

Meeting Summary
US 29 South Corridor Advisory Committee (CAC) Meeting #4
September 10, 2015, 6:00 p.m. – 9:00 p.m.
Silver Spring Civic Building
1 Veterans Place Silver Spring, MD 20910

Attendees

CAC Members			
Louis Boezi	X	Karen Michels	X
Alan Bowser		Bernice Mireku-North	X
Marie-Michelle Bunch	X	Anita Morrison	
Ilhan Cagri		Brian Morrissey	X
Carmen Camacho		Michael Pfetsch	X
Barbara Ditzler	X	Shane Pollin	
Sean Emerson		Mark Ranze	X
Karen Evans		Dan Reed	
Roberta Faul-Zeitler		Michele Riley	
Joseph Fox	X	Herb Simmens	
Sean Gabaree	X	Tina Slater	
Melissa Goemann	X	Julie Statland	
Larry Goldberg	X	Brad Stewart	
Bradley Gude		Eugene Stohlman	
Avi Halpert		Chris Wilhelm	
Kevin Harris	X	James Williamson	X
Linda Keenan		Teddy Wu	X
Rebecca Lentz-Fernandes	X	Lori Zeller	
Tracy Lewis	X	James Zepp	
Harold McDougall		Clifford Zinnes	X
Jeffrey McNeil	X		
Project Team			
SHA Project Manager – Jamaica Arnold		Lead Project Facilitator – Andrew Bing	
SHA Representative – Kenya Lucas		Facilitator – Jennifer Kellar	
SHA Representative – Carole Delion		Facilitator Assistant – Lauren Garrett	
MTA Project Manager – Tamika Gauvin		Consultant Engineer – Melanie Earnest	
MTA Representative – Kyle Nembhard		Consultant Engineer – Lindsey Ulizio	
Consultant Manager – Brian Lange		Consultant Engineer – Feng Liu	
County Staff			
County Project Engineer – Rafael Olarte		County Representative – Darcy Buckley	
County Planner – Larry Cole		County Representative – Gary Erenrich	
Public			
Nat Bottingheimer		Harriet Quinn	
Joey Heath		Dale Tibbitts	
Chris Morgan		Julie Wolz	

Handouts

Handouts to add to CAC Members' study binders were distributed, which included the following:

- Meeting #3 Summary
- Meeting #4 Agenda
- Meeting #4 PowerPoint
- Meeting #4 Frequently Asked Questions

Meeting materials, including a video recording of the meeting, will be posted on the county's RTS website: www.montgomerycountymd.gov/rts.

Introductions

Jennifer Kellar, the meeting facilitator, opened the meeting by providing an overview of the meeting materials being distributed and the agenda for the meeting. This is a special technical informational session designed to cover in greater detail the data presented during the June CAC meeting.

Background

Carole Delion opened the technical presentation, which covered detailed information associated with travel demand, ridership forecasting, and traffic operations analysis.

CAC Member Comment: A Member wanted to start the meeting by thanking the project team for adapting to the demands of the CAC.

Question: How is the demand analysis going to help with the BRT evaluation? Most of what was described does not seem relevant. The issue isn't the forecasting, it is introducing a new product to a group of people who haven't used BRTs before. What is that methodology?

- **Answer:** The methodology we will be using requires that we evaluate the future demand for vehicle and transit travel within and through the study area. We need to understand what could happen, under assumed future conditions, to traffic operations and bus ridership so that we can evaluate how various BRT alternatives would function. These evaluation results will assist us in understanding how people could react to BRT.

Question: A member asked about how the model is updated to reflect BRT. Are other examples of real-world BRT systems from around the country used to update the model?

- **Answer:** Yes, the model is updated based on industry accepted assumptions and available real-world data. It uses data from multiple sources that provide necessary parameters for bus speeds, frequencies, headways, boarding and alighting time, station spacing, and ridership demand based on population, development, and socio-economic activity, among others.

Question: We (Maryland) have no existing BRT systems but there are places in the country that have implemented BRTs. Has the modeling process factored in those experiences in Washington or Oregon etc.?

- **Answer:** Yes, the assumptions for the BRT alternatives evaluated in the modeling process are based on existing BRT services and experiences from currently operating areas around the nation with similar features and functions as US 29.

