

**Agenda**

1. Begin Meeting
2. Review of the Final Purple Line Functional Master Plan Purpose and Outreach Report
3. Review/Discussion of Ridership and Cost Estimates as presented at the first MTA Open House
4. Planning Board Agenda Items (removed to next meeting)
5. Wrap-up
6. End Meeting

---

**Master Plan Advisory Group (MPAG) Members:** Phil Alperson, Ed Asher, Pat Baptiste, Veda Charrow, Eric DeVaris, Peter Gray, Tony Hausner, Jonathan Jay, Laurie Kelly, Byrne Kelly, Caleb Kriesberg, Bill Mellema, Anne Martin, Andy O'Hare, Bill Mellema, Ted Power, Joe Rodriguez, Karen Roper, David Saltzman, Harry Sanders, Todd Solomon, Judy Tso, Mier Wolf, Rob Rosenberg

**Absent Members:** Karen FitzGerald, Sue Knapp, Marcy Fisher, Clay Harris, Rob Lanza, Chris Richardson, Mike Marsh, and Fred Schultz

**Others:** Tom Autrey (Staff), Katherine Holt (Staff), Helen Reed, and Pam Browning

---

**1. Meeting Began**

Tom Autrey began the meeting at 7:10 pm. Anne Martin introduced herself to the MPAG.

**2. Review of Final Draft Purple Line Functional Master Plan Purpose and Outreach Strategy Report (15-30 minutes)**

Draft copies of the "Final Version" of this report were made available on the web via a link address about 48 hours in advance of the meeting. In addition, each MPAG member was provided a revised copy at the meeting. The objective at this meeting is to review the changes made as a result of input at the last meeting and to get the report ready for final presentation to the Planning Board in mid-January.

Who is the intended audience of the report?

*There are multiple audiences. These include the public, the MPAG, the Planning Board, and the County Council. The Outreach section of the report explains how this report and issues and other reports or documents related to the Purple Line will be shared with other interested groups and individuals.*

Of note are the following changes to the report...

On page 10 a paragraph on technology was added and discussed. There was a request to check with the MTA to see that the information presented on vehicle size was consistent with both that presented earlier by the MTA and with the industry norm. There was also a request to add a statement about the importance of design given the importance of station location and access in established neighborhoods, in particular. There was a request to add a qualifying statement about the importance of evaluating the technology available at or near the time of the completion of final design – given the pace of change in the application of some technologies. We should also mention the importance of real time information systems for users. There was also a request to consider the potential implications of free fares on the Purple Line.

*Tom indicated we could revise the report to respond to all of the above requests with the exception of the request to consider free fares. Any detailed examination of the fare structure for the Purple Line is outside of the scope of this effort.*

Who makes the light rail cars and how wide are they?

*There are multiple manufactures of light rail cars with a range of widths. As noted in the section on technology, the width can vary from 8.5 to 9.5 feet. It was mentioned that in Portland, Oregon, the streetcar in use is about 8 feet wide to fit into the street system. The narrow body results in a lower seated capacity. More information on the Portland Streetcar is available at: <http://www.portlandstreetcar.org/history.php>.*

How wide is a city bus?

*A standard city bus is either eight or eight and one-half feet wide without the side mirrors.*

On page 12 under “Neighborhood Impact”, there was a discussion about the paragraph that notes that “efforts will be made to insure that each neighborhood is afforded ample opportunities for input prior to all applicable study milestones.” One comment was that this should be changed to include a recognition that “best efforts will be made to insure that all impacts to each neighborhood will be fully mitigated and that each neighborhood is afforded ample opportunities for input prior to all applicable study milestones.”

*This paragraph will be modified to acknowledge that mitigation of impacts is an important part of the process and that the extent of the mitigation, at a minimum, must be consistent with applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations.*

There was a discussion of the narrative on pages 14-21 that is intended to document MPAG member's positions and concerns as well as provide an update of the alternatives in narrative form. In general, the format of the discussion is such that the concern or issue is presented and then staff's initial comments on the specific concern or issue follow. Updated maps of the alternatives will be included the Final Report.

One question that came up concerned the inclusion of the staff comments and more specifically, the concern that the MPAG or the public later might be told items are "off the table" if the Planning Board approves the report because the staff's perspective statements are included in the report?

*Tom stated that items of concern noted by the MPAG will not be "off the table" as a result of the items being noted in this report, addressed by the staff in some form, and the report being approved by the Planning Board. Items may be "off the table" because of other things such as resources and time, but not solely because it is acknowledged and addressed in this report. An example (and as described in the report in the third paragraph on page 14 - under the subsection Inner Purple Line vs. Purple Line Loop) of an item that would be considered "off the table" at this point would be the evaluation of alternatives outside of those alternatives considered by MTA since doing so would be outside of our approved work program scope.*

Another concern expressed by some members of the MPAG is that the MPAG agreeing even conceptually to the report could be viewed by some as endorsing the report in its entirety.

*Tom explained that the Purpose and Outreach Report is not a policy document – it is about process. The Planning Board does not expect the MPAG to endorse the staff position on items such as work scope or other similar items. As a result, forwarding the document to the Planning Board should not be interpreted as an endorsement of any specific position. In general, it is more of an acknowledgement that the report fairly represents the history and purpose of the project, the concerns of the community, how we might reasonably expect to engage the community about the issues at hand, and the (project) schedule before us.*

A concern was expressed about the last paragraph on page 15 – the sentence that reads "There are concerns about an at-grade alignment along Wayne Avenue and the potential impact on traffic on Wayne Avenue itself and in the surrounding neighborhoods. There is also a concern that an at-grade alignment along Bonifant Street and Wayne Avenue will be too slow to offer any travel time savings."

