Plan & Briefing Purpose

• **Plan Purpose:**
  - Prioritize transit options for service along I-270 Corridor
  - Develop implementation plan to realize priority option(s)

• **Briefing Purpose:**
  - Discuss pre-screening results
  - Review new approach for Corridor Cities transit service
Requested Guidance

1. Confirm emerging list of transit options for further Plan study and prioritization

2. Confirm acceptability of revised approach to Corridor Cities transit service
Pre-Screening Approach & Results
Conceptual Options Summary

1. MD 355 (BRT)
2. MARC Improvements (Commuter Rail)
3. Redline Extension 1 (Metrorail)
4. Redline Extension 2 (Metrorail)
5. Corridor Cities Transitway (BRT)
6. Purple Line Extension (LRT)
7. North Bethesda Transitway Extension (BRT)
8. I-270 Monorail (Monorail)
Conceptual Options Summary

9. I-270 Managed Lanes Bus (Bus)
10. I-270 Light Rail (LRT)
11. I-270 BRT to Bethesda (BRT)
12. I-270/I-495 BRT to NoVa (BRT)
13. I-270/I-495 BRT to Silver Spring (BRT)
Pre-Screening Analysis

1. Organize projects by cost and coverage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low Coverage &amp; High Cost</th>
<th>High Coverage &amp; High Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Coverage &amp; Low Cost</td>
<td>High Coverage &amp; Low Cost</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Evaluate projects via high-level metrics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Travel Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Are travel times competitive?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Population Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Does it serve communities?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Job Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Does it connect jobs?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Accommodating Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Does it support areas with expected growth?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Equitable Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Does it support equity goals?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommended Options for Detailed Study

- Monorail or Light Rail from Shady Grove to Frederick
- Corridor Cities Transitway with current alignment
- MARC station and service upgrades along the Brunswick Line
- I-270 BRT from Frederick to Northern Virginia + Corridor Cities Transitway new concept
- Red Line Extension to Germantown
- Purple Line Extension to Tysons
Requested Guidance:

Confirm acceptability of revised approach to Corridor Cities transit service:

Re-envision Corridor Cities transit service using a network approach rather than a service approach.
Finding: Existing CCT attempts to fulfill two separate purposes, which are not complementary.

a) Connecting Upcounty with the Red Line
b) Supporting the Life Sciences Centers’ economic development potential via enhanced access
**Finding 1:** Option 12 – I-270/I-495 BRT: Frederick to NoVa supports more efficient Upcounty access to the Red Line.
Finding 1: Option 12 – I-270/I-495 BRT: Frederick to NoVa supports more efficient Upcounty access to the Red Line.

Finding 2: Option does not completely fulfill the two separate CCT purposes; it isn’t an effective “replacement” option

- Off-highway diversions are not efficient
- No “local” component of Option 12
- Option 12 does not support Life Sciences Center
Bus offers the advantage of programming flexible service patterns, but to date, the Department has master-planned bus transitways as singular projects with defined routes.

Dedicated guideways can be programmed in multiple ways (e.g. branded BRT, local bus, shuttles). Individual segments have independent utility.

Finding: The Department should shift from a service approach to a network approach to serve the Corridor Cities.
Corridor Cities Transit Network Package

Additional Dedicated Bus Guideway (Planned)
- Montgomery College to Clarksburg Outlets
  - via Future Observation Drive, master-planned
  - Creates alternating leg service pattern for MD 355 BRT
Additional Dedicated Bus Guideway (Planned):
- Montgomery College to Clarksburg Outlets
  - via Future Observation Drive, master-planned

Additional Dedicated Bus Guideway (New):
- Germantown MARC to MD 355 BRT
  - via Germantown Road MD118
  - Connects Germantown MARC, Town Center, Montgomery College and MD 355 BRT
Additional Dedicated Bus Guideway (Planned):
- Montgomery College to Clarksburg Outlets
  - via Future Observation Drive, master-planned

Additional Dedicated Bus Guideway (New):
- Germantown MARC to MD 355 BRT
  - via Germantown Road MD118
- Montgomery Village to Metropolitan Grove
  - via Montgomery Village Avenue/Quince Orchard Road
  - Connects low-income, racially diverse, dense, transit-dependent population to MD 355 BRT & MARC
  - Supports Lakeforest Mall Redevelopment
Additional Dedicated Bus Guideway (Planned):
- Montgomery College to Clarksburg Outlets
  - via Future Observation Drive, master-planned

Additional Dedicated Bus Guideway (New):
- Germantown MARC to MD 355 BRT
  - via Germantown Road MD118
- Montgomery Village to Metropolitan Grove
  - via Montgomery Village Avenue/Quince Orchard Road
- **Shady Grove to Life Sciences Center**
  - via King Farm Boulevard, Fields Road, and Medical Center Drive
  - Makes use of 30 percent CCT design, if desired
Additional Dedicated Bus Guideway (Planned)
• Montgomery College to Clarksburg Outlets
  • via Future Observation Drive, master-planned

Additional Dedicated Bus Guideway (New):
• Germantown MARC to MD 355 BRT
  • via Germantown Road MD118
• Montgomery Village to Metropolitan Grove
  • via Montgomery Village Avenue/Quince Orchard Road
• Shady Grove to Life Sciences Center
  • via King Farm Boulevard, Fields Road, and Medical Center Drive
• Rockville Town Center to Life Sciences Center
  • via MD 28 and/or Research Boulevard; or
  • via MD 355, Gude Drive, and Fallsgrove Road
  • Could be programmed as a leg of CCT or extension of Veirs Mill for a one seat-ride to Life Sciences Center
Questionnaire Feedback from Corridor Cities Respondents

- **Balance access and efficiency**, efficient access more important to Upcounty residents
- **Reliability and frequency > ridership and ease of implementation**
- **Existing needs > future needs**, particularly in terms of serving existing communities vs. areas planned for growth
**Questionnaire Feedback from Corridor Cities Respondents**

- Relatively balanced Plan goal preferences:
- Valued more-highly:
  - serving existing communities
  - meeting existing equity needs
  - addressing future environmental needs
- Valued less-highly:
  - supporting growth
  - meeting future equity needs
Re-envision Corridor Cities transit service using a network approach rather than a service approach.

Requested Guidance:

Confirm acceptability of revised approach to Corridor Cities transit service:

*Re-envision Corridor Cities transit service using a network approach rather than a service approach.*
Outreach

- **Postcard Campaign** – 4,000 mailed to Equity Focus Area households on January 26, 2021
- **On-Bus Signage** - Late-January through Mid-March

10 Percent Participation Increase for Questionnaire
Next Steps

**Winter 2021**
- Develop **metrics** to compare key options
- Develop and execute **methodology** to realize metrics

**Early Spring 2021**
- **Prioritize** options based on metrics

**Late Spring-Summer 2021**
- Solicit feedback and solidify priorities
- Develop **preliminary recommendations**
Recap & Questions

Project Contacts

Patrick Reed
Transportation Planner Coordinator, Mid-County Planning
patrick.reed@montgomeryplanning.org

Jesse Cohn
Transportation Planner Coordinator, Countywide Policy & Planning
jesse.cohn@montgomeryplanning.org