Gary Erenrich from Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) added some clarifications on how the modeling efforts are being used to compare and assess alternatives. Gary noted that they are used to highlight the differences between the alternatives using the variances from the models. For the BRT project we are using the up to date methodology for these studies. The key is that we are comparing no build and the different build alternatives using the model. The model has variables that distinguish the alternatives to determine different outcomes. We will get to a point where we can discuss the measures that we want to get from these models. During the presentations please think about the possible results of the model to reflect the differences in alternatives (speed, reliability, etc.).

Feng Liu stated he has worked with the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (MWCOC) model for two decades and different projects across the region. These modeling efforts are required for all projects as part of the FTA funding approval program. In each case, the MWCOC model is adapted and tailored to be a better fit for the particular study area and its specific characteristics and functional properties of the systems being studied.

Question: Has the model been refined to consider evolving technologies like ride sharing, car sharing, etc.? Since your projecting into 2040 does it take future changes in transportation options into consideration?

- **Answer:** Yes, there are many different combinations of travel modes available. The model accounts for all modes that might be utilized, such as BRT, local bus, car sharing, non-motorized, and splitting time between car and transit.

Question: Are all of the BRT studies using the same evaluation and modeling methodology?

- **Answer:** Yes, those that are in process right now are using similar base assumptions and background data in the MWCOC model.

Regional Demand Model: Forecasting

Forecasts utilize computerized mathematical models that provide measurable and comparable data output, such as travel patterns, traffic volumes, and transit ridership. These output values are used by planners, engineers, and decision-makers to document and make decisions on potential transportation improvements. The project is currently at the point where the study area calibration and validation of the forecasting model for transit and highway are being finalized.

Regional Demand Model: Four Step Model

The four step travel demand forecasting model encompasses trip generation, trip distribution, mode choice, and trip assignment. The latest MWCOC/TPB model is a four step model, with the iterative feedback run of major components until it reaches an acceptable level of convergence. The model has been calibrated and validated to the observed data in the base year, and will be used for forecasting in the future year.

Question: Please explain the mode choice parameters and assumptions. There doesn't seem to be anything in this model that has any real context to the choice of using a BRT.

- **Answer:** If someone has a high value of time, they might decide to choose a mode that facilitates faster travel time. That person will choose a facility or a mode that will get them there by a specific time. Someone who isn't as concerned about time may choose a

different mode. The value of time can determine what mode they would use to get to their destination. There is also socioeconomic data; such as if someone cannot afford to buy a car, they might use the BRT since their options are more limited. All of these variables are considered as part of the modeling efforts.

Feng Liu further discussed speed and time, which are key variables in travel behaviors. Cost is another important part of the calculation. There are many variables in mode choice calculations, including transfer times and others. This is not a simple one variable model; it's a very complicated model structure that takes into account actual travel behavior based on actual travel behavior for the area. The MWCOG mode choice model represents an advanced state of practice, with a nested logit model structure and being validated using the latest household and transit-on-board surveys conducted in the region. We do not have BRT in this region to put into the regional model, but we do have travel behavior for the express bus and rail, the BRT would be reasonably expected to fall somewhere in between. In addition, we utilize available data from other similar real-world BRT systems for validation purposes. The model also accounts for the effect of unmeasured variables such as comfort, and security. We need to recognize this is the standard practice in the nation and it is a best practice to use.

Question: It's very hard to evaluate 2040 without really knowing the baseline of 2015. I'm assuming for 2040 projection that there must be a baseline from one point to the next. We need data from 2014 and 2015 to compare to the 2040 numbers. What is the methodology for projecting people and travel demand in the future?

- **Answer:** Existing (current 2014/2015) ridership data has been presented at previous CAC meetings, and we will provide more detailed existing ridership data in the Purpose and Need document. This document will be provided to all members as soon as the document is complete.

CAC Member Comment: There is a metro bus corridor study that overlaps with this one for the Z-Line corridor study. That data would probably cover 98% of the existing ridership data.

Question: I haven't seen how congested traffic operations, particularly at the beltway, are reflected in the model.

- **Answer:** We have presented existing and future no-build traffic operational data, and as we progress through the study we'll be sharing more data on how traffic could function under the various build scenarios. Much more detail on traffic operations will be provided as the project progresses.