The suggested change by one MPAG member is the following: "There are concerns about an at-grade alignment along Wayne Avenue and the potential impact on traffic on Wayne

Avenue itself, in the surrounding neighborhoods, and in accessing and moving through the Silver Spring CBD by the taking of two lanes of traffic on Wayne Avenue.”

*The above change will be made to the final document.*

On page 15-16, add this statement after the above statement. “There is additional concerns about takings, the disappearance of parking, and pedestrian safety on Wayne Avenue, as well as potentially significant adverse impacts to three schools, a church, an assisted living facility, and the proposed Old Blair Auditorium renovation project, all of which are on Wayne Avenue.”

On page 15, there is a discussion about single track vs. double track along the corridor. Some members of the MPAG expressed concern that the staff comment at the end of the second paragraph in this section is too absolute. More specifically, innovative design features could potentially be utilized at certain points along the alignment and that it is too early in the process to suggest that the entire alignment will have a conventional double track profile.

*The staff will add a statement noting that there are members of the MPAG that believe that it is too early in the process to discount the potential to utilize innovative design along the segment that could lessen the impact on the surrounding environment while avoiding any appreciable reduction in service frequency or travel time. The MTA project team should pursue these opportunities when identified.*

On page 16, there is discussion about the MTA’s stated position that a tunnel extending from the Transit Center to the Long Branch area is too costly – i.e., the construction of a tunnel of this length would result in the project “cost effectiveness” rating exceeding the FTA threshold for cost effectiveness. Some members of the MPAG take issue with that statement given that the cost effectiveness rating (cost per hour of transportation user benefit) includes factors other than just capital costs (e.g., travel time savings and ridership). The MPAG members taking issue with the statement believe the MTA position should be presented in a way that makes it clear that there is not necessarily a relationship between the cost effectiveness; and that there has been no estimate of the additional ridership and travel time savings related to a tunnel between the Transit Center and Long Branch and therefore there can be no statement about the cost effectiveness, as opposed to costs, as considered by the FTA. The MPAG members concerned with the issue would instead prefer to have the MTA position presented in quotes – directly attributable to the MTA with some type of discussion about cost and cost effectiveness for a tunnel along this segment.

*The staff will revise this discussion to better draw the distinction between the consideration of the additional capital costs alone and the potential impact on the rating process which takes into account additional variables.*

Also on page 16, there was discussion about the narrative explaining the issues surrounding the Bonifant Street / Wayne Avenue alignment and the Silver Spring Avenue / Thayer Avenue alignment. Some MPAG members would like to see the two alignments discussed separately.

After the sentence about the concern about the speed on the at-grade alignment along Bonifant Street and Wane Avenue, they would like to add the following:

“There are also concerns about the impact on community traffic if Bonifant Street is one way. The impact to businesses that have no rear access for deliveries and the loss of street parking are also of concern.”

As for the discussion on the Silver Spring Avenue / Thayer Avenue alignment, some members would like to add the following:

“There are concerns on the Silver Spring Avenue / Thayer Avenue alignment about the loss of parkland, loss of parking, open tunnel on a residential street, and the potential impact on homes with tunnels proposed under them. There is also considerable concern about the possibility of a station on Fenton Street and the potential of overlay zoning within 800 feet of a station impacting the adjacent neighborhood.”

More generally but related to East Silver Spring, some members of the MPAG expressed concern as to “whether all efforts have been made, as stated in MTA goals, to minimize and mitigate impacts to the natural and human environment of East Silver Spring neighborhoods and small businesses.” “There are significant concerns about the alignment between Silver Spring and Thayer Avenues including: the significant amount and number of takings, the risk and mitigation of impacts to historic and old homes, and the at-grade operation on Thayer Avenue near East Silver Spring Elementary School.”

Finally on page 16, the second sentence has an extra comma that should be deleted between Fenton Street and Wayne Avenue.

*The staff will revise the discussion about the Bonifant Street / Wayne Avenue and the Silver Spring Avenue / Thayer Avenue alignments to reflect the above suggestions.*

A new schedule was presented by the staff that included simultaneous consideration by the MPAG and Planning Board of a staff recommendation on the Locally Preferred Alternative



(LPA) and the Staff Draft of the Purple Line Functional Master Plan. There was a discussion about the relative merits of attempting to review both at the same time or focusing on the LPA and then the Functional Master Plan. The new schedule was presented as a result of input received at the prior MPAG meeting. Upon further discussion, a number of MPAG members indicated that the amount of work involved in the review of the LPA issue and the development of the Master Plan require that the two items be considered separately.

*The staff will revise the schedule to reflect consideration of the LPA first – to be followed by the development and review of a Staff Draft Purple Line Functional Master Plan.*

### **3. Review/Discussion of Ridership and Cost Estimates as presented at first MTA Open House (30-45 minutes)**

The Silver Spring Open House was held by the MTA Project Team the evening before this MPAG meeting. What followed was an open discussion of the information presented at the Open House.

Each member of the MPAG was asked for comments, concerns, or observations related to the presentation at the Open House. Individuals who did not attend were asked to comment or ask questions about the presentation so that they might be better prepared in advance of any opportunity they had to attend an open house. It was noted that same information will be presented at all of the open houses.

Overall, the MPAG was happy to see the ridership numbers, but were disappointed that the ridership numbers were not broken down into segments and by stations. In addition, it was noted that cost estimates per segment would be useful.

