

# Changes to Address Board Comments

- Modified language regarding transit priority and added General Plan references
- Added more explanatory text for BRT cross-sections
- Included in the Plan:
  - VMT and VHT maps for the three BRT scenarios that were modeled (Appendix A)
  - additional explanatory language on decision-making for recommended treatments (Appendix B)
  - maps showing the relationship between the recommended network and 2040 forecast employment and housing (Appendix C)

# Letters received since 3-18-13

- Letters in favor of BRT and in support of providing greater priority for transit - 113
- Letters not in favor of BRT – 14
  - Against providing greater priority for transit - 1
  - Against BRT on US29 - 1
  - Against BRT on MD355 (residents of Chevy Chase West) - 12

# Chevy Chase West Comments - 1

- BRT service would duplicate Metrorail service
  - Response: BRT serves a different ridership and is complementary to Metrorail
    - Serves a new market – 40,000 new daily boardings in Red Line corridors (both MD355 and MD97)
    - Low impact on Red Line ridership – 13% to 21% (est.)
    - Additional stops between Metrorail stations
    - Dedicated bus lanes would facilitate direct service from DC to the Bethesda Metro Station and the Purple Line
    - WMATA sees BRT on MD355 as complementary to Metrorail

# Chevy Chase West Comments - 2

- Dedicated bus lanes would make access to neighborhood harder
  - Response: Curb bus lanes would make it easier to get out of the neighborhood; The impact of median bus lanes would depend on future decisions at individual intersections (Phase 2)
- A single pilot project should be pursued first in an area without Metrorail service
  - Response: This is a likely scenario.

# Chevy Chase West Comments - 3

- The need on other corridors that do not duplicate Metrorail service is greater
  - Response: The forecast new ridership on MD355 is the highest of all corridors studied. WMATA is also currently considering introducing MetroExtra service on MD355
- Not following Master Plan process in regard to public input
  - Response: There is no Citizens Advisory Committee, as there would be with an area Master Plan, but we've had many opportunities for public input on the Plan

# Public Outreach

- Oct-Nov 2011: Two community meetings/open houses
- Apr 2012: White Oak Science Gateway CAC
- Oct 2012: Four Corners civic groups
- Nov 2012: Three community meetings/open houses
- Jan-May 2013: Mid-County CAB, Coalition for Smarter Growth, BRAC Implementation Committee, the Montgomery County Civic Federation, Rockville Planning Commission, Rockville Mayor and Council, and Action Committee for Transit
- Plan webpage links to all staff memos, presentations, and resources, as well as an invitation to comment

# Chevy Chase West Comments - 4

- Not following Master Plan process in regard to potential land use changes
  - Response: The recommended network will serve currently planned land use; no land use changes are proposed. Phase 2 identifies a potential expansion as a guide for future land use changes but those changes are not recommended in the Functional Plan.
- A single pilot project should be pursued before putting the network in the Plan
  - Response: The network should be planned as a whole to ensure integrity even if implemented in stages.