at Sleaford Rd. There is a proposed pedestrian tunnel that connects residents on the south side of the tracks to the Sleaford Rd ramp. Also, the Georgetown Branch right-of-way does not extend into residential property, though in a number of cases fencing has encroached on the public right-of-way. See Comment #22 (item 3) regarding double tracking.
32	Karen	Dietrich	Individual	My house is adjacent to the Capital Crescent Trail and I am opposed to the Purple Line Functional Plan. My opposition is based upon three concerns - the double track will destroy the trail, the cost does not result in any tangible difference in the lives of most County residents (i.e., it will not ease traffic congestion, will have no mitigating effect on the increasing congestion north of downtown Bethesda, at NIH and Naval Medical, and in the corridor along Wisconsin Avenue), and concern over safety.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Project Overall	12/10/2009	See Comment #22 regarding double tracking and Comment #19 regarding additional transit trips.
33	Robert	Curtis	Edgevale Civic Association	The Draft Plan is inconsistent with the single track approach of the adopted plan. Several of our houses are only 20 feet from the right of way. Our properties will lose value and there will be a huge loss of quality of life in our area. We will lose our gates and access to the trail if the train is on the south side of the trail. Architects have fought for centuries to find and design green spaces in dense urban areas. Once you take them out, you don't EVER get them back. People come from all over the region to use the trail. It seems irresponsible to put the Purple Line on the trail when it can be routed to the Medical Center Metro Station. We strongly oppose the Purple Line along the trail and even more as a double track.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Project Overall	12/10/2009	See Comment #18 regarding the preferred alignment, Comment #22 regarding double tracking and impacts to the trail, and Comment #24 regarding location of the trail on the north side of the tracks to the west of Connecticut Avenue.
34	Bonnie	Naradzay	Individual and Member of Carroll Knolls / McKenney Hills Citizens Association	The Draft Functional Plan bears no relation to the Master Plan. There is no room for the double track light rail system. Only private developers will gain from such an unreasonable concept. The trail is important to thousands of multigenerational users. The trail has a precious heritage and legacy. Double tracking will destroy this legacy. The Park and Planning Commission has a responsibility to prioritize preservation of green space for its citizenry. Moreover, the down county area is particularly vulnerable to developers encroachment and haphazard predatory development.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Project Overall	12/10/2009	See Comment #22 regarding double tracking.
35	Ajay	Bhatt	Individual	I oppose this new plan to destroy the Nature Trail and build two train lines. Like the plans before it, this plan revision fails to address many important community concerns and promotes the falsehoods that after repetition, have been accepted by facts by many. There are negative environmental impacts, negative economic impacts, and negative impacts on our quality of life. The two track approach is unacceptable and was not what was proposed when the County bought the land from the railroad. This plan fails to address any sincere mitigation of the environmental devastation that the train line will cause. The cooling effects of evapotranspiration cannot be ignored. This plan lacks a thorough review of the impact of development around the stations. The plan also does not consider the total cost of ownership for a new train system. There is no cost-benefit analysis in the plan. This approach is too costly. We cannot afford this plan. I do not want the county and federal government to use my tax dollars to build and pay for a system that will not pay for itself. Attachments include two pages depicting adjacent residences and trail users.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Project Overall	12/10/2009	See Comment #19 regarding costs and Comment #22 regarding impacts to the trail and double tracking. Environmental impact and mitigation will also be the focus of the FEIS.

**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments  
Dec 10 through Feb 12**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTRAK #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
36	Penina	Maya	Individual	I live with my family in East Bethesda and along with my neighbors are devastated to know that plans to build the Purple Line along the Capital Crescent Trail continue despite the terrible costs to local communities, the environment, and our state budget. The project will divide walkable communities and destroy this treasured park. The financial cost is not justified given the minor reduction in traffic and huge environmental costs - especially when the real need for transportation to Bethesda is a mile north at the expanded NIH/Medical Center campus. A more flexible approach is BRT along the Beltway or Jones Bridge Road. We can connect Prince George's and Montgomery Counties to Northern Virginia. We need to have the same foresight as Justice Douglas when he recognized that the towpath was worth preserving as a park.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Project Overall	12/10/2009	See Comment #18 regarding the preferred alignment, Comment #19 regarding costs and congestion, and Comment #22 impacts to the trail. Environmental impact and mitigation will also be the focus of the FEIS.
37	Rolf	Sinclair	Individual	There are serious shortcomings to the Purple Line plan as it now stands. The first is safety - running it on the surface along the future Capital Crescent Trail will introduce real hazards. Secondly - the MTA has focused on the light rail alternative to the exclusion of any proper study of the transportation requirements of the region. Former Commissioner Wellington questioned in September 2004 why the objectives could not be attained by an improved bus system at less cost and quicker. Thirdly - the plan to accommodate a double track and an adjacent trail is not practical. Neither is the plan to locate the trail over the train in the tunnel under Wisconsin Avenue. Fourth, the ridership estimates are suspect. They were suddenly increased by 50% and the MTA refuses to make public the reasoning and numbers behind this change.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Project Overall	12/10/2009	There will be adequate separation (and a fence) between the trail and the train. Most trail crossings will not be at-grade and those that are will be designed in a manner that - along with train operation - provides for safe crossing and train operation. MTA conducted a robust purpose and need analysis. Other alternatives were examined and found to be problematic from an operational and/or cost effectiveness standpoint - as well as overall project purpose and need. The functional plan and locally preferred alternative largely reflects a plan that is consistent with long standing County policy to develop the Georgetown Branch right of way as a transit facility. In the long term, buses are not the preferred mode for the Purple Line with its numerous connections with Metrorail and alignment that intersects with a high north - south travel demand. We need the increased capacity afforded by light rail cars in this environment. The double tracking and tunnel under Wisconsin Avenue are not without constraints but are doable and reflect trade-offs common in projects of this magnitude. The MTA has explained the basis for the change in the ridership estimate from a couple of years ago. When first published, they did not include passengers that were using both Metrorail and the Purple Line to complete a trip.
38	Bill	Schultz	Individual	I live in Martins Addition and from 1994 to 2000 served at the USDOT as Deputy Director, then Director Public Affairs. The plan for the Purple Line would destroy the trail as we know it today. To justify its \$1.7 billion cost, the supporters have cooked the ridership books. Among the Purple Line supporters is a development corporation for which the line will produce a huge windfall - but the for the neighborhood will result in a congestion nightmare. I cannot recall seeing such a questionable project.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Project Overall	12/10/2009	See response to Comment #22 regarding impacts to the trail. The ridership estimates were developed using land use forecasts provided by local agencies and a methodology approved by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). The MTA project team has been met with the FTA on numerous occasions throughout the Alternatives Analysis / NEPA process. Development proposals within the County are subject to the Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This project is competitive with other LRT projects in the FTA pipeline in terms of cost per mile and estimated ridership - especially when compared to other projects in inner suburb locations. The Purple Line is estimated to result in about the same number of new transit trips on an average weekday in 2030 (compared to the TSM alternative) as the Phase I extension (to Wiehle Avenue) of Metrorail to Dulles for the same year.
39	Julie	Standish	Individual	The Functional Master Plan is inconsistent with the 1990 Master Plan. There are two tracks and the trail is on the north side. I believe the relocation of the trail is retaliation against the Town of Chevy Chase for its opposition to the Purple Line along the Capital Crescent Trail. First we hear that workers from New Carrollton need access to jobs in Bethesda. Now we hear that there isn't enough funding to complete the light rail and that there isn't enough ridership to justify starting in New Carrollton. BRAC will bring increased workers and traffic to an already congested area. The Purple Line will not help the Red Line. The Purple Line is a transportation plan that asks the Bethesda Chevy Chase area to make all of the sacrifices with none of the benefits.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Project Overall	12/10/2009	See Comment #22 regarding double tracking, Comment #24 regarding locating the trail to the north of the tracks west of Connecticut Avenue, Comment #30 regarding a reduction in auto trips, and Comment #18 regarding BRAC.

**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments  
Dec 10 through Feb 12**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTRACK #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
40	Bette	Petrides	Individual	I live in West Bethesda, use the Georgetown Branch, and founder of Citizens for a Better Bethesda. Neither the Draft Functional Plan nor the DEIS adequately address the environmental harm caused by the Purple Line nor mitigation measures needed. The DEIS reference on page E22 (paragraph 10) stating that the Purple Line will take advantage of areas of lowered track and the existence of an embankment to reduce the need for retaining walls is difficult to believe. The potential for increased instability of embanked soil and sediment run-off is significant. I urge the Board to vote for the single track option. There are other problems with this plan - the double tracks extending into Woodmont East plaza, the lack of consideration of the BRAC initiatives, the trail above the train in the tunnel below Wisconsin Avenue, etc. The Purple Line is a train to nowhere for Bethesda and Chevy Chase. The Purple Line should be moved. Failing that, the Purple Line should follow the route of least harm and retain a single track.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Project Overall	12/10/2009	See Comment #19 regarding the preferred alignment, Comment #22 regarding impacts to the trail, Comment #22 regarding double tracking, and Comment #30 regarding the user experience in the Wisconsin Ave tunnel. Also, environmental impact and mitigation will also be the focus of the FEIS. See comment # 24 regarding impacts to Coquelin Run.
41	Susan	Ingram	Individual	I do not have the vision necessary for driving or navigating new or changing environments. The trail is the equivalent for me to a major road for people who drive as I can independently access my community. By moving the rail to the neighborhood side of the trail, I will no longer be able to access the trail safely. Crossing a double track with trains coming in both directions is out of the question for me. The manner in which the Functional Plan implements the project presents an insurmountable obstacle to my mobility. Please reconsider the changes you have made and don't force me to choose between independence and safety.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Future Capital Crescent / Interim Georgetown Branch Trail	12/10/2009	Access for persons with disabilities, including both vision and hearing impediments, is a priority for design of the Purple Line and the Capital Crescent Trail. Through the Preliminary Engineering phase of this project MTA will meet Federal ADA standards by identifying measures that enable persons with disabilities to safely cross the tracks. Potential design features to improve safety may include: yellow tactile strips, channelization, Z gates that force pedestrians to look in the direction of potentially approaching trains, and audible warning devices.
42	Stephen	Seidel	Individual	I am a long time resident of Chevy Chase with a Masters in City and Regional Planning and a law degree. Also have worked for over 30 years in various aspects of environmental protection. The Draft Plan is more public relations than substance. The history of the hearings on page 8 does not discuss the issues that were prominent at those hearings. The vision described on page 9 leaves problems unstated. The illustrations contain idealized caricatures of trains and people coexisting in blissful harmony. High schools kids will have to run across the tracks with a heavy backpack before dawn to get to class before the bell rings - a situation made worse by the unsubstantiated decision to move the tracks to the town-side of the path. Runners and bikers will be laboring along with the summer sun beating down on them because the tree cover has been eviscerated. The trail above the trains in the tunnel under Wisconsin Avenue is a totally unrealistic promise. The fiscal impact analysis should look closely at (1) the huge expense of the light rail system compared to the county-wide transportation needs that could be more cost-effectively served through an extensive bus rapid transit system and (2) the likely economic inefficiencies of operating a single light rail system in the county.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Project Overall	12/10/2009	See Comment #18 regarding the preferred alignment, Comment # 24 regarding the location of the trail to the north of the tracks and at-grade crossings, Comment #19 regarding cost and cost effectiveness, and Comment # 30 regarding tradeoffs in the Wisconsin Tunnel.
43	Veda	Charrow	Individual and MPAG Member	My family has lived in the Town of Chevy Chase for past 21 years. We love the Town because of the canopy of mature trees, especially the Capital Crescent Trail. The trees help protect the Town from the noise and danger of the traffic that surrounds us and they shut out views of the overdevelopment of lower Bethesda that began shortly after we moved in. Facts on the ground have changed radically since the Master Plan for Montgomery County was first created 20 years ago. A more practical western terminus for the Purple Line would be the Medical Center. In addition, the upper part of the Bethesda Business District is very close to the Medical Center and it needs to be developed. The ideas and needs of the residents of the Town were completely disregarded and disrespected. The plans do not take into account the width of the trail. The only vegetation to be planted along the new rail/trail would be shrubbery. Now we have a non-functional Functional Plan. The trains are double tracked and the trail has been moved to the north side without our knowledge. There is no reason for this yet it will increase dangers for the B-CC students and others that take short cuts across the trail. The trains will endanger an irreplaceable linear park. The Town and neighboring communities would bear the brunt of the Purple Line with little evidence that they would benefit, if at all, from its service.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Project Overall	12/10/2009	See Comment # 18 regarding the preferred alignment, Comment #22 regarding impacts to the trail, Comment # 24 regarding location of the trail to the north of the tracks and at-grade crossings, and Comment # 22 regarding double tracking. Based on policy direction provided by the County Council (see page 7 of the Functional Plan), we intend to seek opportunities to widen the trail to a minimum of 12 ft and a maximum of 16 ft through Preliminary Engineering, where existing right-of-way is available and the cost and loss of trees is not significant.

**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments  
Dec 10 through Feb 12**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTRAK #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
44	Harry	Sanders	Individual and MPAG Member	I live in Silver Spring and believe the Functional Plan Draft plan correctly reflects the position of the County Council's unanimous decision last winter as well as the Governor's August decision in favor of the Master Plan alignment and the light rail mode. I want to focus on best practices. I just returned from a trip to France and Spain where I utilized four tram systems. I wish everyone with doubts about the Purple Line could see these systems and realize some perceived issues just aren't problems. I feel we should seek out the affordable best practices when dealing with community and environmental issues. I think the Dale Drive stop should be implemented in the beginning but if not, definitely in a future stage. The Purple Line is a project that is part of a vision for transit friendly walkable neighborhoods with greater access to job and educational choices. It links Bethesda, Silver Spring, Takoma-Langley, and College Park. Attachments include tram photos from Europe with bikers and diners adjacent to tram and grass and tree lined right of way.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Project Overall	12/10/2009	The staff agrees that there are established light rail systems in the United States and abroad that clearly demonstrate the ability to compliment an urban or inter suburban setting characterized by high pedestrian activity, adjacent residential dwellings, and bike/trail users.
45	Yvonne	Finnegan	Individual	I live in Kensington and am here to testify against changing the Master Plan to build a double track light rail along the Capital Crescent Trail. I am a big fan of public transit and would support a project that makes sense like a heavy rail connection underground or along the beltway. The trail is an important component of a healthy lifestyle for many people all over the metropolitan region. The multi uses of the trail are incompatible with the presence of a double track light rail system. It is a given for conscientious urban planners that green space is an invaluable resource. We can put transit in many places. But we have very few beautiful continuous trails like the Capital Crescent Trail.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Future Capital Crescent / Interim Georgetown Branch Trail	12/10/2009	The staff has never questioned the trail as a valuable resource. The Purple Line project involves trade-offs and the plan as proposed is a reasonable approach to insuring east west connectivity down county while continuing to protect open space and agricultural land throughout the County over the long term. See Comment #22 regarding double tracking.
46	Mary	Rivkin	Individual	I live in Battery Park in Bethesda and am here to advocate for children having places to be outdoors. Children need to be outdoors and in nature. The State of Maryland has strongly supported this point with the Governor's 2008 Executive Order on Children in Nature. The Capital Crescent Trail is an irreplaceable contribution to this endeavor - an urban linear park connecting children and families to nature. Montgomery County - especially the lower County, already fails the State standard for open space. More density and infill argue against creating accessible nature places for children. Governor O'Malley has proclaimed an Outdoor Bill of Rights for children. I urge the Planning Board to conserve the Trail and safeguard these rights. Attachment included the Governor's Proclamation.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Future Capital Crescent / Interim Georgetown Branch Trail	12/10/2009	Improving and completing the trail through Silver Spring and connecting the trail to the Met Branch Trail in Silver Spring is a major component of the Purple Line project. Completing the trail and connecting it to a regional network of trails will improve recreational opportunities.
47	Lynda	Williams	Individual	My home abuts the Capital Crescent Trail in Columbia forest. When we bought our house about 18 months ago, many of the things we loved about our house revolved around the trail. All of this will be destroyed by the current proposal for the Light Rail system. Valuable green space will be lost, never to be adequately replaced. There have a lot of attempts to justify the proposed Purple Line in this location but it is simple to us - this is about developers wanting a dedicated rail stop to build the next Friendship Heights in downtown Bethesda and at Connecticut Avenue in Chevy Chase. The relocation of Walter Reed is upon us soon. The transportation needs of all the recovering soldiers and their attending families, not to mention all the jobs that are going to be created there, have been completely dismissed. Bus Rapid Transit would serve the area more effectively. They are less expensive and can be routed to serve targeted locations. It is time for policymakers to stop thinking purple and think green.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Future Capital Crescent / Interim Georgetown Branch Trail	12/10/2009	See Comment #22 regarding impacts to the trail, Comment #18 regarding the preferred alignment, Comment #18 regarding BRAC, and Comment #19 regarding cost and cost benefits. Environmental impact and mitigation will also be the focus of the FEIS. The Purple Line is being constructed for many reasons, including to improve mobility.
48	Aileen	Worthington	Individual	I am a DC resident and a cyclist. I often ride from the bike trail in Rock Creek Park and connect with the Capital Crescent Trail - sometimes continuing to cross one of the Potomac River bridges and connect with the Mt. Vernon Trail. What a treasure this regional trail system is! If the Purple Line takes the CCT route, a long section of the Trail will be unusable for recreational cyclists, runners, and walkers. Including cycling/walking paths fairly close to light rail makes sense when the purpose is to add a path through an existing urban area. With the CCT we are starting instead with a treasured tree lined recreational trail/linear park in an extremely narrow corridor and then actively planning to trash that park like trail when there are other options.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Future Capital Crescent / Interim Georgetown Branch Trail	12/10/2009	See Comment #22 regarding impacts to the trail. The primary advocacy groups for the bicycling community in Montgomery County (MoBikes and WABA) are in favor of the Purple Line because it will provide a minimum width of 10 ft and will provide a paved trail between Bethesda and Silver Spring.