Purple Line “Build” Alternatives – Summary (Draft) – MPAG Meeting 12/04/07

Alt. – Wkdy. Pass. & Cost Mid.	Trail	Primary Alignment Bethesda To Silver Spring	At Grade Crossings – Major Streets Only	Grade Separated Crossings	CSX Crossing - South to North	Primary Alignment – East Silver Spring	Shared Lanes	Dedicated Lanes	Exclusive Lane
Low BRT - 32,000 \$485 M	In Tunnel	Jones Bridge Road	Connecticut Ave. Jones Mill Rd. 16 <sup>th</sup> & Spring St. Georgia Avenue	None	Spring Street	Second Ave./Wayne Ave.	Woodmont Ave., Jones Bridge Rd. Spring St., Wayne Ave., Piney Branch Rd.	None	None
Med. BRT - 39,500 \$700 M	In Tunnel	Georgetown Branch	16 <sup>th</sup> & Spring St.	Connecticut Ave., Jones Mill Rd., Georgia Ave.	Aerial –East or West of Falkland Apts.	Bonifant St. To Wayne Ave.	Bonifant St.	Woodmont Ave., Wayne Ave. & Piney Branch Rd.	Georgetown Branch & CSX Corridor
High BRT - 43,500 \$1,255 M	In Tunnel	Georgetown Branch		Same as above plus 16 <sup>th</sup> & Spring St.	Aerial – East or West of Falkland Apt.	Tunnel To Wayne – Option of SS/Thayer Tunnel w/ Aerial Segment On Piney Branch Rd.	None	Woodmont Ave & Wayne Ave, Piney Branch Rd. if not aerial along with SS/Thayer tunnel	Georgetown Branch , CSX Corridor & Tunnel To Wayne Ave., Tunnel To Arliss St.
Low LRT 39,500 \$1,245 M	Trail Thru Park	Georgetown Branch	Connecticut Ave. 16 <sup>th</sup> & Spring St.	Jones Mill Rd., Georgia Ave.	Aerial – East or West of Falkland Apt.	Bonifant St. To Wayne Ave. Tunnel To Arliss St.	Bonifant St.	Wayne Ave.	Georgetown Branch & CSX Corridor, Tunnel To Arliss St.
Med LRT 43,500 \$1,260 M	Trail Thru Park	Georgetown Branch		Connecticut Ave., Jones Mill Rd., Georgia Ave.	Aerial – East or West of Falkland Apt.	Bonifant St. To Wayne Ave.	None	Bonifant Ave., Wayne Ave., Piney Branch Rd.	Georgetown Branch & CSX Corridor, Tunnel To Arliss St.
High LRT 45,500 \$1,685 M	In Tunnel	Georgetown Branch		Same as above plus 16 <sup>th</sup> & Spring St.	Aerial – East or West of Falkland Apt.	Tunnel To Wayne – Option of SS/Thayer Tunnel w/ Aerial Segment On Piney Branch Rd.		Wayne Ave., Piney Branch Rd.	Georgetown Branch , CSX Corridor & Tunnel To Wayne Ave., Tunnel To Arliss St.



# Ridership & Costs

## Ridership

- Based on Future Year 2035 Population & Employment Forecasts
- “Travel times” are between New Carrollton and Bethesda
- “Boardings” are the number of riders who would use the Purple Line on a typical weekday

## Capital Costs

- Estimates in 2007 Dollars; subject to inflation to the time when a project is implemented
- Includes costs to design, manage and construct facilities, acquire right-of-way, and purchase equipment including transit vehicles

## Operating and Maintenance (O&M) Costs

- Estimates in 2007 Dollars; subject to inflation to the time when a project starts operating
- Includes costs to operate transit services and maintain the vehicles, facilities, and equipment
- Accounts for adjustments to local bus services



# Ridership & Costs

Purple Line Alternatives Preliminary Travel Demand Forecasts & Cost Estimates				
Alternative	End to End Peak Period Travel Time (minutes)	Ridership (Daily Boardings)	Capital Costs (Millions -2007\$)	Operating & Maintenance Costs (Millions -2007\$)
Alternative 2: TSM	108	N/A	\$105	\$8
<b>BRT</b>				
Alternative 3: Low Investment BRT	73	29,000 - 35000	\$450 - 520	\$9
Alternative 4: Medium Investment BRT	64	38,000 - 41000	\$650 - 750	\$9
Alternative 5: High Investment BRT	57	42,000 - 45000	\$1,170 - 1,340	\$8
<b>LRT</b>				
Alternative 6: Low Investment LRT	59	38,000 - 41,000	\$1,160 - 1,330	\$20
Alternative 7: Medium Investment LRT	52	42,000 - 45,000	\$1,170 - 1,350	\$18
Alternative 8: High Investment LRT	46	44,000 - 47,000	\$1,580 - 1,790	\$17

\* Preliminary estimates; subject to change based on possible refinements to the alternatives.

- The ridership forecast levels compare well with similar projects being implemented around the US.



# Travel Times

- The Purple Line will save time for many travelers along the corridor.