Question: What are the current traffic counts? What are the differences in traffic volumes along US 29? Also are you going to look at how far someone is from the BRT stop to determine if they will actually use the BRT?

- **Answer:** Yes, we will share the existing traffic volume data, it will be sent out in the upcoming weeks as we finalize the Purpose and Need document. We will also be looking at the station locations in detail to better understand how they would serve both existing and new transit users, local populations to draw from, development opportunities, and activity center demand. Convenience, connectivity, and accessibility will be a main focus as we evaluate the station locations.

Regional Demand Model: MWCOG Model

The MWCOG regional demand model was used in the forecasting process. The documentation of the model and its data can be viewed on their website: www.mwcog.org. The latest officially adopted regional model Version 2.3.57 was used.

Question: You're saying the screenlines are your baselines?

- **Answer:** Screenlines are used to establish base points for calibration and validation purposes.

Regional Demand Model: Model Inputs

Model inputs for the study area were presented. The study area represents the area from which data will be pulled for analysis. It does not cut or remove roadways or zones outside of the study area. It is selected to buffer the corridor without expanding out so far that the results will be too insignificant to notice. Transportation Analysis Zones (TAZs), Land Uses, Population, and Socio-economic data are other forms of inputs used in the model.

In addition, the projects that are included in the 2040 Constrained Long Range Plan (CLRP) are used for the modeling efforts associated with the future no-build assumptions. The CLRP is available online at www.mwcog.org/clrp. By 2040 approximately 733,000 trips are expected to occur within the study area. We are looking at travel patterns throughout the study area as part of our analysis.

Question: Do you assume a certain frequency for the BRT service when you assign trips?

- **Answer:** At this point no, we are not there yet. Once we get to the point of formulating alternatives, we will make assumptions about the headways and span of service. We have not done any BRT inputs that would reflect a build condition; we have only run no-build figures. The build configuration runs will come later in the study.

CAC Member Comment: The White Oak plan was added to the MWCOG model, the employment numbers based on square footage that is commercial may not necessarily materialize. It's not based on any historic information.

Project Team Response: Land use information was developed by Montgomery County planners at Maryland-National Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC); what was given to us for White Oak (and other areas) is what was used in the model assumptions. It represented the latest planning assumptions for the area.

Question: Integration with existing systems, is that factored into this model? How does it factor in if WMATA is a competitive service? Is WMATA involved in this at all?

- **Answer:** Yes, the study team is coordinating with WMATA. We recognize that existing local bus service is competitive and we'll need to understand how the two systems will affect each other once integrated. The model will look at how WMATA impacts BRT, and vice versa, and we will coordinate with WMATA on the modeling results to understand how the systems could be optimized to work together.

Project Team Response: We are coordinating with all of the local transit groups (WMATA Metrobus and Metrorail, Ride-On, and MTA), they are our partners. There will be on-going coordination with them regarding service operations, stations, fare structure, scheduling, etc.

Question: I'm really concerned about the employment numbers, and the validity of the model with how the data is being incorporated into the evaluation process. My understanding is that the

county's current growth is 300 jobs per year but this document is assuming 6,000 jobs per year. How is the county going to go from 300 jobs a year to 6,000 as used in the model?

- **Answer:** We have been working with the M-NCPPC planners and they have confirmed the numbers being used reflect 75% of the maximum land use. This approach is traditionally used in their projections and is an industry accepted standard for growth modeling. These figures are the best educated guesses based on absorption rates and historical data, but we don't have true historical data since this area is currently being developed. This is an evolving process; the modeling accuracy changes as more data can be provided in each new round. Each time we complete a new model our results will be more refined.

CAC Member Comment: During the master planning sessions, very early on M-NCPPC indicated that the projections of employment and office spaces were not necessarily something they were prepared to comment on at the time. But there are federal agencies that actually do this. In this area there are all kinds of projections of future growth, etc. They were saying that these numbers would be more refined during the master planning session.

Question: On slide 29 there is a discussion on trip patterns, it would be really good to know what it is now. We would like to see corresponding data for current information vs the projections.

- **Answer:** In the previous CAC presentation there are slides that show something similar. Slide 29 shows both the existing pattern and the future pattern. This information is available on the CAC website and will be provided again in the Purpose and Need document, once complete.