**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments  
Dec 10 through Feb 12**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTRAK #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
49	Barbara	Hankins	The League of Women Voters of Montgomery County, MD, Inc.	Transportation issues have been a focus of League research, study, discussion, and consensus since the early sixties. The League is committed to transportation systems that focus on regional solutions. We also favor transportation services which are made convenient and accessible by minimizing the time required for a trip and which provide frequent and reliable service. The Purple Line Light Rail option meets both of those criteria. We are please to see that the Draft Functional Plan does well in implementing the decision by the Governor to support the light rail option. The League has long been an advocate for strong stewardship of the environment. We recommend a best practices approach in design issues so that the rail and trail work together to benefit both and the neighboring community as well. We urge you to expedite approval of the Draft Functional Plan so that it continues on its path to adoption in the County's Master Plan.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Project Overall	12/10/2009	The staff agrees with these comments from the League of Women Voters.
50	Deborah	Ingram	Individual	I have lived in Chevy Chase since 1987 and my yard abuts the Capital Crescent Trail. I am here to testify against the proposed revision of the 1994 Master Plan as detailed in the Functional Plan which changes the Purple Line from single tracking to double tracking from Bethesda to Silver Spring and moves it from the south side of the right of way to the north side of the right of way between Bethesda and Rock Creek. My family and I use the trail daily for exercise and to navigate around our community. The proposed Purple Line has many problems - (1) selection of the wrong alignment if ridership and public transit is really the goal, (2) destruction of urban forest, (3) loss of irreplaceable urban green space, and (4) loss of the heavily used Capital Crescent Trail. The proposed double tracking has additional negative consequences that have not been adequately addressed in the proposal - safety being the most important. Students want to take the shortest route to cross the trail. Once the train is there, many will continue to cross where they now cross even if it means cutting through any fencing that is in the way. The Town's crossing at the Lynn path will remain open for crossing and it will be dangerous. It will be far more dangerous for these kids to cross two tracks, with trains bearing down at high speed from both directions, than to cross a single track. The trains will be running quietly and kids will not be paying attention. Double tracking makes this more dangerous. The right of way is narrow - too narrow to accommodate double tracks and the trail. Elevating the trail will result in a serious loss of privacy for residents along the upper portion of Elm Street as there will be a need to elevate the trail starting around 44th Street. Attachments include July 8, 2009 article on Baltimore Light Rail accident, May 5, 2009 article on Pedestrian Railway Deaths (as) Recurring Problem in Maryland, and summary of excerpts and links to articles on train accidents and resulting pedestrian deaths and injuries.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Project Overall	12/10/2009	See Comment # 22 regarding impact to the trail and double tracking, Comment #24 regarding the Purple Line travel speed at -grade crossings and location of the trail to the north of the tracks, and Comment #41 regarding provisions for safe at-grade crossings at Lynn Dr. In addition, we recognize that the Capital Crescent Trail is an important recreational and commuting path used by many pedestrians, bicyclists, and others and will make improvements to the trail as part of the Purple Line project. The trail will be paved between Bethesda and Silver Spring and will be a minimum of 10 ft wide.
51	Michele	Horwitz Cornwell	Chevy Chase Land Company and MPAG member	I am Senior Vice President of the Chevy Chase Land Company and a member of the Purple Line Advisory Group over the past two years. The history of transit in the region is entwined with the roots of the Chevy Chase Land Company. In 1890, Senator Francis Newlands of Nevada founded the Chevy Chase Land Company, assembled the land from DuPont Circle to Jones Bridge Road and established a village called Chevy Chase. The Company built the Rock Creek Railway to connect Chevy Chase with the Federal City. At the end of the 7 1/2 mile railway was Chevy Chase Lake where the Company built a power house to run the streetcars, light the streetlamps, and eventually power any homes that were built. It was a visionary investment and now, over 100 years later, we need to stand behind another visionary investment - better east - west transit in this region. The Land Company supports the recommendations of the Draft Purple Line Functional Master Plan as the guiding policy document for implementing the Purple Line. The Land Company still owns the fee simple interest in a substantial portion of the land that comprises the Georgetown Branch right of way. We fully support the use of this right of way, which was created for transportation purposes, for the light rail Purple Line. As well, the Land Company strongly advocates the completion of the hiker biker trail within this same right of way proposed for the Purple Line. The Land Company also supports the recommendation in the Functional Plan for a transit station at Chevy Chase Lake on Connecticut Avenue. How transit oriented redevelopment may occur for this area is not the subject of this Functional Plan but rather will be the subject of a sector plan study in 2010.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Project Overall	12/10/2009	The staff notes and agrees that establishing land use policy along the alignment is not part of a Functional Plan. The primary role of this Functional Plan is to protect the alignment from encroachment.

**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments**  
**Dec 10 through Feb 12**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTRACK #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
52	Anne	Martin	Greater Bethesda Chevy Chase Chamber of Commerce and MPAG member	I am appearing before you today as a past chairman of the Chamber - an organization that represents more 750 member businesses and their more than 45,000 employees. I am also the Chamber's representative on the Planning Board's Purple Line Master Plan Advisory Group. I am here to express our support for the Draft Purple Line Functional Master Plan and the alignment specified therein that was recommended unanimously by the County Council in January 2009 and was announced as the Governor's Locally Preferred Alternative in August 2009. The Chamber has long supported the alignment for transit and trail on the Georgetown Branch right of way as it was recommended in the B-CC Master Plan, Bethesda CBD Sector Plan, and the Georgetown Branch Master Plan for over 20 years, and the right of way was purchased for such purpose. In addition to supporting the vision of the Plan, the Chamber supports the objectives noted for the Bethesda and Chevy Chase stations, the trail, and the transit segments that will provide enhanced travel options and opportunities for targeted growth to prevent sprawl. B-CC has long been the economic engine of the County, however, the missing link for efficiency has always been the east-west transit between the population centers of Montgomery County and Prince George's County. As the Draft Plan states, the Purple Line is a critical long term investment in our master planned transportation infrastructure that will allow the County to remain economically competitive in the region.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Project Overall	12/10/2009	The staff generally agrees with this statement from the Greater Bethesda Chevy Chase Chamber of Commerce.
53	Tony	Hausner	Indian Springs Citizens Association and MPAG member	I am with Indian Springs Citizens Association (ISCA) and two countywide task forces - the Purple Line Bi-county Task Force and the Planning Board's Purple Line Master Plan Advisory Group. The ISCA has 800 homes just inside the Beltway. We voted last year 70 to 3 to support the Purple Line and prefer light rail over bus rapid transit. We support transit solutions rather than highway solutions and we oppose Beltway widening as it will be destructive to our neighborhood and to suburban Maryland. While we support the Purple Line, there are several other important planning considerations. Affordable housing needs to be maintained as best as possible at current levels at all locations along the route. We do not want to see overdevelopment, particularly in residential neighborhoods. The goal of the Purple Line from our view is to provide transportation and transit oriented development, but not to be an excuse to overdevelop the area. We strongly recommend that you support the current route adopted for a light rail system for the Purple Line. Attachment provided of written statement to Planning Board Hearing on Locally Preferred Alternative on January 8, 2009.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Project Overall	12/10/2009	The staff acknowledges that affordable housing has been - and will remain - a critical issue to be addressed in the various station area plans underway (Takoma Langley Crossroads and Long Branch) and planned (Chevy Chase Lake). Relatively recent research suggests that affordable (i.e., competitively priced) housing is an important factor in individuals choosing to reside in mixed use settings that ultimately result in shorter trip lengths and proportionally less trips by auto.
54	Webb	Smedley	Woodside Civic Association	The Woodside Civic Association strongly supports the light rail alternative for the Purple Line. WCA members have twice voted in unanimously in 2003 and 2008 to support joint use of the Georgetown Branch right of way for a light rail line and trail. WCA believes that completion of the Purple Line and Capital Crescent Trail should be the number one transit priority for the County. WCA represents homeowners and tenants living along the CSX right of way between Spring Street, 16th Street, and Georgia Avenue, an area immediately abutting the proposed Purple Line route and the Capital Crescent Trail. We see the project offering enormous benefits including: faster and easier access to destinations both east and west, a quality alternative to driving for Silver Spring residents, a critical new link in the regional rail transit network, and completion and improvements to the Capital Crescent Trail. We urge the Board to forward this functional plan to Council as quickly as possible so that the State will be one step closer to completion of this vital project.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Project Overall	12/10/2009	The staff agrees with these comments from the Woodside Civic Association
55	Kathy	Davies	Individual	I would like to note that the proposed route does not run by my house nor near the house of any of my relatives or close friends. My remarks today are those of a citizen of Montgomery County who is concerned with the common good. The original Master Plan which provided for a single track was bad enough in that it would destroy a much beloved trail and would run trains going 60 mph 30 feet from our citizen's back doors. The proposed amendments take all of the negative features of the Master Plan and builds on them. It takes the single track of the earlier proposal and makes it a double track. It proposes using a pedestrian walkway in the liveliest part of Bethesda as a parking lot for the trains. Transportation belongs on roads not trails. It seems to me there is a determination by this body to have the light rail on the trail without serious consideration of the impact on the community. I urge you to reject the double tracking and not to park trains in downtown Bethesda. I urge your to consider Bus Rapid Transit which would be less destructive, less expensive, and more flexible. Attachment provided of November 27, 2009 article by Charles Lemos on Bus Rapid Transit Systems.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Project Overall	12/10/2009	Staff examined the issue of proximity to the Georgetown Branch right-of-way between the Elm Street Park and Jones Mill Road by examining the number of parcels whose structure closest to the right-of-way fell within 30, 50, or 80 feet from the right-of-way centerline, ignoring for the moment where the train and trail are located relative to one another. The objective was to try and determine if there is any significant difference when comparing the north side and south side. There is no significant difference in the number of parcels when considering the entire segment from Elm Street Park to Jones Mill Road. Within the segment that includes the Town boundary to the south, there are two more single family homes on the south than on the north side but there are more residences (multi-family) on the north than the south and those residences are closer to the centerline.

**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments  
Dec 10 through Feb 12**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTRAK #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
56	Jim	Roy	Individual	I have been a resident of the County for 11 years and live in Chevy Chase. I have studied the Functional Plan and attended hearings over the last few years and have many simple questions and serious concerns. Where is the demand for this light rail? Is \$100 million a mile good use of our taxpayer money? I have not been able to find anyone - after an internet search - who has said they plan to use the Purple Line. I would like to know specifically what will happen at Elm Street Park with respect to access to the trail. Do we have enough money to build the Purple Line and a trail wide enough for 10,000 weekly users? The pictures I have seen show a trail, trains, a buffer zone between the trail and tracks, fully grown trees on either side of both, and no overhead wires. Is this accurate? How can this be when there is just enough room for the mature trees and trail at this point? The Functional Plan shows the trail on the north side of the tracks between East West Highway and Wisconsin Avenue. Residential zoning is on the south side and commercial zoning is on the north side. What prompted the change from the plan I saw months ago?	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Project Overall	12/10/2009	Direct access from the Elm Street Park to the Capital Crescent Trail will be provided. There will be a ramp from the Elm Street Park that will enter the tunnel above the tracks. This concept will be refined during the Preliminary Engineering phase. See Comment #24 regarding the location of the trail to the north of the tracks and Comment #19 regarding costs and ridership.
57	Wayne	Phyllaier	Individual	Those of us living in Woodside, North Woodside, Rosemary Hills, and also the many families living in the apartments and condominiums in the Silver Spring CBD are still waiting for the Capital Crescent Trail after all of these years. A M-NCPPC Department of Parks survey report of 2007 noted that the low use of the gravel trail at Grubb Road strongly supports the need to pave this portion of the trail and complete it to downtown Silver Spring. The Purple Line Functional Plan would give the Capital Crescent Trail to ALL neighborhoods between Bethesda and Silver Spring. The Functional Plan will us all a better Trail - AND better transit. Please endorse it!	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Project Overall	12/10/2009	The staff agrees that completion of the trail through Silver Spring is an important objective of the project.
58	Craig	Simpson	Purple Line Now!	We have reviewed the Draft Purple Line Functional Plan and find it consistent with the decisions of both the County Council and Governor O'Malley. Our organization represents a broad range of diverse interests including major businesses, labor, environmental, municipal, and community organizations. Now, more than ever, Montgomery County needs the Purple Line. Even during the current economic downturn, traffic on the beltway and East West Highway is often at a standstill and our citizens are suffering as a result. We have a great radial rail system. What we need is a quality, light rail line connecting the system. It would be nice if a tunnel could quickly and <u>affordably</u> be constructed for the 16 miles covered by the Purple Line. Unfortunately it can not. Modern light rail lines have proven to be community friendly in cities across the globe. There are now many examples of successful light rail lines operating on grass tracks alongside popular hiker biker trails. Light rail has been specified on the County's Master Plan since 1990 when the Georgetown Branch Master Plan was approved. The adopted plan also specifically states on page 49: "In the event future consideration is given to additional double track section, the existing right of way is generally sufficient with appropriate structural treatment to accommodate the necessary typical 56 foot trolley/trail cross section, except along the Metropolitan Branch section from Talbot Avenue to Silver Spring." PLN supports best practices when dealing with community and environmental issues and we feel grass tracks and the future examination of wireless LRT illustrates the State and County's commitment to addressing community concerns. The Purple Line will be good for Bethesda, good for Silver Spring, and especially good for the University Boulevard corridor where people are suffering as a result of the current recession. We urge you to move this plan forward to the County Council as quickly as possible.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Project Overall	12/10/2009	The staff notes and is in specific agreement with the statement regarding the unlikelihood of funding a tunnel for the entire (or any significant) length of the project as well as the reference to modern light rail having demonstrated its compatibility with community life in many locales.

**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments  
Dec 10 through Feb 12**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTRACK #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
59	Chris	Richardson	Individual, Park Hills Civic Association Officer, and MPAG Member	I am a 10 year resident of the neighborhood adjacent to Wayne Avenue and east of downtown Silver Spring. First with respect to the potential Dale Drive station on page 24, I ask that you <u>keep</u> the language that is in the draft master plan before you and <u>not</u> modify it in any way as to permit such an unnecessary station to be built in the initial construction of the Purple Line, if at all. Second, that you strike the language on pages 23 and 24 regarding the Green Trail, a trail which as it now reads would be a hiker-biker trail, with no separate sidewalk on the north side of Wayne Avenue. In January of this year, the County Council modified a prior Planning Board decision to say that perhaps a Dale Drive station could be built after the Purple Line was constructed and operational. However, now MTA is lobbying the County to permit a station at Dale to be built in the initial construction. In the four mile stretch between Bethesda and the Silver Spring Transit Center there is an average of one station per mile. However, if the Dale Drive station is built, there would be five stations in less than two miles, going east from the Silver Spring Transit Center. The proposed Dale Drive station is in the middle of a single family residential neighborhood with no high density apartment buildings within walking distance of the proposed station that not nearer to either the Fenton or Manchester Place station. Moreover, MTA's estimated boardings for a Dale station is twice what it projects for the Fenton station - number which would appear to be reversed. MTA's proposal to change what the Count previously decided and which earlier MTA has said it agreed with would have adverse impacts on the community: eventual transit oriented development at or near the station, greatly increased noise, greater widening of Wayne Avenue, and the closing of the Wayne Avenue access to the large parking lot of the elementary and middle schools at Dale and Wayne and pushing traffic onto Dale Drive and neighborhood side streets. Regarding the Green Trail, the Draft Plan states euphemistically that the Green Trail on the north side of Wayne Avenue would be "shared use". This means that the ling planned bicycle path would now be changed to hike and bike path with no separate sidewalk. This will change the previous decision of the Planning Board and County to build the Green Trail. Any decision to change this original conception of the Green Trail should happen only after a separate hearing. This is a matter of concern because of due process and safety.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Dale Drive Station and Silver Spring Green Trail	12/10/2009	See Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive Station and access and safety considerations at the Sligo Creek ES and International MS. As you have noted, the Countywide Bikeways Functional Plan indicates that an 8 ft shared use path and a 5 ft sidewalk will be provided on Wayne Ave between Spring St and Sligo Creek. Due to right-of-way constraints, this is being modified as part of the Purple Line Functional Plan process to be an 8 ft shared use path and a 5 ft buffer. Due process is being satisfied by considering this modification as part of the Purple Line Function Master Plan process. It is appropriate to closely space light rail stations in dense locations, such as Silver Spring.
60	Byrne	Kelly	Individual and MPAG Member	The Purple Line is in competition for Federal Funds and it is competitive! Is that all our MTA needs to consider and to design to, and for? At the intersection of New Hampshire Avenue and University Boulevard and at Georgia Avenue, in the heart of the Central Business District of Downtown Silver Spring, the <u>Aerial Alternative</u> has not been analyzed or included in the design and planning processes. We have looked at the tunnel option and found it to be not viable because of costs. When performing "Due Diligence", are we not compelled to by our laws and common sense to look for the most efficient and cost effective solutions to make mass transit rapid transit? The Planning Board and the County Council, and our County Executive must compel the MTA to perform studies of an Aerial Option along the entire Purple Line route.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Project Overall	12/10/2009	The staff does not believe an aerial alignment is feasible from a cost standpoint nor desirable from an urban design standpoint. The MTA examined the feasibility of an aerial crossing in the Takoma Langley Crossroads area (it was included as part of the Light Rail and BRT High Investment Alternatives) and found the dedicated lanes on University offered close to the same travel time benefits at much less cost. The City of Takoma Park supports an at-grade Purple Line.