**Estimated 2030 Travel Times (in minutes) between Stations by Alternative**

Station-to-Station	TSM	Low BRT	Med BRT	High BRT	Low LRT	Med LRT	High LRT
Bethesda - College Park	54	52	49	43	44	38	34
Bethesda - Riverdale Park	58	55	53	46	48	42	37
Bethesda - Silver Spring	18	18	17	16	11	9	9
Bethesda - Takoma/Langley	30	33	31	28	25	21	20
East Silver Spring - College Park	38	34	32	25	30	29	25
East Silver Spring - Riverdale Park	40	38	36	28	34	33	28
East Silver Spring - Silver Spring	8	6	6	4	5	4	4
East Silver Spring - Takoma/Langley	13	15	15	14	11	12	12
New Carrollton - College Park	15	18	17	14	16	14	12
New Carrollton - Riverdale Park	14	14	15	11	12	10	9
New Carrollton - Silver Spring	53	52	50	41	48	43	37
New Carrollton - Takoma/Langley	41	36	33	29	34	31	25
Silver Spring - College Park	44	34	32	29	33	29	25
Silver Spring - Riverdale Park	46	42	36	32	36	33	28
Silver Spring - Takoma/Langley	27	19	15	14	14	12	12
Takoma/Langley - College Park	29	20	19	15	18	18	15
Takoma/Langley - Riverdale Park	28	24	23	19	24	22	18
Takoma/Langley - Silver Spring	27	20	15	14	18	14	13

\* Preliminary estimates; subject to change based on possible refinements to the alternatives.

**AM Peak Transit Travel Times (in minutes) Between Sample Trip Ends**

Trip Origins-Trip Ends	2007	Year 2030				
		NoBuild	TSM	Low BRT	High BRT	Low LRT
<b>Takoma Park (WB on Atlas Avenue &amp; Philadelphia Avenue)</b>						
to Landover (Professional Plaza)	87	88	86	77	78	71
to NIH (Wisconsin Avenue & Jones Bridge Road)	54	57	57	47	52	45
to Rockville (Auricular HealthCare Research Building)	79	88	86	80	85	78
to IRS (Old Road, Lathrop)	39	59	59	54	59	53
<b>Takoma Langley Transit Center</b>						
to Landover (Professional Plaza)	78	114	88	57	53	50
to NIH (Wisconsin Avenue & Jones Bridge Road)	48	72	65	27	31	29
to Rockville (Auricular HealthCare Research Building)	79	88	86	80	85	78
to Bethesda (Leatherhead Martin, Rockledge Drive)	70	105	98	67	62	60
to IRS (Old Road, Lathrop)	54	74	43	34	30	28
<b>Riverdale Park (Barnesby Road &amp; Taylor Road)</b>						
to Landover (Professional Plaza)	57	58	51	46	47	46
to NIH (Wisconsin Avenue & Jones Bridge Road)	77	116	115	72	69	68
to Rockville (Auricular HealthCare Research Building)	128	189	148	112	99	91
to Bethesda (Leatherhead Martin, Rockledge Drive)	100	150	145	112	99	91
to IRS (Old Road, Lathrop)	20	30	28	25	24	25
<b>North Chevy Chase (Washington Parkway &amp; East North Drive)</b>						
to Landover (Professional Plaza)	90	98	98	83	84	80
to Metro Center	35	40	40	31	40	38
to Rockville (Auricular HealthCare Research Building)	50	80	80	50	61	56
to Bethesda (Leatherhead Martin, Rockledge Drive)	45	57	57	44	57	54
to IRS (Old Road, Lathrop)	73	78	78	61	61	60
<b>Riverdale Heights (Beverly Street &amp; 83rd Avenue)</b>						
to Metro Center	48	85	58	54	55	54
to NIH (Wisconsin Avenue & Jones Bridge Road)	75	93	93	74	71	62
to Rockville (Auricular HealthCare Research Building)	103	125	125	103	100	91
to Bethesda (Leatherhead Martin, Rockledge Drive)	88	106	109	106	99	91
to IRS (Old Road, Lathrop)	14	21	20	18	19	18
<b>Silver Spring (Woodale Drive &amp; East West Highway)</b>						
to Landover (Professional Plaza)	94	98	98	80	77	75
to Rockville (Auricular HealthCare Research Building)	58	69	69	70	69	65
to IRS (Old Road, Lathrop)	64	98	78	63	54	60

\* Preliminary estimates; subject to change based on possible refinements to the alternatives.  
Median investment alternative times are approximately mid-way between high and low times for a given mode.

- It will also provide travel time savings for transit users throughout the area.