Project Team Comment: We will be providing additional technical data in the Purpose and Need document that will show the comparative information you're requesting. Tonight we just wanted to make sure everyone understands what it is that we do and how we do it.

CAC Member Comment: There are certain points in a model that really change the potential output data, and what I'm hearing is that assumptions that go into the model can vary and affect those outputs. I hope that you can work backwards for this model, for example how much ridership you would need from point A to point B that would impact your decisions. Small variations in your assumptions could change your decision-making. Everything comes down to the assumptions; we want to know what those critical values are for the assumptions.

Project Team Comment: When MWCOG creates this model they go through a very rigorous process to validate the model against the observed data. It is created so that people are very comfortable with the data coming out of these models.

We as engineers, planners, and industry professionals are always discussing whether the data are realistic or optimistic and also talking about evaluation criteria for determining relative accuracy of the output. The federal government has been requiring forecasting processes to be sensitive to uncertainty. There is uncertainty analysis that is required by the federal and state government, we are using our best guesses based on information that we do have (zoning, land use, market trends). We are using a range of forecasts, not just a single point to assist in the decision making process.

Traffic Operations

To establish the base data for the traffic operations analysis, SHA obtained traffic counts from 2012 – 2014 (cars, trucks, and pedestrians) from the Maryland State Highway Administration's Traffic Monitoring System (TMS). Current signal timing data was obtained from Montgomery County's Division of Traffic Engineering and Operations, and were also verified by field visits. Regional Integrated Transportation Information System (RITIS) data is used for validation of the model (i.e., to ensure that the model accurately represents true conditions today).

A simulation video of Southbound US 29 was played to show existing conditions during the a.m. peak hour. The video represents congestion experienced during morning peak hours southbound. The video is used to confirm the model isn't doing anything strange and that the conditions are accurately representing what is out there today.

Question: What were we seeing when the colors were changing in the slide with the graphic?

- **Answer:** The graphic is displaying varying degrees of congestion on roadways throughout the project area for 24 hours, every Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday.

Question: September 2014 was used for traffic counts, is that a peak time or average time, how is that used for an annual number? That is a month with a lot of holidays; will that month really reflect accurate numbers?

- **Answer:** We always want to obtain counts that reflect a typical week day during a non-summer/non-holiday time period so that we have numbers that reflect traffic conditions typically experienced by travelers. For the purposes of traffic analysis we are looking for standard and verifiable vehicle counts. The counts are not done during a holiday, schools must be in session, and Monday and Friday's traffic is atypical, so those days are not included. We tried to get a typical weekday of Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday to balance the network. There is a public RITIS data website that you should be able to pull up all of the same travel flow data that the team used for the analysis.

Question: How is MTA data being included? It's showing as not available in the PowerPoint.

- **Answer:** The numbers within the mobility report were just an example. MTA data is included.

Question: Does the simulation take into account delays for accidents?

- **Answer:** No, we do not take into account any accidents that happen.

Question: The delayed access from the cross streets, is that accounted for?

- **Answer:** Yes, VISSIM (traffic operations modeling and simulations software) takes into account vehicles that are considered "unserved". It is very helpful for the no-build scenarios that we incorporate the side streets.

Question: How do you measure boarding?

- **Answer:** We had someone ride the bus and wait for the dwell times and counted the number of riders boarding and exiting the bus.

Project Team Comment: The existing network was calibrated for both a.m. and p.m. peak hours and in each direction of US 29 to accurately represent existing conditions. Calibration refines vehicle behaviors along a network to reflect field conditions; for this study, calibration was based on vehicle volumes and travel times.

Specifically, the chart on slide 50 shows existing US 29 Southbound travel time during p.m. peak hours. It compares the VISSIM timing, field averages (four travel times), and the upper and

lower confidence intervals. You can see both of the models (VISSIM and the field averages) are within the confidence intervals.

Also, Slide 52 shows intersection delays and defines the level of service. Like school grades, A is the best and F is the worst. Anything in the A-C range is green and considered acceptable.

Question: I don't see evidence of queuing, which is a characteristic of US 29. South of MD 650 you get considerable concentrations of queuing.