**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments  
Dec 10 through Feb 12**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTRAK #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
61	Pat	Baptiste	Coalition for the Capital Crescent Trail and MPAG member	Pat Baptiste provided the oral testimony in place of Peter Gray, chair of the Coalition for the Capital Crescent Trail Board. The Coalition spearheaded the effort to have Montgomery County and the National Park Service build the current Capital Crescent Trail including the portion between Wisconsin Avenue and Stewart Avenue over which the Purple Line may one day run. We have also engaged in continuous advocacy efforts to ensure that the Trail is usable and safe for all users, including my personally representing the Coalition on the Purple Line Advisory Group meant to advise this very Board on the Purple Line itself. Unlike every other group on the MPAG, the Coalition did not come into the process advocating a certain outcome with respect to building the Purple Line. Our intent has been all along to represent the interests of all users of the Capital Crescent Trail, regardless of what the Board decides on the overall transportation project. We endorse the Plan recommendations with LRT as the preferred mode. The plan should incorporate the High Investment LRT design for the Capital Crescent Trail through the tunnel under Wisconsin Avenue. The plan should expand the Capital Crescent / Georgetown Branch Trail from the previously planned 10 foot to at least 12 foot paved width with two foot usable shoulders on each side ( as in the trail west of Bethesda Avenue) <b>IF</b> the Purple Line is built along that Trail corridor. The Purple Line must include a Capital Crescent Trail that is completed off directly connecting into the Silver Spring Transit Center and on to the Metropolitan Branch Trail with funding for the Trail assured. Further analysis should be conducted for the Final Environmental Impact Statement to developing design details, not currently included in the Functional Plan, for the Trail, including: detailed plans for all access points, retaining walls and fencing for safety, noise reduction, and privacy, loss of trees and landscaping along the Trail corridor, aesthetic treatments for the bridges crossing Rock Creek, signing and marking along the Trail, bicycle facilities at all Purple Line stations, and a public plaza at the Woodmont East terminus.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	Future Capital Crescent / Interim Georgetown Branch Trail	12/10/2009	We recognize that a 10 foot wide trail is less than ideal for a facility that is as extensively used as the Interim Capital Crescent Trail. Based on policy direction provided by the County Council (see page 7 of the Functional Plan), we intend to seek opportunities to widen the trail to a minimum of 12 ft and a maximum of 16 ft through Preliminary Engineering, where existing right-of-way is available and the cost and loss of trees is not significant. In addition, the Locally Preferred Alternative does recommended using the High Investment LRT design for the Capital Crescent Trail through the tunnel under Wisconsin Ave. <b>2)</b> Staff agrees that a direct connection between the Capital Crescent Trail and the Metropolitan Branch Trail at the Silver Spring Transit Center is vital and that this connection should not require a dismount zone. The design of the connection at the Transit Center should avoid conflicts between trail users and transit passengers.
62	Casey	Anderson	Washington Area Bicyclist Association	WABA strongly supports the locally preferred alternative selected for the Purple Line, including use of the Georgetown Branch right of way for light rail as well as the Capital Crescent Trail. We have three concerns about the functional master plan as it relates to bicycling, primarily concerning the Metropolitan Branch Trail and the Silver Spring Green Trail. The routing of the CCT/Met Branch trails through the transit center is critical. The master plan draft does not address this issue. The functional master plan should make it clear that trail access should be accommodated in a way that avoids creating conflicts between transit passengers in the station area and trail users. In particular, the final design should not call for cyclists traveling on the trail through the station to dismount and walk their bikes for extended distances. If a dismount zone for cyclists is necessary during construction of the transit center, that's fine - but the master plan should make it clear that this is not an acceptable permanent solution. The Green Trail should be at least a full 10 feet in width per AASHTO standards for multiuse paths. It should include a separate bicycle facility (preferably a cycle track or at a minimum a striped bike lane) as contemplated by other master plan documents. The draft Purple Line master plan calls for a narrowing the trail to 8 feet and eliminating the separate bicycle facility. Again, this would invite conflicts between cyclists and pedestrians. It is also unacceptable to build substandard trails where, as here, the trail in question is being constructed from scratch and the right of way is being completely reconfigured. It is important for the Green Trail to be built to AASHTO standards because it will be a link to the Purple Line for residents of surrounding neighborhoods, it will provide a link to downtown destinations, it has been identified as a major regional trail in master plans for several years, and Silver Spring in general lacks a robust network of bike and pedestrian connections. The CCT, Met Branch, and Green Trail designs should incorporate appropriate design features to increase safety. Let's avoid the problems that happened with the Georgia Avenue bike/ped bridge crossing the beltway.	Written Statement / Testimony	N/A	CCT/Met Branch/ Green Trails	12/10/2009	Staff agrees that a direct connection between the Capital Crescent Trail and the Metropolitan Branch Trail at the Silver Spring Transit Center is vital and that this connection should not require a dismount zone. The design of the transit center should avoid conflicts between trail users and transit passengers. Staff agrees that a 10 ft width for the Green Trail is preferable and we will seek opportunities to increase the width from 8 ft when possible. Staff agrees that design considerations are an important part of providing a safe trail experience. This includes providing call boxes, adequate sight distance, and sufficient lighting. In addition, the Functional Plan should note that the Purple Line can leverage bicycle facilities to increase station "catchment areas" by providing secure bicycle parking at each station.

**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments  
Dec 10 through Feb 12**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTRAK #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
63	Joseph	Lavorgna	MCPS - Facilities Management	Mr. Lavorgna is Acting Director of the Montgomery County Public Schools Department of Facilities Management. With respect to Rosemary Hills Elementary School, MCPS staff is concerned that the Purple Line alignment will have a negative impact on the school site, as it will reduce useable area that is already constrained in size. The proposed alignment located the hiker/biker path on the south side of Talbot Avenue, necessitating the relocation of the street very close to the school building. To lessen the impact to Rosemary Hills Elementary School, we propose that the hiker/biker trail alignment be revised to show the proposed pedestrian bridge crossing the CSX railroad tracks further west towards the terminus of Hanover Street. With respect to Silver Spring International Middle School and Sligo Creek Elementary School, the plan calls for closing an entrance on Wayne Avenue that serves Sligo International Middle School and installing a new entrance on Schuyler Road. This proposal is unacceptable as drawn for it will concentrate all vehicular traffic, both private automobile and school bus traffic, to one location causing safety concerns for the 1,500 students and staff at both facilities. We request that alternative entrances be investigated to provide safe and improved traffic circulation. In addition, the proposal to locate a station near the intersection of Dale Drive and Wayne Avenue poses a possible safety concern as there is the probability that state and students will be tempted to cross mid-block to access the station platform. Consideration should be given to installing acceptable barriers along the hiker/biker trail along the Wayne Avenue frontage.	Letter to Chairman Hanson	2009-1108	School Access	12/14/2009	See Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive Station and access and safety considerations at the Sligo Creek ES and International MS and Comment #24 regarding at grade crossings. Also, MTA has agreed to investigate the feasibility of shifting the Capital Crescent Trail to the west of Rosemary Hills ES and aligning with Hanover St. This concept will be refined during the Preliminary Engineering phase.
64	Marilyn	Mazuzan	Individual	I decided not to testify as I was under the impression that this was an opportunity for general testimony. I would appreciate it if each Commissioner was given a copy of my testimony. I live in Bethesda. Since I do not live in the Town of Chevy Chase and do not play golf you cannot label me as a NIMBY. I am however a trail lover and have been for many years. My husband and I loved to walk the trail together and often took one of grandchildren with us. I still walk the trail as it is a place where I can be in touch with nature and still feel safe walking alone. I have concern for the owners of the properties I can see from the trail. The original BRAC intersections improvement plans took away a slice of my front yard to widen Oakmont Avenue. That part of the plans has been eliminated for which I am very grateful. Many trees will be lost because of this proposal to build the Purple Line. We need to give another look at bus rapid transit. There are new more efficient models out there such as the ones now serving Cleveland and Los Angeles. Given the economic conditions of all three governments involved, the least costly alternative needs to be given a through review. Attachment included - article by Lauren Gravitz from Onearth (winter 2010) on bus rapid transit.	Letter	N/A	Project Overall	Dated 12/10/2009 and Received 12/15/09.	See Comment #22 regarding impacts to the trail and Comment #18 regarding the preferred alignment.
65	Jonathan	Jay	Individual	I have served on the Planning Board's Purple Line MPAG and am also Vice President of Seven Oaks Evanswood Citizens Association which represents approximately 700 households directly to the northeast of the Silver Spring CBD. The majority of the community most directly impacted by the planning of Purple Line surface route through downtown Silver Spring and along Wayne Avenue through the residential neighborhood favored a tunneled route not a surface route for that segment. As serious as we believe those consequences area, we would hope that the County and State would not make any additional decisions which would compound rather than mitigate problems for the community. Therefore I ask that you consider this testimony in that context. The "potential" Dale station is addressed on page 24 of the Draft Plan you are considering. That draft retains the County's decision earlier in 2009 - namely, that a Dale Station, if built at all, would not be included in the initial construction of the Purple Line. I ask that you retain this language and resist any efforts to dilute it that in any way would permit a station to be built prior to the completion of the Purple Line and the initial operation of the 16-mile system. Only single family residences and a handful of small multi-family residences on the east side of downtown Silver Spring and east of Sligo Creek Park that are not nearer to another station (Fenton/Silver Spring Library and Manchester Place) are within reasonable walking distance (1/4 mile as defined by the MTA) of a Dale station. On pages 23 and 24 of the Draft it is stated that there will be a "shared use" Green Trail. nowhere does it state what 'shared use' is or that the separate sidewalk will disappear. The shared use refers to what will be a hiker biker trail. This will be one of the few, if any, hiker / biker trails on a major residential road that is also used to access downtown. It will create major safety hazards for both pedestrians and bikers. I urge you to strike all mention of the Green Trail in the Functional Master Plan or at least take out anything which would mean that it is clearly going to be merged with the sidewalk into a hiker/biker trail.	CTRAK	2009-1109	Dale Drive Station and Silver Spring Green Trail	Dated 12/16/2009 and Received 12/21/09	Staff disagrees that the Green Trail should be eliminated due to safety concerns. While it is preferable for shared-use paths to be located along roadways that have a low density of intersections and driveways, most of the driveways are single-family residences that will generate only sporadic conflicts with bicyclists. We recommend amending the text on page 24 as follows: "The Silver Spring Green Trail is a shared use path on the north side of 2nd Avenue and Wayne Avenue, accommodating bicyclists, pedestrians, and other users on a path that is separated from vehicular travel lanes by a landscaped panel." See the staff memo for the 03/04/10 work session for additional discussion on the Silver Spring Green Trail. The staff 's position on the Dale Drive station is that the MTA has not to date presented enough compelling data to recommend a change in the County Council position. We question whether the station would actually have double the boardings of a Fenton Street station. We also think the MTA needs to continue to work with the community and MCPS on access issues to the school property - both with and without and with a potential station. From the staff's perspective, the community remains divided on this issue.

**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments  
Dec 10 through Feb 12**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTRAK #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
66	Kristin	Schneeman	Individual	I and my family are residents of East Bethesda and we are passionately concerned about preserving the environmental resource that is at the heart of our neighborhood, the Georgetown Branch Trail. The stated purpose of this Functional Plan is to update the 1990 Master Plan. That is no minor matter, considering how significantly the scope and scale of the project have grown over the last nearly twenty years, and the detail provided in this Functional Plan does not remotely seem to do the task justice. The Plan does not make clear the trolley was originally intended to run on a single track, an egregious omission in my view. The right of way in many places where I live in East Bethesda is simply too narrow to accommodate two trains and the promised trail. The Functional Plan table describing the right of way requirements in my area are completely unenlightening as to whether additional right of way will be required, which as a homeowner abutting the trail is of serious concern. The state has insisted in all the community briefings that I have attended that additional right of way will not be required; this document appears to hint that that may not be entirely accurate. I was dumbfounded by the Plan's accounting of the environmental benefits of the project, which essentially consisted of grass tracks. As the costs of the project continue to escalate many of us in the community fully expect the things being offered up as benefits go by the wayside, including the grass tracks, the attractive landscaping and fencing. Perhaps even the trail itself. The state claims this project is important for smart growth. An absolutely ironclad principle of smart growth in urban area is the preservation and enhancement of green space for environmental benefits, recreation, community space, and habitat for plants and wildlife. This project will result in the permanent loss of thousands upon thousands of mature trees and wreck a precious environmental resource.	CTRAK	2009-1105	Future Capital Crescent / Interim Georgetown Branch Trail	Dated and Received 12/17/09	The draft plan should be revised to state that the double tracking along the entire segment is a change to the currently adopted plan. The MTA has begun working on mitigation efforts on the trail with the Town of Chevy Chase. Environmental impact and mitigation will also be the focus of the FEIS. The staff has reviewed the plans developed by the MTA and believes some limited amount of additional right of way will be required to construct pedestrian access ramps at Pearl Street and near the Riviera Apartments. The staff has never questioned the trail as a valuable resource. The Purple Line project involves trade-offs and the plan as proposed is a reasonable approach to insuring east west connectivity down county while continuing to protect open space and agricultural land throughout the County over the long term.
67	Carol	Roberts	Individual	I hope in light of the dire financial deficits of METRO, to say nothing of the millions of dollars the County and State need for crucial services, plans for the most expensive alternative to solving east-west traffic will be abandoned. If ever there was a time to ignore the plea for more offices and stores it is now.	CTRAK	2009-1113	Project Overall	Dated 12/20/2009 and Received 12/23/09	See Comment #19 regarding cost. The most expensive alternative (LRT High) was not selected.
68	Pamela	Kurland	Individual	I am writing to urge you to minimize the damage to the Crescent Trail - it is an invaluable resource to our community and the drawings of the Purple Line that have seen thus far would severely limit our family's and community's ability to use the trail.	CTRAK	2009-1113	Future Capital Crescent / Interim Georgetown Branch Trail	Dated 12/17/2009 and Received 12/23/09	See comment #22 regarding impacts to the trail.
69	Catherine	Pickar	Individual	I am in favor of having mass transit on the trail, beginning in Bethesda and traveling to College Park and beyond. In addition to the advantages of having mass transit (other than buses on our already crowded roads) having a way to get to University of Maryland other than in a car would open up an invaluable cultural and academic resource to the citizens and students, both high school and college. Although it is true that the character of the trail would change, we would still have a trail. I am a biker and a walker and I love the trail.	CTRAK	2009-1113	Project Overall	Dated 12/17/2009 and Received 12/23/09	We agree.
70	Nancy	Ridgway	Individual	I am a Montgomery College nursing student who lives in Kensington and attends classes at the Takoma Park campus. I have been attending classes part time at Takoma Park for almost three years. I drive the East West Highway back and forth between Takoma Park and Bethesda at all times of the day and evening. I wish I could bring all of you with me on my commutes. I have no problem driving East West Highway at any time because there is so little traffic! The thought of spending all that money and ripping down all those trees is extremely surprising to me. I would be really interested in seeing the projected ridership for the Purple Line. Please reconsider the Purple Line.	CTRAK	2009-1113	Project Overall	Dated 12/17/2009 and Received 12/23/09	See Comment #22 regarding impacts to the trail, Comment #19 regarding congestion and ridership projections. There is a high volume of vehicles traveling on East-West Highway (MD 401). Approximately 27,000 vehicles used East-West Highway per day in 2008. This is projected to increased to 33,000 by 2030.
71	John	Mutzberg	Individual	I live next to the trail in Bethesda and consider it a valuable asset to our county. While I recognize the need for mass transit and offering ways to connect the municipalities in our vast area, I also see the green spaces disappearing faster and faster. I am also concerned that the cost will far outweigh any benefit to the citizens other than to a few developers who will gain zoning exemptions to expand their properties. Please consider the expanded bus routes for Bethesda at least in the short term until it can be proven that destroying the trail is really justified.	CTRAK	2009-1113	Project Overall	Dated 12/17/2009 and Received 12/23/09	See Comment #22 regarding impacts to the trail, Comment #19 regarding cost benefits, and Comment #18 regarding the preferred alignment.
72	Reid	Lewis	Individual	I strongly favor mass transit so it pains me to say that I strongly oppose the Purple Line as proposed. As I told Roger Berliner a few years ago "there are many roads - there is only one Crescent Trail - put the Purple Line on a road!" My favorite route is elevated down the middle of the beltway or perhaps down the middle of 410.	CTRAK	2009-1113	Project Overall	Dated 12/18/2009 and Received 12/23/09	See Comment #22 regarding impacts to the trail and regional benefits and Comment #18 regarding the preferred alignment.

**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments  
Dec 10 through Feb 12**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTRAK #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
73	Lloyd and Diane	Eisenburg	Couple	This lovely setting (Crescent Trail) is threatened to become a bus/train line to satisfy the rapid movement of east-west Montgomery County travelers. First the cost to destroy and secondly, the cost to construct ugliness - all this dressed in the guise of moving people from east to west and west to east. In 20 years when the rusted remains of the purple line is torn up to create playgrounds and parks, another act of foolish planners will be pondered by those in the third quarter of the 21st century. The second thing that most Americans want after a home is a car - any thought that a rapid transit line running between College Park and Bethesda will replace this American dream is the city planners constant fantasy.	CTRAK	2009-1113	Project Overall	Dated 12/18/2009 and Received 12/23/09	See Comment #22 regarding impacts to the trail.
74	Barry	Miller	Individual	I wish to register my strong opposition to the Current Purple Line Master Plan for installing light rail along the popular Capital Crescent Trail. Add bus rapid transit to Jones Bridge Road and/or a Purple Line route along the beltway. Do not bulldoze this valuable green, quiet corridor that is peacefully used by bike commuters, pedestrians, and for recreation.	CTRAK	2009-1113	Project Overall	Dated 12/18/2009 and Received 12/23/09	See Comment #22 regarding impacts to the trail and Comment #18 regarding the preferred alignment.
75	Debra	Turkat	Individual	My husband and I are frequent users of the Crescent Trail. Every week, more than 10,000 walkers, runners, and bikers from all over the region use the Capital Crescent Trail. Hundreds of children and teens use the Trail every week to get to Bethesda Chevy Chase High School, Westland Middle School, the Jane Lawton Community Center, and to visit friends, for exercise, recreation, and to hang out. It's easy to see that the Purple Line doesn't belong 10 feet from the Capital Crescent Trail and a few feet from homes along the Trail. Please act wisely - put transit elsewhere to preserve the Capital Crescent Trail as this region's Central Park - so that we and generations to come will be able to enjoy this beautiful, safe, irreplaceable green space, regardless of the growth and development that takes place around us.	CTRAK	2009-1122	Future Capital Crescent / Interim Georgetown Branch Trail	Dated 12/24/2009 and Received 12/28/09	See Comment #22 regarding impacts to the trail and Comment #18 regarding the preferred alignment.
76	Jay	Nijjer	Individual	Signed e-mail above from Debra Turkat	CTRAK	2009-1122	Future Capital Crescent / Interim Georgetown Branch Trail	Dated 12/24/2009 and Received 12/28/09	
77	Judy	Tso	Individual and MPAG Member	These plans are in theory designed to make sure we have a well thought out transportation project that would meet the area's transportation needs, adequately assess benefits and costs and prove to be wise investment of limited funds. Unfortunately, this plan does not meet these criteria. It does not openly and accurately address the implications of changing from one track to two tracks. It does not address the implications of preserving the trail along the light rail and what that actual cost will entail and who will pay for the construction costs. If the cost of the trail is not included in the total cost of the project, then the costs underestimated and therefore are inaccurate.	CTRAK	2009-1099	Future Capital Crescent / Interim Georgetown Branch Trail	Dated 12/10/2009 and Received 12/11/09	See Comment #22 regarding impacts to the trail, Comment #22 regarding double tracking, and Comment #19 regarding costs. Please note, the cost of constructing the Capital Crescent Trail are included in the cost current estimates for the Purple Line (\$1.57 billion in 2009 dollars).
78	Richard	Ullman	Individual	I do not see explicit accommodation for the present pedestrian use of the trail. Pedestrians enter the current path from several points between Connecticut Avenue and Jones Mill Road. When light rail is installed, these entryways will likely be cut off by safety fencing. In Chevy Chase Lake, a supplement/alternative to the Purple Line route for pedestrian and bicycle use could be developed using existing wooded conservation areas. The Bethesda/Chevy Chase Master Plan shows an <b>20-year old proposal for a sidewalk or path in parcel C10</b> . Indeed there exist unofficial and untended trails that follow parts of this route today. These paths would be cut off by the Purple Line plans. A route through C10 with enough width for a walking and bicycle use would indeed provide the benefits noted in the 1990 plan and also could provide the start of a reasonable alternative to the existing Capital Crescent Trail use. Such a route could be <b>extended parallel to Chevy Chase Lake Drive through the existing woods, perhaps along the stream banks in parcel C9. A wide sidewalk along the southern side of Chevy Chase Lake Drive right-of-way could connect to the Georgetown Branch (Capital Crescent) trail at Connecticut Avenue</b> . A trail could reasonably link to the Rock Creek trail. The current walking and biking facilities along Jones Mill Road are quiet unpleasant and unsafe. A safe path could be installed in the parkland on the east side of Jones Mill Road.	CTRAK	2009-1120	Future Capital Crescent / Interim Georgetown Branch Trail	Dated 12/24/2009 and Received 12/28/09	Some of the access points will be cutoff when the Purple Line is constructed. The proposed path is more appropriate for the Chevy Chase Lake Master Plan that is slated for FY11.