## AM Peak Transit Travel Times (in minutes) Between Sample Trip Ends

Trip Origins-Trip Ends	2007	Year 2030					
		NoBuild	TSM	Low BRT	High BRT	Low LRT	High LRT
<b>Takoma Park</b> (Ethan Allen Avenue & Philadelphia Avenue)							
to Landover (Professional Place)	67	88	86	77	73	76	71
to NIH (Wisconsin Avenue & Jones Bridge Road)	54	57	57	47	52	50	45
to Rockville (Adventist HealthCare, Research Boulevard)	79	86	86	86	83	80	76
to IRS (Ellin Road, Lanham)	39	59	59	54	50	53	48
<b>Takoma Langley Transit Center</b>							
to Landover (Professional Place)	76	114	66	57	53	56	52
to NIH (Wisconsin Avenue & Jones Bridge Road)	48	72	65	27	31	29	24
to Rockville (Adventist HealthCare, Research Boulevard)	79	86	86	65	62	60	56
to Bethesda (Lockheed Martin, Rockledge Drive)	70	105	96	67	62	60	55
to IRS (Ellin Road, Lanham)	54	74	43	34	30	33	28
<b>Riverdale Park</b> (Queensbury Road & Taylor Road)							
to Landover (Professional Place)	37	56	51	48	47	48	46
to NIH (Wisconsin Avenue & Jones Bridge Road)	77	116	115	72	69	68	61
to Rockville (Adventist HealthCare, Research Boulevard)	126	189	146	112	99	98	91
to Bethesda (Lockheed Martin, Rockledge Drive)	100	150	145	112	99	98	91
to IRS (Ellin Road, Lanham)	20	30	28	25	24	25	23
<b>North Chevy Chase</b> (Kensington Parkway & Kenilworth Driveway)							
to Landover (Professional Place)	90	96	96	83	84	89	80
to Metro Center	35	40	40	31	40	38	37
to Rockville (Adventist HealthCare, Research Boulevard)	50	60	60	50	60	56	54
to Bethesda (Lockheed Martin, Rockledge Drive)	45	57	57	44	57	56	54
to IRS (Ellin Road, Lanham)	73	78	78	61	61	66	57
<b>Riverdale Heights</b> (Sheridan Street & 63rd Avenue)							
to Metro Center	48	65	56	54	55	54	54
to NIH (Wisconsin Avenue & Jones Bridge Road)	75	93	93	74	71	71	62
to Rockville (Adventist HealthCare, Research Boulevard)	103	125	125	103	100	100	91
to Bethesda (Lockheed Martin, Rockledge Drive)	88	109	109	109	99	100	91
to IRS (Ellin Road, Lanham)	14	21	20	18	19	18	18
<b>Silver Spring</b> (Sundale Drive & East West Highway)							
to Landover (Professional Place)	94	98	98	86	77	83	75
to Rockville (Adventist HealthCare, Research Boulevard)	56	69	69	70	69	65	62
to IRS (Ellin Road, Lanham)	94	98	78	63	54	60	52

\* Preliminary estimates; subject to change based on possible refinements to the alternatives.  
 Medium investment alternative times are approximately mid-way between high and low times for a given mode.

Preliminary

# Preliminary

## Estimated 2030 Travel Times (in minutes) between Stations by Alternative

<i>Station-to-Station</i>	<i>TSM</i>	<i>Low BRT</i>	<i>Med BRT</i>	<i>High BRT</i>	<i>Low LRT</i>	<i>Med LRT</i>	<i>High LRT</i>
Bethesda - College Park	54	52	49	43	44	38	34
Bethesda - Riverdale Park	58	56	53	46	48	42	37
Bethesda - Silver Spring	18	18	17	16	11	9	9
Bethesda - Takoma/Langley	30	33	31	28	25	21	20
East Silver Spring - College Park	38	34	32	25	30	29	25
East Silver Spring - Riverdale Park	40	38	36	28	34	33	28
East Silver Spring - Silver Spring	8	6	5	4	5	4	4
East Silver Spring - Takoma/Langley	13	16	15	14	11	12	12
New Carrollton - College Park	15	18	17	14	16	14	12
New Carrollton - Riverdale Park	14	14	15	11	12	10	9
New Carrollton - Silver Spring	53	52	50	41	48	43	37
New Carrollton - Takoma/Langley	41	36	33	29	34	31	26
Silver Spring - College Park	44	34	32	29	33	29	25
Silver Spring - Riverdale Park	46	42	36	32	36	33	28
Silver Spring - Takoma/Langley	27	19	15	14	14	12	12
Takoma/Langley - College Park	29	20	19	15	18	18	15
Takoma/Langley - Riverdale Park	28	24	23	19	24	22	18
Takoma/Langley - Silver Spring	27	20	15	14	18	14	13

\* Preliminary estimates; subject to change based on possible refinements to the alternatives.