- **Answer:** We will be showing those results in the purpose and need document. It is taken into account along with travel times. It is just not shown in the PowerPoint today.

Question: The Traffic Calibration example, when was that taken? There should also be 3 others that were taken as well.

- **Answer:** Southbound in p.m. is what was displayed in the PowerPoint, this is just an example graphic, all four (southbound am and pm, and northbound am and pm) were evaluated.

Question: What does the wording of the 2nd bullet on slide 47 mean?

- **Answer:** We used different standards for calibration, so we wanted to see exactly how far away we are with the simulation from the target. There are different statistics that we use to calibrate the traffic volumes to make sure we are in bounds that are industry practice standards.

Question: In the graph on slide 50, why are confidence intervals deviating as you head south? That is a red flag to me. If that is what you are using to compare your model it seems to me you are comparing it to your field measured average data. You are showing you are systemically underestimating the last quarter of the network.

- **Answer:** For that area there is more variation within the section with each run. As you can see we are extremely close to the field measured average, which is also compared to the RITIS data and speeds. We were very close throughout the corridor. This instance just shows the field travel times vary more in this area than in others.

Project Team Comment: Slide 57 discussed future no build assumptions including 2040 future a.m. and p.m. forecasted volumes, existing lane geometry with the proposed Fairland Rd. interchange including Musgrove Rd. closures, optimized signal timings, and Z-line improvements.

Slide 60 is a comparison of 2015 traffic conditions and 2040 no build results. It displays both northbound and southbound traffic peak and off peak hour conditions. As a reminder, the green on the chart represents a range of level of service, A through C, so it reflects a relatively wider variation of congestion levels. The other colors, yellow, orange, and red represent LOS D, E, and F, respectively.

Question: Do we know what the evaluation measures are?

- **Answer:** We discussed those earlier, the travel times, speeds, and densities. The purpose and need will also include more specifics on the evaluation measures.

Question: The graphic on slide 58, the bottom northbound peak time for 2040, it looks like an abnormality to me since it becomes pretty red there. Do you understand the basis for that?

- **Answer:** The volumes in that area are significantly increased due to the planned White Oak development and increases in employment and related travel demand there.

Question: The graphic on slide 57 does not include all that was recommended in the plan, does it?

- **Answer:** We are only including those projects that are currently funded in the CLRP.

Crash Data

Crash data along the corridor were obtained from the Maryland State Police reports for the limits of the study area from 2011 to 2013 (i.e., three years of data). Crash data is important because crashes can negatively impact the reliability of travel times and the data can be used to identify potentially high crash locations so that improvements to address safety concerns can be incorporated into designs.

Question: Does it only include crashes that Maryland State Police respond to? Does it go to the insurance records level?

- **Answer:** Montgomery County Police also report accidents to Maryland State Police and yes, there are some accidents that do go unreported.

Question: The crashes on US 29 listed here are just between the given roadway segments, correct?

- **Answer:** Correct. The data is for each segment of roadway based on the specific characteristics of the facility. The data shown is for a 3 year study period and includes all intersections and interchange ramps to and from US 29.

Question: If the highway between Spring Street and Sligo Creek Parkway would have been captured, the reversible lane section and the corresponding crash rate in that area would have been clearly identified. This may be helpful to better understand the issues there.

- **Answer:** That was brought up during the US 29 CAC North meeting and we will be providing a discussion on the crash data in the purpose and need where the issues in this area will be documented.

Question: The PowerPoint suggests MD 193 to Spring Street is a half mile segment and it shouldn't be.

- **Answer:** MD 193 to Spring Street is approximately 1.6 miles, which is what is reflected in the crash data table presented.

Question: I know you are looking at crash rate per mile; do you also look at number of cars in that section?

- **Answer:** The crash rate comparison is a calculation that takes into account more than just the number of incidents that occurred over the number of miles. Specific characteristics, like traffic volumes, all factor in to how segments are defined and compared across the state

Question: Pedestrian safety is a big issue along this corridor. Is there a way to break out to tell us about the pedestrian crashes area?

- **Answer:** We have the data and we recognize there were a number of pedestrian-related incidences along the corridor. This data will be included in the Purpose and Need document and considered as we develop our alternative designs.