**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments**  
**Dec 10 through Feb 12**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTRAK #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
79	Gary	Stith	County Executive	As noted in the February 2, 2009 joint letter , the draft should specifically list these additional analyses and identify the right-of-way issues associated with each as something to be accomplished during preliminary engineering: <b>(1)</b> Examine the feasibility of using hybrid light rail vehicles that do not require wires, poles, and electrical substation. <b>(2)</b> Identify more access points to the Capital Crescent trail. <b>(3)</b> Maximize the retention of existing trees in the corridor. <b>(4)</b> Investigate surface LRT operations in Silver Spring to ensure safe operation with respect to pedestrians and vehicular traffic. <b>(5)</b> Study pedestrian, vehicular, LRT operations in Silver spring, including vehicle queuing, on-street parking operations, and the design for the Green Trail. <b>(6)</b> Develop detailed designs for the Capital Crescent Trail that include access points, retaining walls, security and fencing, landscaping, aesthetic treatments for new bridges, signing and markings, bicycle facilities at station, and the public plaza at the Woodmont East terminus. <b>(7)</b> Prepare a phasing plan along University Blvd. that identifies how LRT implementation will be coordinated with the wider master plan typical section. <b>(8)</b> Provide continuous sidewalks and/or shared use paths on both sides of roadways that carry the Purple Line alignment; and <b>(9)</b> Include mitigation strategies for wetland, parkland, wheel squeal locations, historic resources, and Parks Department Brookfield Road Maintenance site. Please consider the following comments to include in the plan.	CTRAK	2010-0001	Overall Project	Dated 12/20/2009 and Received 1/04/10	The staff agrees and will add these nine items identified in the joint letter.
79	Gary	Stith	County Executive	<b>Department of Transportation:</b> The Plan should identify feasible locations for electrical substations along the LRT route and specifically how they will be accommodated along the Capital Crescent Trail and the East Silver Spring segments. How will kiss-and-ride be accommodated such as size, location, traffic concerns, pedestrian safety, and quality of sidewalks, and bicycle facilities? Remove operational issues from the plan such as one-way street and on-street parking. Can identify potential cross-section issue may exist and will have to be coordinated with appropriate agencies. <b>Department of Police:</b> Interagency Working Group is needed especially to coordinate handling vehicular/pedestrian conflicts and training for first responders. <b>Department of Libraries:</b> Bonifant Street one way eastbound with parking on south side to be reviewed before a final decision is made to include this recommendation. If Bonifant is to be one-way, it should be studied by MCDOT to see what is the most appropriate direction for making it safe and convenient for the public. <b>Department of General Services:</b> The impacts on parking and driveway access in the commercial areas are of critical importance to the businesses in Silver Spring. The Plan should emphasize the need for these details to be addressed in the final design of the Purple Line. If parking must be removed from a commercial street, then it may be necessary for off-street public parking to be provided. Loss of parking can have severe economic impacts on businesses that depend on public parking. Need to address the importance of maintaining access to businesses for loading and parking via drives and alleys. this access should be maintained for left turns, particularly into high-volume entrances such as the Whole Foods Market off of Wayne Avenue. The impact of parking by transit riders on neighborhood streets should be reviewed around stations located in residential areas.	CTRAK	2010-0001	Overall Project	Dated 12/20/2009 and Received 1/04/10	The staff does not agree that the Functional Plan should identify locations for electrical substations or other specific facility supporting infrastructure unless the MTA can identify that need at this time. We will review this issue with the MTA to determine if there is any reason at this stage in the planning to believe that additional area outside of the already identified right of way requirement will be needed. The Functional Plan includes right of way requirement for the track, trail, trail access, immediately adjacent pedestrian paths, station platforms, and yard and shop facility. The Functional Plan does not identify specific areas for kiss and ride locations, bicycle storage, etc. In many station locations, this detail of planning is being undertaken as part of related development applications, on-going facility planning or supplemental studies, station area master planning, etc. The staff believes it is important to provide as much flexibility as possible in the planning of specific supporting infrastructure and design elements. Identifying specific features and locations beyond that already known could introduce constraints to better design in the future. One example is in Bethesda where DOT and WMATA have a study underway on access at Elm Street . There are active station area planning efforts underway in Takoma Langley and Long Branch and there will be another effort underway at Chevy Chase Lake. There has been considerable progress in coordinating key design features with development applications (Woodmont East as an example) and mandatory referrals (Silver Spring Transit Center). There are some station areas (Lyttonsville, 16th Street, and Manchester Place) where additional general narrative on the station area amenities could be included. Finally, the staff agrees that any references to operational issues (traffic flow, etc.) should be highly qualified and clearly identified as being subject to review by the respective operating agencies.
80	Wayne	Phyllaier	Individual	Having a single track section will have an almost insignificant benefit for users of the future CCT. But it would severely hurt the performance of the Purple Line. Please do not allow the Master Plan and the Purple Line preliminary design be disrupted by this bad idea. (1) The near track impacts the trail user and not the second track. (2) Single-track will not provide a wider separation distance between the trail and the near track. (3) Two tracks and the trail must fit through the Bethesda Tunnel, regardless of any decision about single tracking between stations. (4) The single-track would only be along a short part of the trail. Single-track would spare only a few trees. Even one short single-track section will put severe constraints on the operation of the transit system. Trail users do not want to cripple transit for insignificant trail benefits.	CTRAK	2010-0002	Future Capital Crescent / Interim Georgetown Branch Trail	Dated and Received 1/04/10	The staff does not support single tracking for the Purple Line. The scope of the project is different now than it was when the Georgetown Branch Master Plan was adopted. The project now extends east of Silver Spring along a segment that does not have an exclusive right of way and is subject to conflicts with north - south traffic and other potential delays. The alignment now connects with Metrorail in four locations - not two and also serves the Takoma Langley Crossroads area. We believe double tracking is necessary in this environment for operational and capacity reasons.
81	Leeann	Irwin	Individual	Endorse the use of "best practices". The inclusion of the Rail and Trail is also a positive addition to plans.	CTRAK	2010-0003	Project Overall	Dated and Received 1/04/10	We agree.

**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments  
Dec 10 through Feb 12**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTRAK #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
82	Pat	Baptiste	Individual and MPAG Member	(1) It would be useful if each illustration in the Plan had a caption—either as to what part of the country/world the light rail illustrations come from, or where exactly along the alignment each illustration lies. Also, many of the illustrations are duplicate (compare pp 10 & 25, 4 & 19, 2 & 11). (2) Every change to an existing Master Plan or Sector Plan should be specifically stated. For example where this plan calls for double track but the Bethesda-Chevy Chase Plan and the Georgetown Branch Master Plan Amendment call for single track, the change and its implications should be addressed and necessary changes to language in each should be spelled out. Similarly, this plan has the trail twice cross over the track to achieve the placement on the north side of the tracks but the Georgetown Branch Master Plan Amendment does not, this plan needs honestly to explain the change from the earlier Plan's call for a south-side track and this Plan needs to discuss the significant implications of this change. (3) There needs to be a glossary of terms to avoid confusion. For example, the Plan should explain the distinction between a shared right of way, dedicated lanes, and exclusive lanes for the rail tracks.	CTRAK	2010-0007	Project Overall	Dated and Received 1/06/10	The staff agrees that captions and the source or credit for each illustration should be added and that duplicate illustrations should be eliminated. Staff also agrees that the plan should state the alignment includes double tracking and that this is a change from the adopted plan where certain segments between Bethesda and Silver Spring were single track segments. The staff does not agree that the Functional Plan needs to include a discussion of implications or impacts of changes. The detailed discussion of the impacts is included as part of the DEIS and FEIS. Staff agrees that the existing Glossary is not really a Glossary and one should be added that includes definitions for technical terms used in the Draft Plan.
82	Pat	Baptiste	Individual and MPAG Member	Specific suggestions: (1) Page 5: the first paragraph should be removed. It is unnecessary, meaningless and untrue as the Plans' recommendations violate the unique character of the "local community" between Bethesda and the CSX main line, and between Silver Spring via Wayne Avenue to Sligo Creek. (2) Page 7: paragraph one—change "parallel" to "on top of" and in paragraph two—amend the language to reflect the fact that this functional plan amends both the B-CC Master Plan, the Georgetown Branch Master Plan Amendment and the East Silver Spring Master Plan. Also, the Plan should make clear that its recommendations set the stage for additional density in both existing and future plans when read in conjunction with the Growth Policy and the pending CR Zone. (3) Page 7: Under <i>Background</i> add language to show that the County purchase of the Georgetown Branch was from the DC Line to the CSX Main Line and that the potential of a trolley-trail was not limited to the Bethesda to Silver Spring portion of the Georgetown Branch now serving as the interim Capital Crescent Trail. (4) Page 7: Under <i>Background</i> add language to show that the County purchase of the Georgetown Branch was from the DC Line to the CSX Main Line and that the potential of a trolley-trail was not limited to the Bethesda to Silver Spring portion of the Georgetown Branch now serving as the interim Capital Crescent Trail. (5) Page 7: Under <i>County Council Policy Direction</i> , bullet 4, clarify that the 12 foot paved trail must also have, on either side, two-foot soft shoulders clear of benches or plant material. (6) Page 8: In discussing the MPAG, please include the information that the Group was deeply divided with the majority of the Chevy Chase and Silver Spring community representatives strongly opposed to the staff position on the recommended alignment. (7) Page 9: Under <i>Vision</i> , change "by building on" to "drastically altering the character of" (8) Page 9: Under <i>Diversity</i> include the affordable housing element under every link; add access to recreation centers (Lawton Center, Caufield Center, other?) where appropriate; add housing access at Lyttonsville; add shopping and entertainment to both Bethesda and Silver Spring.	CTRAK	2010-0007	Project Overall	Dated and Received 1/06/10	Staff does not agree that the introductory paragraph on page 5 should be eliminated. This paragraph simply defines a plan in its broadest context and informs the reader who may not be familiar with planning or the planning process. Staff would recommend changing the description to adjacent to the trail or within the Georgetown Branch right of way. We do not recommend "on top of" as that descriptive phrase would be more applicable to the segment in the tunnel under Wisconsin Avenue where the trail is "on top of" the train. Staff agrees that in the second paragraph on page 7 that the additional plans should be listed. The staff agrees that a general statement on setting the stage for additional density or Transit Oriented Development at selected station areas is something that could be added to Table 1 for segments where that is known to be the case. Staff does not agree that there is a need to document that the potential for a trolley trail extended west and south of Bethesda to the DC line. There is no adopted County plan that contemplated a trolley on this segment. Staff agrees that the bullet 4 statement on page 7 should be changed to include reference to the two foot shoulder on either side of the 12 feet of pavement. Staff does not agree that a summary of the various positions of the members of the MPAG on any of the many issues examined should be included in the Functional Plan. The staff has in the past noted in staff memos that the MPAG was unable to reach consensus on a number of issues. Staff does not agree that "drastically altering the character of" should be inserted into the first paragraph under the "vision" section on page 9. The Purple Line is consistent with adopted plans. The staff agrees that the proposed changes (comment 8) on page 9 should be made.

**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments  
Dec 10 through Feb 12**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTRAK #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
82	Pat	Baptiste	Individual and MPAG Member	(9) Page 9: Under <i>Design</i> remove reference to Woodmont East as the tail tracks in the Plan actually reduce the amount of open space that will be available there. (10) Page 9: Under <i>Environment</i> : o Remove reference to sprawl prevention. There is no basis for this statement as growth promoted in Bethesda by the Purple Line is not linked to reduced development in any other area. o Consider the negative environmental impact of grass tracks. Recently the Zoning Advisory Panel was advised that pesticides and nutrient load make urban grass plots no longer desirable. o The maintenance yard location has negative environmental implications—this area is next to the Rock Creek and there have been chemical and oil spills from other industrial uses there in the recent past. o The rail alignment east of Silver Spring, where there is no exclusive lane for the rail, has negative effects on the traffic capacity of all roads sharing the rail right of way. The plan should admit this impact. (11) Page 10: Last paragraph, first section: change “updates prior planning efforts” to “amends existing Master Plans” (12) Page 10 Under <i>Light Rail as the Mode</i> section, eliminate the first three bullets and add at the end of the first sentence “it was chosen by the Governor” (13) Page 10: There is no reason to limit the length of the platform for the rail line. If such impacts were important then the BRT would have been selected. (14) Pages 12 and 13: Additional illustrations are necessary to show the trail over the light rail line in the tunnel, crossover of the trail over the rail line at the east end of the tunnel, the passage of the rail and trail under the overpass supports at East-West Highway, the Lynn Drive at grade crossing, and the crossing of the trail over the rail line and under Jones Bridge Road. (15) Page 14 Under <i>Capital Crescent Trail</i> : Bullet three: the width of the paved trail should be a minimum of 12 feet at all points. The next bullet should keep the trail on the south side of the tracks as required in the Georgetown Branch Master Plan Amendment and by reference in the Bethesda-Chevy Chase Master Plan.	CTRAK	2010-0007	Project Overall	Dated and Received 1/06/10	Staff agrees that the wording under "Design" related to Woodmont East should be deleted. The staff does not agree that the statement referring to the prevention of sprawl should be removed. We believe well designed and affordable TOD does help reduce sprawl. The staff is proposing revised wording when referring to grass tracks. See Comment #12. The staff does not agree that wording related to the yard and shop environmental impact and traffic flow east of Silver Spring are issues to be addresses in the Functional Plan. These are issues that are addressed in the DEIS and FEIS. Staff does not agree that the first three bullets under Light Rail as the mode should be eliminated. These are some of the generally accepted major reasons that the Planning Board, Council, and Governor endorsed light rail. The staff does not agree that reference to the platform length is not needed. One of the reasons for selecting LRT was the increased capacity that is afforded by the trains that are longer than a bus. The staff generally agrees that additional illustrations at key locations would be beneficial. We are working on developing additional images that might be useful. Staff agrees that wording on the trail width should be consistent with the wording as approved by Council. Staff has conducted an inventory of the parcels along the trail and has determined that there is not a compelling reason to revisit the issue of which side of the right of way the trail should be located on in the area between Bethesda (Pearl Street) to the County Club (see Comment #55). The staff will also review this issue with the MTA Project Team and MDOT.
82	Pat	Baptiste	Individual and MPAG Member	(16) Page 14 &15: All ramp access points should be illustrated and identified on the maps as to location. (17) Page 17 The Plan calls for a separate rail bridge and trail bridge over Connecticut Ave with an elevated station platform on the east side of Connecticut Ave (illustration needed here) but it is silent as to the connection between the platform and the elevated trail section. The plan needs to make clear that there will be a connection between the two at the station platform level.	CTRAK	2010-0007	Project Overall	Dated and Received 1/06/10	The staff agrees that trail access points should be generally identified on the maps in some fashion.
83	Nelson	Zaldivar	Individual	Save the trail. Do not put the Purple Line beside the Capital Crescent Trail.	CTRAK	2010-0029	Future Capital Crescent / Interim Georgetown Branch Trail	Dated 1/08/10 and Received 1/11/10	The selected Locally Preferred Alternative is along the Master Plan alignment. This is consistent with the County Council and Planning Board recommendations. One improvement will be to pave the Capital Crescent Trail.
84	Hans	Riemer	Individual	Support the Purple Line Functional Master Plan as it has been drafted. Happy about choices to optimally integrate the Purple Line into existing neighborhoods and downtowns as well as the Metropolitan Branch and Capital Crescent Trail. I have reviewed so many intriguing photos of existing LRT here in the US and globally, and I am always inspired to see the trains running at grade at right amidst pedestrians and shoppers, hikers and bikers, seniors and families with strollers, trees and grass, and of course cars. LRT can activate the street and provide a real boost to community life. The Purple Line ROW along the Georgetown Branch train corridor was purchased by the County explicitly for use as a transportation corridor that could serve pedestrians and hikes, bikes and transit -- together. A high quality LRT is indisputably the best transit option to balance the interests of these different users. It will also significantly improve the safety of the trail on the Silver Spring side, where today the trail is only a bike lane on busy streets, including street-light crossings at several dangerous state-highway intersections. While I am an advocate of bus transit and bus rapid transit, I do not think it is appropriate for the Purple Line and have no room to grow. There is also a powerful economic argument for using the highest-quality LRT. A few generations ago, planners looked decades down the road and built a Metro system that could foster stronger communities and a sustainable growth strategy for the region. It has worked, masterfully. But it also is near its limits in terms of capacity, and adding Metro lines to all of the routes where high-capacity transit is needed would be cost-prohibitive. LRT (with some supplements from BRT) is the answer.	CTRAK	2009-0060	Project Overall	Dated 1/17/10 and Received 1/19/10	Staff agrees that light rail provides users with a high-quality experience.