## Bethesda / Chevy Chase

## Silver Spring

Alternative 3 Low Investment BRT	The transitway goes from the Bethesda Metro Bus station up Woodmont Avenue to Jones Bridge Road.	On Jones Bridge Road the buses are in shared lanes with queue jump lanes at key intersections.	At Jones Mill Road the transitway joins the Georgetown Branch right-of-way. A permanent trail will be constructed along the south side of the transitway. There will be two new bridges over Rock Creek, one for transitway, one for trail.	At the CSX corridor the transitway stays on south side of the CSX corridor, while the trail crosses CSX on a new bridge near Talbot Street Bridge. The transitway crosses 16th and Spring Streets at grade.	Transitway crosses CSX at Spring Street and continues on Second Avenue. Buses enter Silver Spring Transit Center from Ramsey Street.	The buses continue up Wayne Avenue in shared lanes, to Flower Avenue, then Arliss Street.
Alternative 4 Medium Investment BRT	The transitway begins with a one-way counter clockwise loop on Pearl St, East West Highway, Old Georgetown Road, Edgemoor Lane, Woodmont Avenue on to Georgetown Branch right-of-way alignment. Under the Air Rights building there is a direct elevator connection to the Bethesda Metro station. The trail is on the north side of transitway from Pearl Street east.	The transitway follows the Georgetown Branch right-of-way. There will be a bridge over Connecticut Avenue for the transitway and trail, as well as two new bridges over Rock Creek, one for the transitway, and one for the trail. The transitway and trail go under Jones Mill Road. Just west of Jones Mill Road the trail crosses to the south side of the transitway.	At the CSX corridor the transitway stays on the south side of CSX corridor, while the trail crosses CSX on a new bridge near Talbot Street Bridge. The transitway crosses 16th and Spring Streets at grade.	East of Falklands Apartments the transitway crosses over CSX tracks, to arrive at the Silver Spring Transit Center	The buses leave the CSX right-of-way on Bonifant Street at grade in shared lanes. They travel on Wayne Avenue in dedicated lanes, to Flower Avenue, then Arliss Street.	
Alternative 5 High Investment BRT	The transitway begins with a one-way counter clockwise loop on Pearl St, East West Highway, Old Georgetown Road, Edgemoor Lane, Woodmont Avenue on to Georgetown Branch right-of-way. Under the Air Rights building there is a direct elevator connection to the Bethesda Metro station. The trail is on the north side of transitway from Pearl Street east.	The transitway follows the Georgetown Branch right-of-way. There will be a bridge over Connecticut Avenue for the transitway and trail, as well as two new bridges over Rock Creek, one for the transitway, and one for the trail. The transitway and trail go under Jones Mill Road. Just west of Jones Mill Road the trail crosses to the south side of the transitway.	At the CSX corridor the transitway stays on the south side of CSX corridor, while the trail crosses CSX on a new bridge near Talbot Street Bridge. The transitway crosses 16th and Spring Streets below the grade of those streets.  (Design option) The transitway crosses to the north side of the CSX corridor in a tunnel and continues along the north side.	East of Falklands Apartments the transitway crosses over CSX tracks, to arrive at the Silver Spring Transit Center  (Design option) Aerial crossing of CSX west of Falklands Apartments with an aerial structure along Metro Plaza.	Tunnel to Wayne Avenue, Wayne at grade in dedicated lanes, with a tunnel under Plymouth to Arliss St.  (Design option) Silver Spring/ Thayer tunnel that emerges on Thayer Avenue behind East Silver Spring Elementary School.	
Alternative 6 Low Investment LRT	The alignment follows the Georgetown Branch right-of-way. The alignment starts under the Air Rights building with a direct elevator connection to the Bethesda Metro station. The trail does not go under the Air Rights Building, but off the alignment through Elm Street Park. The trail is on north side of the transitway from Pearl Street east.	The transitway follows the Georgetown Branch right-of-way. The LRT crosses Connecticut Avenue at grade. There would be two new bridges over Rock Creek, one for the transitway, and one for the trail. The transitway and trail go under Jones Mill Road. Just west of Jones Mill Road the trail crosses to the south side of the transitway.	At the CSX corridor the transitway stays on south side of CSX corridor, while the trail crosses CSX on a new bridge near Talbot Street Bridge. The transitway crosses 16th and Spring Streets at grade.  (Design option) The transitway crosses to the north side of the CSX corridor in a tunnel and continues along the north side.	East of Falklands Apartments the transitway crosses over CSX tracks, to arrive at the Silver Spring Transit Center	The LRT leaves the CSX right-of-way on Bonifant Street at grade in shared lanes. It travels on Wayne Avenue in dedicated lanes, entering a tunnel after Manchester Place and continuing under Plymouth to emerge on Arliss St.	
Alternative 7 Medium Investment LRT	The alignment follows the Georgetown Branch right-of-way. The alignment starts under the Air Rights building with a direct elevator connection to the Bethesda Metro station. The trail does not go under the Air Rights Building, but off the alignment through Elm Street Park. The trail is on north side of the transitway from Pearl Street east.	The transitway follows the Georgetown Branch right-of-way. There will be a bridge over Connecticut Avenue for the transitway and trail, as well as two new bridges over Rock Creek, one for the transitway, and one for the trail. The transitway and trail go under Jones Mill Road. Just west of Jones Mill Road the trail crosses to the south side of the transitway.	At the CSX corridor the transitway stays on south side of CSX corridor, while the trail crosses CSX on a new bridge near Talbot Street Bridge. The transitway crosses 16th and Spring Streets below the grade of those streets.	East of Falklands Apartments the transitway crosses over CSX tracks, to arrive at the Silver Spring Transit Center	The LRT leaves the CSX right-of-way on Bonifant Street at grade in dedicated lanes. It travels on Wayne Avenue in dedicated lanes, entering a tunnel after Manchester Place and continuing under Plymouth to emerge on Arliss St.	
Alternative 8 High Investment LRT	This alignment starts under the Air Rights building with a direct elevator connection to the Bethesda Metro station. Under the Air Rights building the trail is in the tunnel, elevated above eastbound tracks. The trail transitions to the north side of the tracks between Pearl Street and just west of Jones Mill Road.	The transitway follows the Georgetown Branch right-of-way. There will be a bridge over Connecticut Avenue for the transitway and trail, as well as two new bridges over Rock Creek, one for the transitway, and one for the trail. The transitway and trail go under Jones Mill Road. Just west of Jones Mill Road the trail crosses to the south side of the transitway.	At the CSX corridor the transitway stays on south side of CSX corridor, while the trail crosses CSX on a new bridge near Talbot Street Bridge. The transitway crosses 16th and Spring Streets below the grade of those streets.  (Design option) The transitway crosses to the north side of the CSX corridor in a tunnel and continues along the north side.	East of Falklands Apartments the transitway crosses over CSX tracks, to arrive at the Silver Spring Transit Center  (Design option) Aerial crossing of CSX west of Falklands Apartments with an aerial structure along Metro Plaza.	Tunnel to Wayne Avenue, Wayne at grade in dedicated lanes, with a tunnel under Plymouth to Arliss St.  (Design option) Silver Spring/ Thayer tunnel that emerges on Thayer Avenue behind East Silver Spring Elementary School, but with an aerial structure on Piney Branch Road.	