**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments**  
**Dec 10 through Feb 12**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTRAK #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
85	Veronique	Kessler	Individual	As you can see from the article in the Baltimore Sun, the dangers of bisecting communities with a double traced Purple Line will be very significant. You need to know that like this teenage girl that was killed lately, the young people from my town and from Bethesda on the other side of the Capital Crescent Trail are very used to cross the trail to go to their school (Bethesda Chevy Chase High School for example), to visit their friends on the other side of the trail, to go to the Sport and Health Club which stands along the trail, to go to Church on East West Highway. My own boys, my husband, and myself are walking along the trail for our pleasure as well as for our many errands and weekly activities in the neighborhood. We are crossing the Trail all the time, and have been doing it for a very long time. The Purple Line project, if it materializes, will force young people and adults like me to cross train tracks to go back and forth to schools, community centers, stores, the metro, fitness centers, churches and friends homes. If the Purple Line project is maintained and implemented, it will without any doubt significantly increase the risks that our community face in our daily lives and errands. Sooner or later our community will be hurt by these risks. They will materialize and may easily turn into deadly casualties given the heavy vicinity traffic that has existed and will persist along and across the trail. Make no mistake. We will resent that responsible representatives for ever for having supported the LRT Purple Line project because we feel that will terribly affect the daily lives in our quiet, friendly, peaceful, green community.	CTRAK	2009-0060	Future Capital Crescent / Interim Georgetown Branch Trail	Dated 1/18/10 and Received 1/19/10	See Comment #24 (item 1) regarding at-grade crossings.
86	Noel	Guerrero	Individual	I currently reside in the Calverton subdivision of Silver Spring. I am glad the deadline for public comments have been extended as I would like to provide my feedback on the Purple Line. The current plan does not include an option for those who reside off the Route 29 corridor. Currently, the only option available to residents and commutes alike is the Park and Ride lot off of Tech Road and Old Columbia Pike intersection, with limited spaces of up to 130. By 7:30 am on a regular weekday is already filled to capacity. The commute from as far back as Briggs Chaney Road to downtown Silver Spring can take up to 1 hour. This is preposterous considering the distance between downtown Silver Spring and Cherry Hill Road is a grand total of 6 miles. The current buses that service the area, also become caught up in traffic, hence discouraging the use of transportation as the detour to service apartments in the White Oak subdivision. I feel a stop at this Park N' Ride would be most beneficial and use for all county and state tax payers, as quite a bit of people commuting from far beyond Baltimore utilize this route.	CTRAK	2010-0064	Parking	Dated and Received 1/19/10	We will be conducting a corridor study that evaluates transit needs in the US 29 corridor.
87	Craig	Simpson	Purple Line Now!	Additional comments related to the Planning Board hearings regarding the use of double tracking along the Georgetown Branch ROW and its effects on transit operations since this was an issue raised during the public hearing. At issues is a 4.4 mile ROW commonly known as the Georgetown Branch. The original plan for returning this railroad ROW to rail service called for single-track trolleys to run between Silver Spring and Bethesda. The use of double tracking is consistent with the 1990 Georgetown Branch Master Plan, which states in part, "In the event future consideration is given to implementing additional double track sections, the existing ROW is generally sufficient with appropriate structural treatment to accommodate the necessary typical 56-foot trolley/trail cross section...". At the time, Montgomery County Councilmember Isiah Leggett opposed the use of single track because, "It would have taken forty-three minutes with single-track [there] and back. If you're on the platform in Silver Spring the train just left, that's forty-three minutes you have to wait." While one could quibble with Leggett's figures, the point is that delays while waiting for one train to pass through the single track section are inevitable - particularly when train spacing is fairly tight. Most single track systems have operated at headways of 15 minutes or greater. In the 20 years that have passed since LRT was first selected to run along the alignment, the concept for a transit line has been extended from Silver Spring to New Carrollton and the number of passengers anticipated has also increased by growth in population and density along the corridor. The line would provide vital transportation connection between the two spokes of the Metrorail Red Line and the Metrorail Green and Orange Lines. In examining the single track issue for the Montgomery County Council, the MTA finds that, "Current projects indicate that Medium Investment LRT alternative would have a peak hour, peak direction load of some 2,200 to 2,300 passengers per hour while operating on a headway or minimum interval of 6 minutes with two-car trains." The Transportation Research Board notes: "Single-track sections with two-way operation will typically be the capacity constraint when they are present." The same paper analyzed the impact of single tracking along a 3,500 foot section between the Columbia Country Club and Pearl Street:	CTRAK	2010-0070	Double Tracking	Dated and Received 1/20/10	Staff agrees that double-tracking is necessary to accommodate forecast demand, provide reliable service to passengers, reduce cascading delays due to operations in mixed traffic, and to permit track maintenance during daylight hours.

**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments**  
**Dec 10 through Feb 12**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTRAK #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
87	Craig	Simpson	Purple Line Now!	<i>"With a top speed of 45 mph, the one-way running time between Bethesda and Connecticut Avenue would take two minutes. To this must be added a minimum allowance of 60 seconds in order to clear the interlocking, throw the track switch over and verify its position, and clear the interlocking for operation in the opposing direction. Based on this, train intervals shorter than seven minutes would be precluded, higher than the planned six-minute peak headways. Even with this seven-minute headway, there would be a margin for error. This would be true even if the train ready to enter the single track had its doors closed, ignored intending passengers wanting to board, and left the instant that the signals cleared. With a minimum headway of seven minutes, only eight trains would run between Bethesda and Connecticut Avenue in the peak hour. This would be a reduction in passenger-carrying capacity of 20% from the planned six-minute headway." The MTA analysis also noted that service delays elsewhere on the line would have further impact to the single track segment. The MTA analysis also noted that maintenance on a single track section would require shutting down operations on the section of the ROW. MTA further concluded that few trees would be saved in the corridor by the narrower ROW used by single track because of the need for construction equipment mobility would remain largely the same. Other systems that implemented single tracking usually did so to cut initial construction costs by eventually ended up installing double tracks for most of the systems at a greater cost with more disruption than it would have to install a double track system initially. The MTA paper says, "Four cities in the United States, San Diego, Portland, Sacramento, and Baltimore, constructed their original LRT lines with single-track segments. This was done to save construction funds because of then-existing budgetary limits. In each of these cases, the headways originally operated were in the range of 15 minutes. Indeed, Baltimore was required to lengthen its headways to 17 minutes to accommodate the operating limitations of its multiple single-track sections. In all four cases the operational and service limitations of single-track were recognized early. These limitations are: 1. Longer travel times - this is due to the need to wait for trains in the opposing direction 2. Less frequent service -</i>	CTRAK	2010-0070	Double Tracking	Dated and Received 1/20/10	We agree.
87	Craig	Simpson	Purple Line Now!	<i>Eventually in all four cities, funding was provided to add the second track for most of their route mileage. The additional cost required to double-track those portions was greater than the amount saved initially. In addition, the service disruption had significant adverse impacts to passengers. In the case of Baltimore, the decision was made to close the entire line to allow for faster reconstruction despite the inconvenience to passengers. Because of additional neighborhood impacts along the alignment (since the new tracks were closer to residences) the project created strong community opposition. New environmental analysis was required, further adding to the time and the expense. The closing service resulted in substantial loss of ridership that was not recovered for several years. The closing of the service created a perception of unreliability that was hard for the MT to dispel. The additional cost was far higher due to the escalation of costs, including the not insubstantial mobilization cost. During the closing of the service the MTA still had infrastructure maintenance costs for the tracks and overhead wire system despite the fact the project generated no revenue." In closing, there is overwhelming evidence that single tracking along the Georgetown Branch ROW would cause significant service issues. The draft Purple Line functional plan addresses the treatment of issues surrounding double tracking in a fundamentally sound way and should be approved.</i>	CTRAK	2010-0070	Double Tracking	Dated and Received 1/20/10	We agree.
88	Carole	Brand	Individual	We are residents of the Bethesda-Chevy Chase area writing in support of passage of the Purple Line Functional Master Plan as drafted. We are all supporters of the broad vision approved by the Planning Board, adopted by the County Council, and submitted by the Governor as the LPA to the FTA. We support the LRT mode along the Metropolitan Branch alignment. The LPA will preserve the Capital Crescent Trail as a local resource, allow 60,000 to 70,000 riders to use the Purple Line daily, and reduce pollution such as greenhouse gases from car emissions. The Functional Master Plan is an important document because it sets out many of the details necessary to making the Purple Line work as intended. The details include: establishing specific stations locations; setting goals for the types of vehicles to be used, including a long term vision for trains without overhead wires; and setting the specific ROW available and needed for each sub-segment of the line. As residents from the Bethesda-Chevy Chase area, we are particularly interested in the sub-segments in our communities. We believe the Functional Master Plan does a good job of balancing the needs of the Purple Line and the surrounding areas, including a minimal impact on downtown Bethesda by restricting tail tracks extending into Woodmont Plaza and using the planned Bethesda South Metro Entrance. We also commend the Planning Board for supporting use of two separate crossings at Connecticut Avenue, allowing safe trail access, efficient rail travel, and not adversely affecting traffic flow on Connecticut Avenue.	CTRAK	2010-0071	Project Overall	Dated and Received 1/20/10	Staff agrees that the Purple Line Functional Plan requires many trade-offs. We will continue to look for opportunities to mitigate the concerns of residents through the use of best practices.
88	Mark	Brown	Individual	See Carole Brand comments 88	CTRAK	2010-0071	Project Overall	Dated and Received 1/20/10	See response to Comment # 88.

**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments  
Dec 10 through Feb 12**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTRACK #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
88	Harry	Freeman	Individual	See Carole Brand comments 88	CTRACK	2010-0071	Project Overall	Dated and Received 1/20/10	See response to Comment # 88.
88	Lucy	Freeman	Individual	See Carole Brand comments 88	CTRACK	2010-0071	Project Overall	Dated and Received 1/20/10	See response to Comment # 88.
88	Margaret	Greene	Individual	See Carole Brand comments 88	CTRACK	2010-0071	Project Overall	Dated and Received 1/20/10	See response to Comment # 88.
88	Eliot	Greenwald	Individual	See Carole Brand comments 88	CTRACK	2010-0071	Project Overall	Dated and Received 1/20/10	See response to Comment # 88.
88	Judith	Hallett	Individual	See Carole Brand comments 88	CTRACK	2010-0071	Project Overall	Dated and Received 1/20/10	See response to Comment # 88.
88	Sally	Hart	Individual	See Carole Brand comments 88	CTRACK	2010-0071	Project Overall	Dated and Received 1/20/10	See response to Comment # 88.
88	Matt	Herrmann	Individual	See Carole Brand comments 88	CTRACK	2010-0071	Project Overall	Dated and Received 1/20/10	See response to Comment # 88.
88	Alminia	Khorakiwala	Individual	See Carole Brand comments 88	CTRACK	2010-0071	Project Overall	Dated and Received 1/20/10	See response to Comment # 88.
88	Sarah	Morse	Individual	See Carole Brand comments 88	CTRACK	2010-0071	Project Overall	Dated and Received 1/20/10	See response to Comment # 88.
88	David	Kathan	Individual	See Carole Brand comments 88	CTRACK	2010-0071	Project Overall	Dated and Received 1/20/10	See response to Comment # 88.
88	Marc	Korman	Individual	See Carole Brand comments 88	CTRACK	2010-0071	Project Overall	Dated and Received 1/20/10	See response to Comment # 88.
88	Rebecca	Korman	Individual	See Carole Brand comments 88	CTRACK	2010-0071	Project Overall	Dated and Received 1/20/10	See response to Comment # 88.
88	Adam	Luecking	Individual	See Carole Brand comments 88	CTRACK	2010-0071	Project Overall	Dated and Received 1/20/10	See response to Comment # 88.
88	Tom	Manatos	Individual	See Carole Brand comments 88	CTRACK	2010-0071	Project Overall	Dated and Received 1/20/10	See response to Comment # 88.
88	Dennis	McGuire	Individual	See Carole Brand comments 88	CTRACK	2010-0071	Project Overall	Dated and Received 1/20/10	See response to Comment # 88.
88	Milagros	McGuire	Individual	See Carole Brand comments 88	CTRACK	2010-0071	Project Overall	Dated and Received 1/20/10	See response to Comment # 88.
88	Cathy	Pickar	Individual	See Carole Brand comments 88	CTRACK	2010-0071	Project Overall	Dated and Received 1/20/10	See response to Comment # 88.
88	Fred	Sand	Individual	See Carole Brand comments 88	CTRACK	2010-0071	Project Overall	Dated and Received 1/20/10	See response to Comment # 88.
89	Amy	Finnegan	Individual	I am writing as one of the many thousands of gravely concerned trail users and Montgomery County citizens who stand in the firm opposition to destroying the beautiful and environmentally critical Capital Crescent Trail in order to make it part of the Purple Line. As an environmentalist, I support public transportation and smart growth -- but NOT at the price of deforestation, noise pollution, and loss of precious -- forever irreplaceable -- green space in urban communities. It has been demonstrated that the best, most economically feasible and all-round constructive way to address our public transportation needs are to create a metro loop tunneled underground, or a LRT along the Beltway from Silver Spring to Bethesda Medical Center. This approach is the one recommended by WMATA staff. Transit can be replotted and planned -- by these 17 acres of wildlife habitat, and century old trees, that sustain the physical, emotional, even spiritual health of hundreds of thousands of people -- cannot be "redone". Once destroyed, it is gone forever. "Growth" that destroys is not smart. A plan to help the environment by destroying the environment does not make sense. A plan to provide public transport (train) by sacrificing less - impact public transport (feet and bikes) does not make sense.	CTRACK	2010-0073	Future Capital Crescent / Interim Georgetown Branch Trail	Dated and Received 1/22/10	See response to Comment # 22 regarding impacts to the trail. We disagree that LRT along the Beltway or a metro loop tunnel would be the best way to address the stated purpose and need of the project. MTA conducted a robust evaluation of alternatives in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments**  
**Dec 10 through Feb 12**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTRAK #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
90	Joanne	Rood	Individual	<p>The County's Master Plan currently calls for a rail on the north side of the Capital Crescent Trail (CCT) ROW and a trail on the south side. The MTA has proposed placing the Purple Line rail on the south side of the ROW and a trail on the north side from Bethesda to some point east of Connecticut Avenue, at which point the proposed rail would be back on the north side of the County's ROW. The MTA's proposal, thus, would require amending the County's Master Plan. For the reasons set forth below, the Planning Board needs to closely scrutinize the MTA's proposal and should take a position on the alignment issue that balances the interests of future trail users with those of individuals and organizations owning property near the ROW. The MTA's current position on trail alignment is based solely on the interests of future trail users, each of whom will use the trail no more than a few hours a week, and gives absolutely no regard to property owners who will have to live with the rail/trail 24 hours a day, seven days a week. The MTA's reasoning for placing the trail on the north side of the ROW is to maximize the trail-user experience. The natural topography of the ROW allows a trail on the north side to be higher than the rail bed, which the MTA claims would create an enhanced trail experience. It also claims that placing the trail on the north side permits more separation between the trail and the rail, thus allowing more plantings between the two than if the trail is on the south side of the ROW. The MTA's proposed is based solely on concerns for trail users, and it totally ignores the concerns of homeowners who reside along the ROW. The ROW's topography is such that if the trail were placed on the north side of the ROW, the homes to the north of the ROW would have a natural buffer between them and the train (i.e., essentially an earth berm) and the homes to the south would have the trail as a buffer. If the rail is placed on the south side of the ROW, the homes to the north would have both a natural buffer and a trail between them and the rail, while the homes on the south side have no buffer. The only thing the MTA plans to do to protect these homes to the south is to create a four-foot sound wall -- period. The MTA claims that noise is not an issue because they have a report stating that the train noise will be between only 46 and 54 decibels. Unfortunately, the MTA's noise report does not withstand even a modicum of scrutiny.</p>	CTRAK	2010-0073	Future Capital Crescent / Interim Georgetown Branch Trail	Dated and Received 1/22/10	<p>The Purple Line Functional Plan is the process by which the County's master plan is amended. However, we will state that the trail location to the west of Jones Bridge Rd is a change from previous master plans. We recommend adding the following footnote to the bottom of page 14: "The Capital Crescent Trail is located on the north side of the Georgetown Branch right of way between Bethesda and a point just west of Jones Mill Road. This is a change from the Georgetown Branch Master Plan Amendment of 1990 where the trail was on the south side of the right of way along this segment." Our analysis shows that there is not much difference between the number of residential structures that are affected by locating the trail to the north or south of the tracks. At a 30 ft distance it appears that more dwelling units would be affected if the tracks were located to the north of the trail, given the location of the Riviera apartment building and the adjacent townhomes. In addition, see Comment #24 regarding the location of the trail. MTA's noise evaluation was based on guidelines from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). See response to Comment #125 for additional responses regarding noise.</p>
90	Joanne	Rood	Individual	<p>First, it does not take into account noise from brakes and wheel squeaking as trains round bends, and it assumes each train will always be in mint condition. Second, it does not take vibrational noise into account, which cannot be controlled by wheel guards or four-foot sound walls. Such noise can be controlled only by structural amenities, such as earth berms or the trail, being placed between the trains and adjacent property. Third, the noise report measures the ambient noise in my neighborhood at 60 decibels. According to witnesses, this noise reading was taken during the middle of the day, from the top of poles, with construction noise going on nearby. The ambient noise in my neighborhood during the day, at ground level, typically is lower than 60 decibels, and it is significantly lower than 60 decibels late at night. I think federal guidelines require noise from transportation projects to be no more than 15 decibels greater than the ambient noise when the projects run near places in which people sleep. If that is the criteria, the ambient noise needs to be measured during sleeping hours, and the true noise from the trains (including the vibration noise) needs to be compared to the sleeping-hour ambient noise. The State and the County want to run a high speed rail up to 22 hours a day within a few feet of people's bedrooms. You MUST perform a high quality noise study to determine the noise level these residents will be subjected to at all hours of the night. Such a study also should consider the noise affect on adjacent properties for both a trail on the north side of the ROW and a trail on the south side of the ROW. Only if such a study is done, can you truly understand the effect of the trail alignment on the adjacent property owners. Also, trail users still can have an enhanced trail experience with the trail on the south side of the ROW. In fact, the MTA originally designed the trail on the south side. Such a trail would be elevated above the trains, as dirt would be moved to create an earth berm on top of which the trail would sit. The only "detriment" (if you want to call it a detriment) to the trail users is there would be less separation between the trail and the trains than there would be with a north side of the trail, thereby allowing for fewer flowers and shrubs to be planted.</p>	CTRAK	2010-0073	Capital Crescent / Georgetown Branch Trail	Dated and Received 1/22/10	See above.