University Boulevard		UM / College Park			Riverdale Park			New Carrollton			
The transitway turns left on Piney Branch Road and then right on University Boulevard, both in shared lanes.		The buses pass through the UM campus on Campus Drive and crosses US 1 at Paint Branch Parkway.			The transitway follows Paint Branch Parkway and River Road in shared lanes.		The buses turn right on Kenilworth Avenue, southbound buses in a dedicated lane, northbound in shared lanes.	The buses turn left at East West Highway and continue on Veterans Parkway in shared lanes.	Turning left on Annapolis Road, the buses are in a dedicated lane westbound, and shared lanes east bound.	The buses reach the New Carrollton Station via Harkins Road in shared lanes.	Alternative 3 Investment B
The transitway turns left on Piney Branch Road and continues in dedicated lanes.	The buses turn right on University Boulevard, in dedicated lanes. All intersections are crossed at grade.	The buses pass through the UM campus in dedicated lanes on Campus Drive.	At Regents Drive (the "M") the buses travel at grade in a new exclusive transitway along Intramural fields through East Campus, crossing US 1 at grade.		The transitway follows Paint Branch Parkway and River Road in shared lanes.	The buses turn right on Kenilworth Avenue, both directions in dedicated lanes.	The buses turn left at East West Highway in dedicated lanes, then turn on to Veterans Parkway in shared lanes. The crossing of Annapolis Road is at grade.	The buses turn left on to Eillin Road into dedicated lanes to arrive at the New Carrollton Metro Station.		Alternative 4 Investment B	
The transitway turns left on Piney Branch Road and continues in dedicated lanes.	The buses turn right on University Boulevard in dedicated lanes, with bridges over key intersections, and an underpass at Adelphi Road.	The buses go through the UM campus in a tunnel under Campus Drive, emerging just past the "M" at Regents Drive.	At Regents Drive (the "M") the buses travel at grade in a new exclusive transitway along Intramural fields through East Campus, crossing US 1 at grade.  (Design option) Aerial crossing of US 1, through East Campus to Paint Branch Parkway		The transitway follows Paint Branch Parkway and River Road in dedicated lanes except under the CSX/Metro tracks at College Park.	The buses enter a tunnel from River Road to East West Highway at Kenilworth Road.	The buses follow East West Highway at grade in dedicated lanes.	On Veterans Parkway the transitway is in dedicated lanes with an underpass at Annapolis Road.	The buses turn left on to Eillin Road into dedicated lanes to arrive at the New Carrollton Metro Station.	Alternative 5 Investment B	
The transitway turns left on Piney Branch Road and continues in dedicated lanes.	The LRT turns right on University Boulevard, in dedicated lanes. All intersections are crossed at grade, except there is an underpass at Adelphi Road.	The trains pass through the UM campus in dedicated lanes on Campus Drive.	At Regents Drive (the "M") the LRT travels at grade in a new exclusive transitway along Intramural fields through East Campus, crossing US 1 at grade.		The LRT uses Paint Branch Parkway in shared lanes.	For the rest of the alignment, from the College Park Metro station to New Carrollton, the LRT is in dedicated lanes on River Road, Kenilworth Avenue, East West Highway and Veterans Parkway, Annapolis Road, and Harkins Road..					Alternative 6 Investment L
The transitway turns left on Piney Branch Road and continues in dedicated lanes.	The LRT turns right on University Boulevard, in dedicated lanes. All intersections are crossed except there is an underpass at Adelphi Road.	The trains pass through the UM campus in dedicated lanes on Campus Drive.	At Regents Drive (the "M") the LRT travels at grade in a new exclusive transitway along Intramural fields through East Campus, crossing US 1 at grade.		The transitway follows Paint Branch Parkway and River Road in dedicated lanes except under the CSX/Metro tracks at College Park.	The LRT turns right on Kenilworth Avenue, southbound in a dedicated lane, northbound in shared lanes.	The LRT turns left at East West Highway and Veterans Parkway in shared lanes. The crossing of Annapolis Road is at grade.	The LRT turns left on to Eillin Road into dedicated lanes to arrive at the New Carrollton Metro Station.		Alternative 7 Investment L	
The transitway turns left on Piney Branch Road and continues in dedicated lanes.	The trains turn right on University Boulevard in dedicated lanes, with bridges over key intersections, and an underpass at Adelphi Road.	The trains go through the UM campus in a tunnel under Campus Drive, emerging just past the "M" at Regents Drive.	At Regents Drive (the "M") the LRT travels at grade in a new exclusive transitway along Intramural fields through East Campus, crossing US 1 at grade.  (Design option) Aerial crossing of US 1, through East Campus to Paint Branch Parkway		The transitway follows Paint Branch Parkway and River Road in dedicated lanes except under the CSX/Metro tracks at College Park.	The LRT enters a tunnel from River Road to East West Highway at Kenilworth Road.	The LRT follows East West Highway at grade in dedicated lanes in the median.	On Veterans Parkway the transitway is in dedicated lanes with an underpass at Annapolis Road.	The LRT turns left on to Eillin Road into dedicated lanes to arrive at the New Carrollton Metro Station.	Alternative 8 Investment L	

Some MPAG members expressed an interest in attending a forecasting workshop to gain a better understanding of how the ridership estimates numbers were arrived at by the MTA. Some of the MPAG members want an explanation of why the ridership numbers or method used in the old model that did not calibrate (mimic existing travel conditions) and how those numbers compare to the new, calibrated model ridership numbers. Other members simply want to understand how the current estimates came to be. Other members feel it is a waste of time to go over the unusable ridership numbers from the old model.

*Tom indicated that the staff would schedule a meeting of the MPAG that would be devoted solely to the forecasting methodology.*

One member of the MPAG believes the MTA is trying to “sell” the ridership numbers and costs. The MTA is selling a product, but they are not identifying what product they are selling (i.e. what alternative is favored).

There was some concern expressed that there was virtually no information, with specific findings or actual options being considered, presented at the Open House about the Transit System Management, or enhanced bus service, alternative that MTA is reviewing.

Another MPAG member questioned whether the FTA been involved in the ridership numbers? If so, do we know their views?

*Tom noted that the FTA has been working with the MTA project team on the issues related to the forecasting of ridership and will continue to work with the FTA through the process.*

A number of MPAG members found the travel time table presented at the Silver Spring Open House to be confusing. As an example, many of the trip origins, trip ends, and station to station travel time estimates were not relevant to those in attendance.

In addition, some MPAG members felt that the travel times do not appear to match real time for Silver Spring area. One example is the travel time from Silver Spring to Takoma/Langley Park area.

It would be helpful to show short trips and medium trips for comparison purposes because 45 minutes is too long of a trip.

Is there a significant difference between the Medium BRT and the Medium LRT? There doesn't seem to be a significant difference between the Low and Medium LRT. How can

there not be a big difference between the High BRT and Low BRT as seen in the estimated travel time matrix in the third row down?

*The staff will try to summarize some of the travel time data that was presented at the Silver Spring Open House for presentation at the next MPAG meeting. Additional open house will be held by that time. On a related matter, the staff presented an updated matrix summarizing the major physical features of each of the build alternatives.*

In the “Build Alternatives” matrix, it would be helpful to add a column that includes the bicycle trail. The trail continues to be an issue with the CSX tracks. There are a couple of different alternatives for the trail, which can be seen on the alternative maps given out at previous meetings. In the Low/Medium LRT option, the trail is taken out of the tunnel, which isn’t clear why. The tunnel is an estimated 300 feet in length.

*The matrix includes a column that notes the trail location in Bethesda – in the tunnel or through the park. There is a need to clarify the trail along the CSX corridor in Silver Spring and staff will work on getting that described in some manner.*

Some MPAG members indicated that it was difficult to find someone to answer people’s questions at the Open House. The experts were not there for certain topics such as tunneling under people’s homes on Fenton Street. Handouts were missing from the Open House for people to take home.

*The staff noted that the posters at the Open House will be posted on MTA’s website after all of the Open Houses are completed and that questions can be sent to the MTA staff at any time.*

The County’s effort for the Purple Line was not acknowledged at the Open House, which should not be the case. County residents need to know that they have a formal planning process underway in the County for the Purple Line.

*The staff will ask the MTA to note that there are contacts at the local level as well as the state level.*

One view from a member is that the Purple Line is important for people who do not have access to a car or can’t afford a car. These people need an affordable option to travel and need a faster way to work than what currently exists. This is important for people who live in the east and can be employed in the west, which also creates job opportunities. As part of Outreach, there should be an extra effort made to involve these groups of people

along with the large population of Latinos in the Master Plan effort. Spanish material should be made available to everyone without material being requested for translation.

*The staff will be meeting with IMPACT Silver Spring on December 6<sup>th</sup> to explore additional outreach activities. We will also be attending the Takoma/Langley Open House and coordinating outreach with the Takoma/Langley Sector Plan team.*

One member of the MPAG asked if ridership estimates will be provided for the proposed Purple Line Loop that would end at the Medical Center Metrorail station.

*Tom noted the MTA will not study the Purple Line Loop nor will estimates be made for the Purple Line Loop as part of this DEIS/AA process.*

Some MPAG members were concerned that BRAC was not considered in the information shown at the Silver Spring Open House. One MPAG member noted that the BRAC Committee looks at transportation from a regional perspective – the Purple Line being but one issue. Other MPAG members feel that the Purple Line planning is not considering the full impact of BRAC.

*The DEIS /AA for the National Naval Medical Center in Bethesda (i.e., with the relocated personnel from Walter Reed Hospital as part of the BRAC process) will be officially released on December 14, 2007. The staff will conduct a review of that document to determine what assumptions have been made with respect to the Purple Line and other transit improvements.*

#### **4. Wrap-Up**

One member of the MPAG asked for clarification of the MPAG involvement in the selection of the LPA.

*Tom noted that the MPAG will review information presented in the DEIS/AA and the staff review of the DEIS/AA. The staff review will be in the form of a memo that will also go the Planning Board. MPAG members will be asked to provide advice and comments on both the staff memo and the MTA's DEIS/AA. In addition, the MPAG members will be encouraged to let the Planning Board know of their comments and preference for a specific alternative should they (individually) have a preferred alternative.*

*A tentative agenda for Dec. 18, 2007 meeting will be emailed out to everyone. At the meeting, Tom noted that the staff had not yet made a determination that a December 18, 2007 meeting would be needed. Some members have brought up the fact that it may be good to have a meeting since we are going to be seeking Planning Board approval of a Final*

*Purpose and Outreach Strategy Report in mid-January. As of this writing, the tentative Planning Board date (to include consideration of the Final Report and an update on the Purple Line planning in general) is the afternoon of January 17, 2008. As a result, the December 18, 2007 meeting will be held as planned.*

*As for the December 18, 2007 meeting, the agenda will focus on:*

- *The Final Version of the Purpose and Outreach Strategy Report*
- *A Request to Extend The DEIS/AA Review Period (Minimum of 90 Days)*
- *A Request for the MTA to Provide A Detail Analysis Of Bonifant Street and Wayne Avenue operations with an at-grade Purple Line operation.*
- *Information on the Maryland Special Session and the Purple Line*
- *Additional Input From MPAG members attending the subsequent MTA Open Houses*

## **5. Meeting End**

The meeting concluded at 9:15 pm.