**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments  
Dec 10 through Feb 12**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTRAK #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
90	Joanne	Rood	Individual	Such a solution would benefit all concerned -- it would allow the trains to run between the earth berms on each side, thereby protecting ALL property owners, and would allow trail users to walk on an elevated trail. There is another alternative, which would allow the trail to be on the north side of the ROW and yet still protect the south side residents. That alternative is to build an earth berm between the rails and the south side residents. Such an earth berm likely would mean eliminating a couple of feet of width from the north side trail, but it would provide much needed protection for the south side residents. Again, though, everything is a balancing act -- the future trail users are not the only stakeholders here. This alignment issue is a policy issue to be made by the Montgomery County planning Board. It is not a decision to leave to engineers and other technical professionals. The engineers and the technical professionals, left with no policy guidance, will create a plan that considers only the rail and trail users. It is up to those individuals who are directly answerable to the public to make this important policy decision and to weigh the concerns of all stakeholders. I would think the last thing you would want to do is needlessly erode your lucrative tax base in these well-established neighborhoods through which the trains will pass. You would be derelict in your duties not to attempt to preserve, through minor concessions to trail users, these quiet, family-oriented neighborhoods that make our County so livable. Construction costs would be marginally higher because dirt would be moved to build up the trail on the south side, but such a construction maneuver is extremely common in the building of transportation infrastructures.	CTRAK	2010-0073	Capital Crescent / Georgetown Branch Trail	Dated and Received 1/22/10	See above.
91	Jennifer "Saraswati"	Moulden	Individual	Please preserve the CCT and Georgetown Branch Trails. At this point, the Trail is public transportation. Many bikes use it daily to commute to and from work. I personally use it to commute to a class I teach at Georgetown University. Putting a trail next to the Purple Line LRT is not a viable solution. The point of using the trail is to be in nature, and to not have to be on the street with cars and pollution that endanger our safety. It provides valuable green space in a place where there is overpopulation and pavement everywhere. No one will want to use a trail next to a LRT, with most of the trees cut down. If we wanted to go alongside moving vehicles, we would walk or bike along the street. There are plenty of streets for us to take that lead directly to the city (Bethesda or DC). I live with a 2 year old and her mother, and the child loves to walk on the trail. It gives her access to nature which she would not otherwise have, living in East West Highway. The trail is important to our mental health. we live in a high stress, urban environment and having green space provides the relaxation and improved health for Bethesda Chevy Chase, and DC residents. Please save the trail, and consider putting the Purple Line on Jones Bridge Road where the natural environment will not be destroyed. This is not an issue of NIMBY; it is an environmental, public health and safety issue.	CTRAK	2010-0078	Future Capital Crescent / Interim Georgetown Branch Trail	Dated and Received 1/25/10	See the response to Comment #22 regarding impacts to the trail. We understand that the trail experience will be different but also believe that usage of the trail will remain, especially as the surface will be paved.

**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments  
Dec 10 through Feb 12**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTRAK #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
92	Susan	Andrea	Individual	Lives in downtown Silver Spring along Wayne Avenue. The majority of our residential neighborhood favored a tunneled route, not a surface route, for that segment. I hope that the County and State will not make any additional decisions that will exacerbate, rather than mitigate, problems for the community. Don't build a stop at Dale Drive. The most sweeping and irrevocable adverse impact of building a stop at Dale Drive could be nothing less than a total change in the character of our quiet, single-family home neighborhood. I believe the so-called "smart growth" strategy of encouraging denser development near transit stops would be used to justify zoning changes that would radically alter our currently viable and desirable neighborhood. Why else would a stop at Dale Drive be proposed if not to promote new and denser development? It certainly cannot be justified in terms of ridership from the neighborhood as it exists today. MTA projects that there would be 1,400 daily boardings at a Dale Drive station. That number would mean twice as many riders as MTA has projected for the Fenton Street/Silver Spring Library station, which is very unlikely. The number of Purple Line daily station boardings at Dale Drive is more likely to be between 200 and 300 - much too small a number to justify a stop in an area where there will be another nearby stations. Only <u>four</u> passengers board the Ride On #15 bus at Dale Drive on Wayne Avenue during morning rush hour, and there are very few boardings at nearby stops. The neighborhood near Dale Drive is one of the <u>least</u> densely populated residential neighborhoods along the entire Purple Line. Most of the relatively few multi-family dwellings in this area are closer to either the Fenton/Silver Spring Library station or the Manchester Place station than to the proposed Dale Drive stop. MTA has projected that there would be several hundred more daily boardings at a Dale Drive station than at the Manchester Place station just to the east of Sligo Creek Parkway. Since Manchester Place is in an area that has many high-rise apartment and condo buildings, unlike the Dale Drive neighborhood, surely there would be far <u>more</u> passengers boarding at Manchester Place than at Dale Drive. Even without a Dale Drive station, there will be five stations in the just more than two-mile stretch of Silver Spring from the Silver Spring Transit Center to Gilbert Street in Long Branch (near Piney Branch and University Boulevard). This is more than in any other comparable segment of the 16-mile route.	CTRAK	2010-0094	Dale Drive Station	Dated 1/28/10 and Received 1/29/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.
92	Susan	Andrea	Individual	Some other impacts of a Dale Drive station on the community would be: <b>1)</b> Widening of Wayne Avenue at Dale Drive even more than the proposed widening without a station, and for a significant section Wayne would be as wide as Colesville Road. This greatly widened segment of road would be directly in front of both an elementary school and a middle school. <b>2)</b> Closure of Wayne Avenue entrance to the large parking lot of Sligo Creek Elementary School and Silver Spring International Middle School, with traffic diverted to Dale Drive and neighborhood side streets behind the schools. <b>3)</b> Westbound traffic on Wayne going toward downtown Silver Spring would be prohibited from turning left onto Dale Drive (toward Piney Branch Road) while a train is in the Dale Drive station. This will hinder residents' access to their neighborhoods. <b>4)</b> More impervious surfaces (hardscaping) will increase the threat to Sligo Creek from storm water runoff and erosion. In light of the lack of ridership and the negative impacts on the neighborhood, I must ask why a Dale Drive stop is even being considered. The only reason I can see is an unstated, unacknowledged, undiscussed, and undeclared plan to greatly increase the density of this area in the name of "smart growth". Such a far-reaching change should be discussed openly, not put into effect through the back door by building a Dale Drive station, then using it as the justification for radically changing the character of the surrounding neighborhoods. What is your position on building a Purple Line stop at Dale Drive?	CTRAK	2010-0094	Dale Drive Station	Dated 1/28/10 and Received 1/29/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.
93	Sylvana	Ehrman	Individual	Susan Andrea's message (above) echoes my views as well as my wife's. Please copy us on any response you send Ms. Andrea, as we (along with other neighborhood residents) intend to follow this issue closely.	CTRAK	2010-0104	Dale Drive Station	Dated 1/28/10 and Received 2/2/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.

**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments  
Dec 10 through Feb 12**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTRAK #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
94	Andy	O'Hare	East Bethesda Citizen Association	<p><b>1) Location of the Trail:</b> The trail should run along the north side of the ROW, as presented in the Plan as proposed by the MTA in the AA/DEIS, released for comment on Oct. 17, 2008. The placement of the trail on the north side of the ROW will facilitate a grade separation between the trail and the adjacent transitway, significantly enhancing the safety of persons using the trail and providing for a much more satisfying trail experience, generally. EBCA is strongly opposed to any suggestions for moving the trail to the south side of the ROW (as has been discussed by the Town of Chevy Chase). Such a move would sacrifice the very important safety features provided by the grade separation, which is much desired by EBCA residents, and all trail users for that matter. <b>2) Trail Access from East Bethesda:</b> EBCA strongly supports the construction of the two trail access points proposed in the Plan, including access points from the north and south sides of the ROW at Sleaford Road and the access point at Kentbury Way/Kentbury Drive. <b>3) Width of the Trail:</b> The Plan envisions a trail ten feet wide with two foot soft shoulders on each side. EBCA does not believe that this design will be adequate to accommodate the complex mix of trail users. Alternatively, we recommend a paved trail surface width of at least twelve feet. <b>4) Funds for Construction and Long-term Maintenance of the Trail:</b> While not a specific design feature outlined in the Plan, EBCA remains concerned generally about the lack of clear sources of funding (from either the county of the state of Maryland) for either the construction or perpetual maintenance of the trail surface and associated landscaping, lighting, access paths, among other features. <b>5) Transit Surface:</b> EBCA endorses the proposal to use grass for the transitway surface. We note, however, that the funds necessary to maintain the surface in perpetuity needs to be incorporated into any final operating plan for the Purple Line (see trail funding concern above). <b>6) Catenary Wires:</b> Overhead catenary wires should be avoided at all costs. The electric supply for the rail cars should be placed underground or at the surface, if such an arrangement can be designed safely.</p>	CTRAK	2010-0127	Capital Crescent / Georgetown Branch Trail	Dated and Received 2/9/10	These comments are generally consistent with the Draft Plan. The staff acknowledges the importance of identifying the specific funding sources. It is expected that the MTA will be providing additional information on project funding as part of the "New Starts" submittal to FTA later this year.
95	Harry	Sanders	Individual	<p>Extended comments from Dec. 10, 2009 hearing. <b>Myth 1:</b> The Georgetown Branch ROW has become a park. You can move the PL rail elsewhere or make it bus. <b>FACT: 1)</b> The Georgetown Branch ROW was purchased by Montgomery County with \$10 million of our tax dollars, for the specific purpose of using the Bethesda to Silver Spring segment for recreation and transit. The ROW was used for trains decades before the Columbia Country Club was established alongside it. <b>2)</b> The interim trail is fenced off from most of the 100' wide ROW through the Club, which is using Montgomery County property rent-free while perpetuating the misconception that this ROW is not big enough for a 25' transitway and 10' hiker-biker trail. Do the Math! That leaves 65' for landscaping and buffering! <b>3)</b> There is no viable or cost effective alternative to a trolley-trail project plan to complete the Capital Crescent Trail into Silver Spring. Purple Line opponents argue that the 10,000 weekly interim trail users should trump sharing the corridor with any other uses. But a closer look at the trail traffic survey shows interim trail use is limited mostly to Chevy Chase neighborhoods, with very little trail use east of Rock Creek. We believe that if the trail is completed through Silver Spring neighborhoods into downtown Silver Spring, trail use will increase to be much higher than it is now. <b>4)</b> There will be 6 times as many uses of the Purple Line in one day as there are uses of the interim trail in an entire week. Over 62,000 uses of the Purple Line are expected each day, vs. the only 10,000 uses now seen on the interim trail in an entire week. The trail will be rebuilds as a full width trail with safe separation from transit and with grade separated crossings of all major roadways. It will be completed into downtown Silver Spring. Trail users are being asked to make a reasonable accommodation and can not fairly refuse to share the corridor with transit users. <b>5)</b> The Capital Crescent Trail between Bethesda and Georgetown will not be altered by the Purple Line. Neither the State, County or Purple Line <b>NOW!</b> propose using that section of the Georgetown Branch ROW for transit. The 4 mile Georgetown Branch segment between Bethesda and Silver Spring is a precious public corridor that can be shared by walkers, bikers and transit users. As WABA put it: <b>"A public ROW such as the Georgetown Branch is a community asset that should be designed to serve the broadest population possible. It will take commitment and creativity to make sure that this valuable transportation corridor will serve everyone: transit users, cyclists, and</b></p>	CTRAK	2010-0130	Capital Crescent / Georgetown Branch Trail	Dated 2/11/10 and Received 2/12/10	The staff generally agrees. We think there is room for the train and trail in the Georgetown Branch right of way and are interested in soliciting input from interested residents, organizations, etc. - all of the community.

**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments**  
**Dec 10 through Feb 12**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTRAK #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
95	Harry	Sanders	Individual	<p><b>Myth 2:</b> The PL trains will kill or injure pedestrians who don't pay attention while crossing the tracks. <b>FACT:</b> The Purple Line will make the Capital Crescent Trail (CCT) safer. The CCT will be a far safer recreational trail alongside the Purple Line than is the existing Interim CCT and Georgetown Branch Trail. Any risk to future CCT users from transit vehicles is small compared to the risk trail users face today of being run over by motor vehicles while using the existing Interim CCT and Georgetown Branch Trail between Bethesda and Silver Spring. The Interim CCT has dangerous at-grade crossings of Connecticut Avenue and Jones Bridge Road. The Georgetown Branch Trail is on roadways for two miles in Silver Spring, and has six street crossings at traffic lights including at-grade crossings of 16th Street and of Colesville Road. Trail users must cross 3 six lane state highways at-grade between Bethesda and Silver Spring. Purple Line opponents want us to ignore this risk. Plans for the Purple Line call for the CCT to be rebuilt as an uninterrupted off-road trail from downtown Bethesda to downtown Silver Spring, with grade-separated crossings on bridges or underpasses of <b>all</b> major roadways. The trail will be paved and will be at least 10 feet wide over its entire length. Trail users will be separated from light-rail tracks by fences, retaining walls or plantings. Purple Line opponents try to convince people that the trail not be safe with the Purple Line. But organizations with a proven commitment to expanding walking and bicycling opportunities by completing the trail, like the <u>Coalition for the Capital Crescent Trail</u>, the <u>WABA</u>, and the <u>Montgomery County Bicycle Action Group</u>, refuse to support the so called "Save the Trail" effort.</p>	CTRAK	2010-0130	Capital Crescent / Georgetown Branch Trail	Dated 2/11/10 and Received 2/12/10	While completion of the Capital Crescent Trail will improve safety by removing grade-separated crossings of major roadways, the LPA includes an at-grade crossing of the tracks at Lynn Dr. See Comment 24 regarding the Lynn Dr at-grade crossing.
95	Harry	Sanders	Individual	<p><b>Flipping rail and rail within ROW:</b> The following text is taken from the Silver Spring Trails blog of Wayne Phyllaier. I feel the analysis presented on the blog was so good that I could not add to it and wanted to make sure a portion was included in the public record. Would the future CCT be a better trail if it is moved south? To be on the south side of the Purple Line LRT in the Georgetown Branch Corridor instead of on the north side as is now proposed. The issue was raised by residents of the Town of Chevy Chase and Edgevale at the Purple Line Master Plan public hearing on 12/10/09. They argued that having the trail on the south side would give them easier access to the trail. They live on the south side of the corridor, and they want to keep their back yard gates that open directly onto the trail. If the rail is on the south side of the corridor, it will block their private access to the trail. They want the Master Plan draft to be changed to have the trail on their side, or at least to have the issue be seriously studied. The part of the trail that could be "flipped" from the north side to the south side of the corridor is between Bethesda and Jones Mill Road. The remainder of the trail in the Georgetown Branch is already planned to be on the south side. <b>THE BOTTOM LINE: The trail will be better overall, by a small margin, if on the north side as now planned. The small differences do not merit disrupting the design process to open a new study.</b> MTA has been briefing the community regularly for over 2.5 years to show their plans to have the trail on the north side, those who are just now coming late in the process to demand we reconsider have not met their burden to show substantive reasons to delay the design to study this yet again...<u>Finally, why is this trail north-south side issue being raised now?</u> MTA has presented their plans to build the trail on the north side at public meetings, and specifically to the Bethesda-Chevy Chase Focus Group, numerous times over 2.5 years since then. They presented these plans to the Coalition for the CCT members and board at the March 2008 CCT meeting, and the north-south side issue was not among the issues that drew attention from the trail supporters according to the <u>meeting report</u>. Now, after remaining silent on the issue for 2.5 years until the Master Plan is being finalized and preliminary design is beginning, a number of Chevy Chase residents are asking for Master Plan changes or more study that could delay the project. They fail to show how more study will show any significant information that has not been available to be last 2.5 years.</p>	CTRAK	2010-0130	Capital Crescent / Georgetown Branch Trail	Dated 2/11/10 and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment 24 regarding the location of the Capital Crescent Trail on the north or south side of the tracks.
96	Kathy	Jentz	Individual	<p>I wanted to write to you that I definitely do want a Purple Line stop at Wayne and Dale, which would be convenient station in our neighborhood. It will encourage people to use transit, get more cars off the road, and be a boost to our air quality. I hope that you will include the Wayne and Dale station in the initial construction of the Purple Line.</p>	CTRAK	2010-0130	Dale Drive Station	Dated 2/11/10 and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.
97	Jonathan	Gilbert	Individual	<p>Support for a Purple Line stop at Wayne and Dale in Silver Spring. I live about a block from that intersection and believe that such a stop will add to the quality of life in our neighborhood. It will help reduce traffic and provide a great convenience especially to the elderly and people with disabilities, who might not walk to one of the other planned stops. I hope you will include a station at that location in the initial construction of the line, rather than waiting to some later date.</p>	CTRAK	2010-0130	Dale Drive Station	Dated 2/11/10 and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.
98	Suzanne	Mintz	Individual	<p>Include a stop at Wayne and Dale. This is an ideal location for those who work in the downtown Silver Spring neighborhood and for those of use who need to travel to Bethesda. Surely, it would encourage more people to ride the Purple Line because of the Wayne and Dale intersection's accessibility and convenience. Furthermore, it would help reduce traffic while improving the environment. Include a Wayne and Dale station in the initial construction of the Purple Line.</p>	CTRAK	2010-0130	Dale Drive Station	Dated 2/11/10 and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.

**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments  
Dec 10 through Feb 12**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTRAK #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
99	Rebecca	Tanner	Individual	Support for a Purple Line stop at Wayne and Dale in Silver Spring. I live about in the Park Hills neighborhood of Silver Spring, just a couple of blocks from the proposed stop. Having a nearby stop will be good for the community. It will permit many households like mine to easily access public transportation for commuting purposes. With public schools, a few businesses, and several bus routes already at the intersection, a stop at Wayne and Dale does not risk changing the character of the intersection. If anything, it could help enhance the community and make it more neighborhood-friendly place.	CTRAK	2010-0130	Dale Drive Station	Dated 2/11/10 and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.
100	Kyle	O'Connor	Individual	It has come to my attention that some folks have been writing to you opposing a Purple Line stop at Wayne and Dale. My family and I have lived on Dartmouth Avenue between Wayne and Cedar for 18 years. Rest assured that I, and many of my neighbors, most definitely DO want a convenient station in our neighborhood. My kids will be able to get around that much more easily, it will encourage people to use transit, get more cars off the road, and improve our air quality. Also, the thought of a trolley just blowing by such an obvious stop for our neighborhood is the utmost in aggravating. <i>Please</i> include the Wayne and Dale station in the initial construction of the Purple Line.	CTRAK	2010-0130	Dale Drive Station	Dated 2/11/10 and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.
101	Michael	Ussery	Individual	We live on Dale Dr and we are definitely in favor of a Purple Line station at Wayne and Dale. It will encourage people to use transit, get more cars off the road, and be a boost to our air quality. I hope that you will include the Wayne and Dale station in the initial construction of the Purple Line.	CTRAK	2010-0130	Dale Drive Station	Dated 2/11/10 and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.
101	Susan	McCauley	Individual	We live on Dale Dr and we are definitely in favor of a Purple Line station at Wayne and Dale. It will encourage people to use transit, get more cars off the road, and be a boost to our air quality. I hope that you will include the Wayne and Dale station in the initial construction of the Purple Line.	CTRAK	2010-0130	Dale Drive Station	Dated 2/11/10 and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.
102	Mark	Posner	Individual	Support to place a Purple Line stop at Wayne and Dale. This is an ideal spot for another stop given the number of people who live within walking distance of this corner, and the distance that otherwise would exist between stops in the near-downtown area if the Wayne/Dale stop is not included (i.e., the distance between the stop just north of Sligo Creek and the Wayne/Fenton stop). I live about 5 blocks from Wayne and Dale, and know that I would use this stop frequently. Some of my neighbors oppose the stop because they claim that it would lead to high density development nearby. This is a clear misreading of the current county policy, which applies to development <u>near subway stops</u> . I don't believe that there is any possibility that this neighborhood, county planners, or the county council would support rezoning for greater development based on a PL stop being at Wayne and Dale. Some of my neighbors also may be concerned because of two schools would be adjacent to this stop; but the state, clearly, would take that into account in constructing the stop. Please support the placement of a PL stop at Wayne and Dale.	CTRAK	2010-0130	Dale Drive Station	Dated 2/11/10 and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.
103	Nancy	Schwiesow	Individual	Wants a Purple Line stop at Wayne and Dale, which would be a convenient station in our neighborhood. It would encourage people to use transit, get more cars off the road, and be a boost to our air quality. I hope that you will include the Wayne and Dale station in the initial construction of the Purple Line.	CTRAK	2010-0130	Dale Drive Station	Dated 2/11/10 and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.
104	Charmaine	Foltz	Individual	I am writing to express my sincere and enthusiastic support of a Wayne/Dale stop for the proposed inner purple line. There are many in the neighborhood who support a stop at that location and I am confident that it would reduce traffic. I would love to have access that close to my home and would use it daily.	CTRAK	2010-0130	Dale Drive Station	Dated 2/11/10 and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.
105	Martin	Crane	Individual	Thank you for considering our comments on this issue. We wholeheartedly support the Purple Line, and our daughter attends Sligo Creek Elementary at Wayne and Dale. Please know that we and many of my neighbors definitely do want a convenient station in our neighborhood. We would certainly get on and off the Purple Line at that intersection, and believe it will encourage people to use transit, get more cars off the road, and be a boost to our air quality. We hope that you will include the Wayne and Dale station in the initial construction of the Purple Line.	CTRAK	2010-0130	Dale Drive Station	Dated 2/11/10 and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.
105	Sonia	Rodriguez-Crane	Individual	Thank you for considering our comments on this issue. We wholeheartedly support the Purple Line, and our daughter attends Sligo Creek Elementary at Wayne and Dale. Please know that we and many of my neighbors definitely do want a convenient station in our neighborhood. We would certainly get on and off the Purple Line at that intersection, and believe it will encourage people to use transit, get more cars off the road, and be a boost to our air quality. We hope that you will include the Wayne and Dale station in the initial construction of the Purple Line.	CTRAK	2010-0130	Dale Drive Station	Dated 2/11/10 and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.

**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments**  
**Dec 10 through Feb 12**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTRACK #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
106	Tina	Slater	Individual	As the deadline for the public comment draws near, I'd like to urge you to include a stop at Wayne and Dale in the plans for the Purple Line. Some in our community do not want it, as they are afraid it will open us up to Transit Oriented Development. My take on this is that the County is due to see a lot more TOD [how else will we keep from encroaching on the Ag. Reserve?] and that we will come to appreciate TOD, much as we have come to appreciate the conveniences of downtown Silver Spring with its coffee shops, restaurants, grocery stores, bookshops, specialty shops and movie theaters. That *is* what makes a "neighborhood" -- people out and about, meeting neighbors on the street, walking and shopping and working close to home. Further, I'm quite certain that we are not too far away from rising gasoline prices, once this world-wide recession is over. Four-dollar-a-gallon gasoline drove many drivers to transit, and once on transit they discovered they liked it. During this decade I feel sure that we'll see \$4, \$6, possibly \$8 a gallon gas ---- and when this happens, everyone will be clamoring for more public transit. At that point, our neighborhood will be kicking itself (or more likely screaming a the County Council) for its decision to eliminate the potential stop at Wayne and Dale. The earliest the Purple Line would be up and running is 2017 -- a lot will be different in the landscape by then. Please look ahead into the future, realize that we'll all be needing transit more and wanting to drive less (commuting is stressful now -- just wait until the population grows and we have <u>more</u> cars on the road!). Please include the Wayne and Dale station in the <u>initial construction</u> of the Purple Line.	CTRACK	2010-0130	Dale Drive Station	Dated 2/11/10 and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.
106	Don	Slater	Individual	As the deadline for the public comment draws near, I'd like to urge you to include a stop at Wayne and Dale in the plans for the Purple Line. Some in our community do not want it, as they are afraid it will open us up to Transit Oriented Development. My take on this is that the County is due to see a lot more TOD [how else will we keep from encroaching on the Ag. Reserve?] and that we will come to appreciate TOD, much as we have come to appreciate the conveniences of downtown Silver Spring with its coffee shops, restaurants, grocery stores, bookshops, specialty shops and movie theaters. That *is* what makes a "neighborhood" -- people out and about, meeting neighbors on the street, walking and shopping and working close to home. Further, I'm quite certain that we are not too far away from rising gasoline prices, once this world-wide recession is over. Four-dollar-a-gallon gasoline drove many drivers to transit, and once on transit they discovered they liked it. During this decade I feel sure that we'll see \$4, \$6, possibly \$8 a gallon gas ---- and when this happens, everyone will be clamoring for more public transit. At that point, our neighborhood will be kicking itself (or more likely screaming a the County Council) for its decision to eliminate the potential stop at Wayne and Dale. The earliest the Purple Line would be up and running is 2017 -- a lot will be different in the landscape by then. Please look ahead into the future, realize that we'll all be needing transit more and wanting to drive less (commuting is stressful now -- just wait until the population grows and we have <u>more</u> cars on the road!). Please include the Wayne and Dale station in the <u>initial construction</u> of the Purple Line.	CTRACK	2010-0130	Dale Drive Station	Dated 2/11/10 and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.
106	Jessica	Slater	Individual	As the deadline for the public comment draws near, I'd like to urge you to include a stop at Wayne and Dale in the plans for the Purple Line. Some in our community do not want it, as they are afraid it will open us up to Transit Oriented Development. My take on this is that the County is due to see a lot more TOD [how else will we keep from encroaching on the Ag. Reserve?] and that we will come to appreciate TOD, much as we have come to appreciate the conveniences of downtown Silver Spring with its coffee shops, restaurants, grocery stores, bookshops, specialty shops and movie theaters. That *is* what makes a "neighborhood" -- people out and about, meeting neighbors on the street, walking and shopping and working close to home. Further, I'm quite certain that we are not too far away from rising gasoline prices, once this world-wide recession is over. Four-dollar-a-gallon gasoline drove many drivers to transit, and once on transit they discovered they liked it. During this decade I feel sure that we'll see \$4, \$6, possibly \$8 a gallon gas ---- and when this happens, everyone will be clamoring for more public transit. At that point, our neighborhood will be kicking itself (or more likely screaming a the County Council) for its decision to eliminate the potential stop at Wayne and Dale. The earliest the Purple Line would be up and running is 2017 -- a lot will be different in the landscape by then. Please look ahead into the future, realize that we'll all be needing transit more and wanting to drive less (commuting is stressful now -- just wait until the population grows and we have <u>more</u> cars on the road!). Please include the Wayne and Dale station in the <u>initial construction</u> of the Purple Line.	CTRACK	2010-0130	Dale Drive Station	Dated 2/11/10 and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.
107	Mary Lou	Foy	Individual	I definitely want a Purple Line stop at the intersection of Dale and Wayne. Additionally, it will be good for the schools at that location.	CTRACK	2010-0130	Dale Drive Station	Dated 2/11/10 and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.

**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments**  
**Dec 10 through Feb 12**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTRAK #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
108	Laura	Smail	Individual	Support of the proposed Purple Line station at Wayne Avenue & Dale Drive. I believe metro station at this location would make our neighborhood more accessible for residents who do not own vehicles. I also believe it would encourage residents who do own cars to leave them at home and use public transportation more often than they normally would. A metro stop here would benefit everyone.	CTRAK	2010-0130	Dale Drive Station	Dated 2/11/10 and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.
109	Ty	Christensen	Individual	Support including a Purple Line stop at Wayne Avenue and Dale Drive. It would be a wonderful addition to our neighborhood, just 2 blocks from my house. This would be a "neighborhood" stop, and would encourage people to use transit, get off the road, and cut down on car pollution. I know that many of my neighbors feel the same.	CTRAK	2010-0130	Dale Drive Station	Dated 2/11/10 and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.
110	Meg	Clabault	Individual	I live in the Park Hills neighborhood of Silver Spring. I really think building a Purple Line stop at Wayne and Dale is very important. I actually think it would be a shame for there not to be a stop at such a major crossroads. <b>*Side note</b> , thank you for providing such fabulous street plows today. Those 3 guys working the diggers are awesome at their jobs.	CTRAK	2010-0130	Dale Drive Station	Dated 2/11/10 and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.
111	Martine	Brizius	Individual	While some neighbors have been writing to you opposing a Purple Line station at Wayne and Dale, please know that many of my neighbors definitely do want a convenient station in our neighborhood. It would encourage people to use transit, get more cars off the road, and be a boost to our air quality. I have put too much energy into the redevelopment of this area over the last 17 years to want to lose out now on one of the prime benefits of revitalization. I hope that you will include the Wayne and Dale station in the initial construction of the Purple Line.	CTRAK	2010-0130	Dale Drive Station	Dated 2/11/10 and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.
112	Debora	Thompson	Individual	Although some neighbors are probably writing to you opposing a Purple Line station at Wayne and Dale, please know that many of my neighbors definitely do want a convenient station in our neighborhood. It would encourage people to use transit, get more cars off the road, and be a boost to our air quality. I hope that you will include the Wayne and Dale station in the initial construction of the Purple Line.	CTRAK	2010-0130	Dale Drive Station	Dated 2/11/10 and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.
113	Lisa	Goldberg	Individual	While some neighbors have been writing to you opposing a Purple Line station at Wayne and Dale, please know that many of my neighbors definitely do want a convenient station in our neighborhood. It would encourage people to use transit, get more cars off the road, and be a boost to our air quality. I hope that you will include the Wayne and Dale station in the initial construction of the Purple Line.	CTRAK	2010-0130	Dale Drive Station	Dated 2/11/10 and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.
114	Melissa	Bannett	Individual	While some neighbors have been writing to you opposing a Purple Line station at Wayne and Dale, please know that many of my neighbors including our family of five definitely do want a convenient station in our neighborhood. It would encourage people to use transit, get more cars off the road, and be a boost to our air quality. It will also make it much safer for my middle school children to travel independently in the neighborhood. Lastly, it is an essential part of planning for a more environmentally sound lifestyle for this wonderful neighborhood. It is vitally important to the quality of life in our neighborhood and to a vision of greener future that the Wayne and Dale station in the initial construction of the Purple Line.	CTRAK	2010-0130	Dale Drive Station	Dated 2/11/10 and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.
115	Matt	McKeever	Individual	While some neighbors have been writing to you opposing a Purple Line station at Wayne and Dale, please know that many of my neighbors definitely do want a convenient station in our neighborhood. It would encourage people to use transit, get more cars off the road, and be a boost to our air quality. I hope that you will include the Wayne and Dale station in the initial construction of the Purple Line.	CTRAK	2010-0131	Dale Drive Station	Dated 2/11/10 and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.
116	Jerry	Withers	Individual	While some neighbors have been writing to you opposing a Purple Line station at Wayne and Dale, please know that many of my neighbors definitely do want a convenient station in our neighborhood. It would encourage people to use transit, get more cars off the road, and be a boost to our air quality. Having to cope with construction, having a rail line pass by and not being able to use the service is ludicrous. Particularly in an area with Blair Schools and an aging population. I hope that you will include the Wayne and Dale station in the initial construction of the Purple Line.	CTRAK	2010-0131	Dale Drive Station	Dated 2/11/10 and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.
117	Jia	Jiang	Individual	Please know that it is crucial for us to have a Purple Line stop at the Wayne and Dale junction as that is one the many things we can do to encourage people to make full use of the new transit system, get more cars off the road, and be a boost to our air quality. As you know, Dale leads to Georgia and in turn all of the residents on the Wheaton side, which is a fairly sizable population that could have made use of the Purple Line just like those of us on this side. It is only sensible that we do so to ensure greater access.	CTRAK	2010-0131	Dale Drive Station	Dated 2/11/10 and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.

**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments  
Dec 10 through Feb 12**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTRAK #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
118	Nare	Ratnapala	Individual	I live just off of Wayne and Dale. I live just off of Wayne and Dale. Like most of my neighbors I like to add my support for this stop. It would certainly make it attractive for me to use the Purple Line to commute to work at the University of MD. I know this is true for most of my neighbors as well because I know that many of them will opt to take the public trans transportation for work. As you very well know this is a very central location and many residents find this an invitation to use the train. Hope you will consider my request favorably.	CTRAK	2010-0131	Dale Drive Station	Dated 2/11/10 and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.
119	Anne	Spielberg	Individual	I am writing to urge you to oppose any and all efforts that would allow a Purple Line station to be constructed at Dale Drive, either immediately or at some future point in time. As a resident that lives within three blocks of where a Dale Station would be constructed, I know first hand that such a station is both unnecessary and would have devastating impacts on the surrounding neighborhood in which I have lived for 17 years. The decision to allow the Purple Line to be built at surface on Wayne Ave., rather than as a tunnel route, will already cause serious problems for our neighborhood. Both the County and the State have obligation not to further exacerbate those problems by allowing construction of a Dale Station. <b>1)</b> There is simply no need for a station at Dale Drive. MTA's projection that there would be 1,400 daily boardings at a Dale Dr station is simply not credible. That number substantially exceeds MTA's projections at two nearby stations that are already slated for construction: the Fenton St/Silver Spring Library station and the Manchester Place station. Both these stations are near a number of high rise residences with much denser development than that surrounding the proposed Dale Dr stations, which is comprised primarily of single family homes and is one of the least densely populated residential neighborhoods along the entire Purple Line. Yet MTA projects ridership figures twice as high for Dale Dr as for Fenton St and several hundred more daily boardings at Dale Dr than at Manchester Place. The number of Purple Line daily station boardings at Dale Dr is more likely to be between 200 and 300, a number that does not justify the expense and adverse impacts of a station when others are so nearby and easily accessible for those who live in the area. Only <u>four</u> passengers board the Ride On #15 bus at Dale Dr on Wayne Ave during morning rush hour, in contrast to the substantial number of bus boardings east of Sligo Creek Park, and there are very few boardings at nearby stops. These kind of numbers cannot justify adding a sixth station to the five already planned for the just more than 2 mile stretch from the Silver Spring Transit Center to Gilbert Street Long Branch (near Piney Branch and University Blvd). This number of stops is more appropriate for express bus service, than for LRT which is supposed to have limited and more sparsely placed stops. Most of my neighbors and I, who live closest to this proposed stop, feel no need for it, even though we would	CTRAK	2010-0131	Dale Drive Station	Dated and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.
119	Anne	Spielberg	Individual	<b>2)</b> The development and adverse impacts a Dale Dr station would bring to our neighborhood are unacceptable. At a time when our county is supposedly promoting walkable neighborhoods and livable spaces, a Dale Dr station would result in even further widening of Wayne Ave, making a significant section as wide as Colesville Rd. It is at best ironic that while there is talk of making a road like Rockville Pike more pedestrian friendly, there are these efforts to make Wayne Ave, which now is pedestrian friendly, just the opposite. Widening Wayne Ave further to accommodate a Dale Dr station will exacerbate the effect of the Purple Line as a huge bisecting barrier in the neighborhood. This further widening will occur directly in front of an elementary and middle school, to which large numbers of children, including my own, regularly walk. The station's adverse impact on the school population is increased because the Dale Dr station would require closing the Wayne Ave entrance to the large parking lot of Sligo Creek Elementary School and Silver Spring International Middle School, and traffic will be diverted to Dale Dr and my neighborhood's side streets near the schools. The station will also hinder my neighbors' access to their homes because westbound traffic on Wayne going toward downtown Silver Spring would be prohibited from turning left onto Dale Dr (toward Piney Branch Rd) while a train is in the Dale Dr station, especially for children walking from our neighborhood to the schools, will be horrific. Given our close proximity to downtown Silver Spring, our neighborhood also does not need the commercial and denser development that will flow from planting an unnecessary station in our small, quiet, long-standing community. That kind of development is appropriately confined to the CBD. Please oppose any Purple Line station at Dale Dr. It is not needed and it will only further harm our wonderful community, which already will suffer with a Purple Line at surface through the only single family residential community along the line.	CTRAK	2010-0131	Dale Drive Station	Dated and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.
120	Shiv	Chopra	Individual	I support having a Purple Line stop at Wayne and Dale. While some neighbors have been writing to you opposing a Purple Line station at Wayne and Dale, please know that many of my neighbors definitely do want a convenient station in our neighborhood. It would encourage people to use transit, get more cars off the road, and be a boost to our air quality. I hope that you will include the Wayne and Dale station in the initial construction of the Purple Line.	CTRAK	2010-0131	Dale Drive Station	Dated and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.

**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments  
Dec 10 through Feb 12**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTRAK #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
121	Edward	Clabault	Individual	I am writing to express my support for the plan to place a Purple Line station at the corner of Wayne Ave and Dale Dr. As a resident of Mansfield Rd, which is right around the corner, I would use this stop regularly. The failure to put a stop at this intersection would severely limit our neighborhood's ability to take advantage of the Purple Line. For a number of years I have lived on Bacon St in Brookline Massachusetts. Down the middle of Beacon St runs the "C" Line to work and to other places throughout the Boston area. The distances between the stops were small enough so that any station was a short walk away, but far enough apart that it made more sense to take the train than to walk. I fear that if no station is built at Wayne and Dale, the distance between the stop at the new Library and the next stop, at Manchester Place, would be far too distant to make riding the Purple Line something my family would regularly do.	CTRAK	2010-0131	Dale Drive Station	Dated and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.
122	David	McPherson	Individual	I understand that some of my neighbors have been writing in opposition to a Purple Line stop at Wayne and Dale. While some may have legitimate concerns regarding a stop in the neighborhood, I believe much of the opposition is either a hangover from their previous general opposition to the Purple Line at grade on Wayne or is simply ill informed. I am writing to let you know that many in the community including my family strongly support a stop at Wayne and Dale - a stop conveniently located in the neighborhood would encourage use the line, reduce traffic in the neighborhood and would be a nice amenity to receive in return for the inevitable disruption and inconvenience caused by the construction of the line through our neighborhood. I hope you will aggressively support a stop at Wayne and Dale, including doing the necessary neighborhood outreach that could sway some in the no camp who are currently there primarily due to lack of understanding the issue.	CTRAK	2010-0131	Dale Drive Station	Dated and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.
123	James	Wallace	Individual	Although some neighbors are probably writing to you opposing a Purple Line station at Wayne and Dale, please know that our family and many other neighbors definitely do want a convenient station in our neighborhood. It would encourage people to use transit, get more cars off the road, and be a boost to our air quality. We hope that you will include the Wayne and Dale station in the initial construction of the Purple Line.	CTRAK	2010-0131	Dale Drive Station	Dated and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.
123	Barbara	Pequet	Individual	Although some neighbors are probably writing to you opposing a Purple Line station at Wayne and Dale, please know that our family and many other neighbors definitely do want a convenient station in our neighborhood. It would encourage people to use transit, get more cars off the road, and be a boost to our air quality. We hope that you will include the Wayne and Dale station in the initial construction of the Purple Line.	CTRAK	2010-0131	Dale Drive Station	Dated and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.
124	George	Rathbone	Individual	With two public schools at Wayne and Dale it would make a lot of sense to put a stop there. I know that folks with houses right there may not be crazy about the idea; that is to be expected. The traffic around here is getting crazy, and without local stops it will only get worse. The walk to Silver Spring Metro is too long for old folks and too long to be safe for kids. We need mass transit that is convenient enough that people will actually use it. Please don't let NIMBY obstruct sensible community planning and progress.	CTRAK	2010-0131	Dale Drive Station	Dated and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.

**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments**  
**Dec 10 through Feb 12**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTRAK #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
125			Town of Chevy Chase	<p><b>ROW:</b> While recognizing that the Town is only one of several communities that border the 16-mile transit line, the segment of the line that abuts the northern boundary of the Town is unique and thus bears additional scrutiny. <b>1)</b> The ROW is exceptionally narrow (32' ) near several Town homes on Elm St. where it then enters a tunnel; the rest of the ROW is only 66'. The southern portion of this has a very steep grade and drop-off along a large percentage of the ROW and a creek that is part of the Chesapeake Bay Watershed is at the base of that drop-off. Near Lynn Dr, the 66' ROW is tightly wedged between commercial buildings and an apartment complex on one side and Town homes within feet of the ROW boundary on the other. In general, there are only single family residential properties to the south of the ROW while a large part of the north side is commercial. <b>2)</b> Into that narrow ROW, the State proposes to place two LRT tracks, catenary wires and poles, a pedestrian paved trail with safety buffers on both sides, an extensive ADA compliant ramped portion of the Trail that will be approximately two blocks long, and plantings, sound barriers, and retaining walls. The State has acknowledged that all trees will be removed within the ROW and that the canopy trees cannot be replaced. Finally, they have noted they will need easements on Town properties to accommodate the areas of disturbance associated with the construction of the rail line (i.e., more trees and plantings will be removed on private property to allow for construction). <b>3)</b> The State also proposes running the trains at maximum speeds of 50 mph within this ROW at 6-minute headways during rush hour (as a consequence, trains will pass through the ROW every 3 minutes). There are homes (not just yards, but actual houses) in the Town that will be literally within feet of trains running at those speeds; the same is true of Edgevale east of the Town. <b>4)</b> Additionally, one of the two access points for the Town to the Trail is proposed at Lynn Dr. The State's current proposal calls for an at-grade crossing to the Trail on the north side and to Montgomery Avenue and East-West Highway beyond. Unlike areas where the LRT will run on streets, following posted speed limits and traffic signage, <i>State engineers have stated that trains will be passing this access point at 45 mph.</i> That means that people will have to first traverse tracks with trains going that speed every 3 minutes to access the Trail or to make this crossing. That includes the numerous teenagers who use this crossing to get to Bethesda Chevy Chase High School, often in the dark morning hours.</p>	CTRAK	2010-0132	Capital Crescent / Georgetown Branch Trail	Dated and Received 2/12/10	See Comment #30 regarding tradeoffs in the Wisconsin Ave tunnel. See Comment #55 regarding the number of residential structures that are located within a close proximity of the Georgetown Branch right-of-way centerline. See Comment 24 regarding Coquelin Run. See Comment #22 regarding impacts to the Capital Crescent Trail. See comment #24 regarding the Lynn Drive at-grade crossing.
125			Town of Chevy Chase	<p><b>Comments on the State's Rationale:</b> MTA states that the primary reason for placing the Trail on the north side is to maximize the vertical and horizontal separation between the Trail and the trackbed, which MTA says would provide a better "trail experience". The decision seems not to be based on specific engineering or cost analyses. MTA says that locating the Trail to the north of the trackbed better follows the existing elevation of the surrounding land and keeps the Trail three to four feet above the trackbed, where possible. But it is counterintuitive to locate a recreational trail close to a barren commercial strip instead of alongside a leafy residential community. Many Trail users have contacted the Town on this issue, in unanimous agreement that walkers, bikers, baby strollers leashed dogs all prefer some semblance of the shaded trail they have enjoyed for years. Only a southern alignment for the Trail would provide that. Likewise, it is unclear why the State couldn't/wouldn't provide an elevated Trail on the south side. Major re-grading of the area will occur in any event. We wholeheartedly agree with the planners' desire to provide a good and safe Trail experience, yet we conclude that a well-designed Trail alignment on the south side is capable to making the Trail experience better than or at least as good as a northern Trail alignment and is cost-comparable and a better environmental choice. The MTA contractor's recommendation acknowledged that the Trail location on the north side of the ROW in Chevy Chase would cause the residents to lose the direct access to the Trail and would place the transitway closer to the residences on the south side. The Town believes that losing a more direct (and thus safer) access and placing the transitway closer to the residences will cause materially different safety and environmental consequences without substantially reducing the cost of construction. Denying the Town's 1,020 residences along with the residences of Edgevale direct access to a treasured recreational Trail and placing a transitway closer to those residences is hardly in line with the new federal policy of funding major transit projects that make communities more "livable".</p>	CTRAK	2010-0132	Capital Crescent / Georgetown Branch Trail	Dated and Received 2/12/10	The staff disagrees. The staff believes the MTA was responding in part to stakeholder concerns about the need to provide as much separation as possible between the trail user and the train. The staff also believes that the topography on the south side along the Town boundary is such that additional costs would be incurred to construct the trail on the south side – relative to the costs of the trail on the north side (all other considerations being equal).

**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments**  
**Dec 10 through Feb 12**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTRAK #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
125			Town of Chevy Chase	Additional Town Concerns: Along with the safety and access issues above, the Town has significant concerns regarding noise and vibrations. The Noise and Vibration Technical Report of the AA/DEIS and the information provided to date does not provide sufficient data to allow the County or the Town to understand the noise impacts of the Purple Line on the Town. A south Trail alignment would be inherently quieter and is key to mitigating noise and vibration impacts. But the Town has serious concerns about the State's noise study; an attachment to this report details these concerns.1) It appears MTA understates the Purple Line's noise and vibration levels along the Trail in the Town and mislabels a "severe impacts" as a "negligible impact". 2) It appears MTA did not take a single sound measurement within the Town of Chevy Chase, but simply assumed the Town is ordinarily as noisy as East-West Highway near Montgomery Avenue and Jones Bridge Road near Connecticut Avenue. 3) It appears MTA assumed that trains will run down the center of the ROW rather than on a track, which understates noise reaching the Town. 4) The Technical Report appears to assume single-tracking where MTA now proposes double-tracking. The Report states that a headway of 6 minutes means 10 trains per hour, not 20 trains per hour, which would occur with double tracking and therefore understates the noise reaching the Town by a further 3dB(A). Since the noise model has not been made available to the Town, this simple error cannot be ruled out. 5) It also appears the MTA underestimates noise emission from light-rail trains. It counts on the trains being quieter than the manufacturers themselves specify. MTA's analysis also appears to not fully account for all of the ways trains produce noise, including the location of the rails, the number of trains per day, maintenance of wheels and tracks, the presence of real-world dust/grit/leaves/imperfections, turns and crossovers, braking, decelerating, accelerating, reflections, canyon effects, and focusing effects when entering the tunnel. The Town of Chevy Chase therefore requests that the State conduct new studies of noise and vibration using alignments individually optimized for the Trail being north or south of the tracks adjacent to the Town. The Town will need these noise studies and more complete engineering details in order to determine the mitigation it will request during the preliminary engineering details to make an informed decision on whether to amend the Purple Line Functional Master Plan.	CTRAK	2010-0132	Capital Crescent / Georgetown Branch Trail	Dated and Received 2/12/10	The noise effects of the LRT are not expected to be significant from an acoustical perspective but noise effects will be considered in developing screening techniques. Staff concurs with the MTA evaluation that the location of the trail has no significant effect on the noise impact from light rail vehicles on adjacent properties to either side of the right-of-way.
125			Town of Chevy Chase	<b>Additional Town Concerns:</b> While the primary objectives of the Town of Chevy Chase are to ensure that the transit project in its entirety, the rail and the Trail, provides our Town residents (and Trail users) with a safe and environmentally benign transit alternative, we are cognizant and respectful of the goals for the entire 16-mile line. We firmly believe, however, that switching the alignment for this area and putting the Trail on the south side of this narrow ROW will not impact the functionality of the entire line - but it does have significant impact on the "livability" of our community. <b>In summary</b> , the Town of Chevy Chase asks that at this time the County deny the State's request to amend the Purple Line Functional Master Plan to change the alignment of the train and Trail in the ROW adjacent to the Town until the State conducts sufficient preliminary engineering on <b>both</b> alternatives with the Trail fully optimized and elevated on both alignments. This preliminary engineering will give the County, the State and the Town the information we all need to compare the consequences, costs and trade-offs of each alignment.	CTRAK	2010-0132	Capital Crescent / Georgetown Branch Trail	Dated and Received 2/12/10	See Comment #24 regarding location of the trail on the north side of the tracks to the west of Connecticut Avenue.
126	Adam	Daniel	Individual	My wife, my son and I live at 8416 Queen Annes Drive, around 100 yards from the site of a proposed Purple Line station at the corner of Wayne Avenue and Dale Drive. I am told that some of my neighbors are writing to express opposition to the station. I am writing to let you know that my wife and I are members of a large group in the neighborhood who are generally quieter but who very much support the station. A station at this location will provide access to the new mass transit infrastructure to a great many homes that will otherwise be outside reasonable walking distance of a Purple Line station. It will make access to jobs and amenities in College Park, Bethesda and other locations that much faster and more convenient. There are more reasons we support the station, but in short, it would help make our densely-populated, inner suburb smarter and more efficient, and a better place to live. I will add that outside the hard-liners, neighbors I chat with say that as long as there is going to be a train on Wayne Ave., they feel strongly that we should have this nearby station.	CTRAK	2010-0133	Dale Drive Station	Dated and Received 2/12/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.
127	Lynn	Rhinehart	Individual	We urge you to include a Purple Line stop at Wayne and Dale. It will greatly increase the utility and usage of the Purple Line, and will put a stop where it is needed - near a school and other recreational centers. Without a stop, our neighborhood will get all the traffic of the Purple Line and none of the benefits, which is really defeats the purpose of the project.	CTRAK	2010-0137	Dale Drive Station	Dated 2/12/10 and Received 2/16/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.
127	Neil	Gladstein	Individual	We urge you to include a Purple Line stop at Wayne and Dale. It will greatly increase the utility and usage of the Purple Line, and will put a stop where it is needed - near a school and other recreational centers. Without a stop, our neighborhood will get all the traffic of the Purple Line and none of the benefits, which is really defeats the purpose of the project.	CTRAK	2010-0137	Dale Drive Station	Dated 2/12/10 and Received 2/16/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.

**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments  
Dec 10 through Feb 12**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTRAK #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
128	Janet	Ishimoto	Individual	While some neighbors have been writing to you opposing a Purple Line station at Wayne and Dale, please know that many of my neighbors definitely do want a convenient station in our neighborhood. It would encourage people to use transit, get more cars off the road, and be a boost to our air quality. I hope that you will include the Wayne and Dale station in the initial construction of the Purple Line.	CTRAK	2010-0137	Dale Drive Station	Dated 2/12/10 and Received 2/16/10	See response to Comment #13 regarding the Dale Drive station.
131	Mier	Wolf	Individual	<b>1)</b> I do not understand support for light rail over bus when bus is one half the cost. Has no one seen the design of modern buses currently in use on city streets around the U.S.? Why take down thousands of trees that won't come back because of overhead lines when if you had the chance, you could implement a plan that would allow successful tree replanting. We will be left with a too narrow bicycle speedway instead of the incredible, summer shaded, hiker/biker amenity. <b>2)</b> Even with BRAC receiving additional funds for traffic adjustments, I still think public transportation on Jones Bridge Road is an option that has not been satisfactorily addressed. <b>3)</b> I am amazed that State MTA goes back and forth on considerations of putting the proposed Purple Line tracks on first the south side of the route and now the north side of the route between Bethesda and Connecticut Avenue. It's a disaster for residents of the Town of Chevy Chase both for homeowners along the trail and for trail users who will have more complicated access to the trail. At the time the state revised its decision about tracks location, it seemed to me it was a sop to Riviera Apartment residents who didn't want the tracks on their side of the trail. <b>4)</b> I attended a planning board hearing during all this controversy at which the state said it could NOT justify a system built between Bethesda and New Carrollton. They said there wasn't sufficient ridership. I thought "game over". But know they sharpened their pencils or pressed more computer buttons to try to generate more ridership statistics by adding approximately 10 new stations in the system to seek intra system ridership.	Email		Overall Project	Dated and Received 2/2/10	See Comment #19 regarding costs. See Comment #18 regarding BRAC. See Comment #24 regarding the decision to locate the trail to the north or south of the tracks. See Comment #19 regarding ridership forecasts.
131	Mier	Wolf	Individual	<b>5)</b> The business development possibilities as a result of this project are illusory. Only Chevy Chase Land Company at Manor Road and Connecticut Avenue might benefit from this plan. I'm not aware of any major economic planning from Bethesda to New Carrollton otherwise. And the PG County advocates are whistling in the wind if they think their portion of this system will do anything but blight the environment. The economy and development trends are such that plopping a rail system into a not in economic demand part of the metropolitan area won't bring any positive results for residents there. <b>6)</b> Trail users of what has become a linear park between Bethesda and Silver Spring have been ignored in the process of planning this project. With the trees gone, they will be offered a too narrow bike path instead of an ambient walk or ride through a beautiful area. We need botanical beauty down county as well as upcounty. We have the agricultural preserve and a number of verdant, large parks there, too. The state has drawn some childlike bush renditions for the trail which do nothing to protect the character built there through maturation of the botany along the route. With over 500,000 uses of the trail a year, it seems negligent to me that you would tear down the trees and put a train down the middle of a route enjoyed by so many people.	Email		Overall Project	Dated and Received 2/2/10	See Comment #22 regarding impacts to the trail.

**Attachment B - Staff Responses to Testimony and Comments  
Dec 10 through Feb 12**

Number	First	Last	Representing	Summary of Comments	Email/Letter	CTRAK #	Primary Focus	Received	Draft Staff Response
132	Richard	Ullman	Individual	<p>I recently moved into the Chevy Chase Lake Area and have lived here for a year. Of course the most important planning hope and fear for the area is the question of the impact of the purple line.</p> <p>When I look at the plans for the Purple Line in this area (from purplelinemd.com maps LPA07, LPA08) I do not see explicit accommodation for the present pedestrian use of the trail. Pedestrians enter the current path from several points between Connecticut Avenue and Jones Mill Road. When light rail is installed, these entryways will likely be cut off by safety fencing. Residents use the trail for exercise for themselves, their children and their pets and also for transportation to the community retail center. For the residents along the path in this area, the Purple Line, even with the proposed walking/biking trail along side will degrade present pedestrian use.</p> <p>In the Chevy Chase Lake neighborhood, a supplement/alternative to the Purple Line route for pedestrian and bicycle use could be developed using the existing wooded conservation areas. In the Master Plan for the Bethesda/Chevy Chase Master Plan posted on the montgomeryplanning.org website and dated as "Approved and Adopted 1990" there is a 20-year old proposal for a sidewalk or path in parcel C10. Indeed there exist unofficial and untended trails that follow parts of this route today. These paths would be cut off by the purple line plans. A route through C10 with enough width for walking and bicycle use would indeed provide the benefits noted in the 1990 plan and also could provide the start of a reasonable alternative to the existing Capital Crescent Trail use.</p> <p>Such a route could be extended parallel to Chevy Chase Lake Drive through the existing woods, perhaps along the stream banks in parcel C9. A wide sidewalk along the southern side of Chevy Chase Lake Drive right of way (the parcel zoned R-20) could connect to the Georgetown branch (Capital Crescent) trail at Connecticut Avenue. In the other direction, the trail could reasonably link to the Rock Creek trail. The current walking and biking facilities along Jones Mill Road are quite unpleasant and unsafe. A safe path could be installed in the parkland on the east side of Jones Mill Road.</p>	Email		Capital Crescent / Georgetown Branch Trail	Dated and Received 12/24/09	One of the tradeoffs with the Purple Line is that some residents will have reduced access to the Capital Crescent Trail. Comment #78 is similar to this comment. See response to Comment #78.