Additional Question and Answer Session

Question: We were just talking about crash data and its frequency, which means that likely every day is going to have some distribution in flow. Can you tweak the model to include those daily crashes to show disruptions? It impacts what we actually see versus what was shown in your model.

- **Answer:** On an average day if there is always some type of disruption that causes an average trip to be delayed, it will be captured. A major incident analysis can always be done via a sensitivity analysis. It can always be done during the alternative studies.

CAC Member Comment: If BRT is implemented it will be along more routes than just the current three (MD 355, MD 586, and US 29). There is enough information out there to estimate where the bus stops are and what the headways could be. These should be included in the demand model for all possible routes. I'm concerned about University Blvd and New Hampshire Ave. Once you get a full BRT network up and running it's a very different set of data outputs than you get having only three separate BRT lines.

Question: By talking about safety information, are you assuming the BRT would make US 29 safer?

- **Answer:** We are not saying that BRT would make US 29 safer. The reason the crash data was investigated was to identify the high crash areas and understand the contributing factors, not necessarily to mitigate those areas. We were looking at that data to determine where we may or may not want to put a stop or service change based on the safety performance of those areas and surrounding facilities.

Question: As far as the modeling, how many assumptions have to be incorrect before you invalidate the model?

- **Answer:** Each model has a certain error threshold level. For instance, VISSIM is 5% error or you start over.

Question: I understand MWCOG is what is used, but how accurate has it been when applied for past forecasts?

- **Answer:** Forecasting is an ever evolving science, it is never the exact same for all projects. What happened in 1990 would not be the same as what's applied today. We recognize that this is a model and we may not precisely meet what we are projecting for 2040. However, we are confident that our projections can be reliably used to conduct comparative analyses of the alternatives that we'll be considering.

Question: Going back into the outputs, you have about a 200% increase in trips, but our population projecting increase is only 17%. What do you attribute the growth in trips?

- **Answer:** Some of the numbers you were quoting exceeded the boundaries of the study area; whereas the 17% is only within the study area. You would have to assess each area individually. There is a difference between commuter trips and local trips, and we must treat them differently.

Question: What assumptions went into the percentage of development numbers? I thought some of the numbers were low.

- **Answer:** Those were figures provided by M-NCPPC planners, we will provide sources for these numbers in our project documents.

Question: You've been giving us a lot of numbers about a lot of things. Will we be getting air quality numbers comparing now and 2040? That is a big determine factor in whatever decision we make.

- **Answer:** Yes, but it may be a little while before we get to that point. This project, if it continues to progress, is going to take on a much more detailed environmental analysis in the future.

Question: During the transit task force that met weeks ago, the chair had mentioned the recent RTS Task Force study for financing purposes. Will those estimates be looked at and will that be presented to the group?

- **Answer:** We appreciate that question. The purpose of this meeting was covering the technical issues related to traffic and ridership. Unfortunately we must avoid questions about other studies and processes that were not covered on tonight's agenda. We can say that the study was done at a very high level and assumptions were made at a very high level. Once we get to the point where we are looking at those details, we will be sharing and comparing that information. Those numbers will likely differ from ours once we conduct detailed construction cost estimates for potential build scenarios along the corridor.

CAC Member Comment: The key numbers that are important to this study are related to employment growth, and several times throughout the presentation corresponding 2040 data are provided, but please also include the 2015 numbers. I'm just a citizen and I'm not remembering what happened at June 2nd meeting and I don't have the time to go back and look. 2040 numbers need to always be displayed against the 2015 numbers so we can always see the changes. The employment number also sticks in my mind. The 78% number seems inflated to me, and apparently the developer manufactured a company that didn't exist. Apparently the developer manufactured this thing in order to get the approvals process advanced. The 78% increase is not reasonable because in the White Oak master plan they had to create a new zoning area whereby commercial and residential can be filled in together. I find 78% for employment very unrealistic. I need more confidence that the commercial and employment growth is actually going to come before we agree that the assumptions in the model are reasonable.

Project Team Response: We recognize that you are very anxious to see side by side comparisons with 2015 and 2040. We hope that for tonight you were able to get a better sense of how we developed those numbers and what we do to get there. Side by side comparisons will be provided as part of the Purpose and Need document.

CAC Member Comment: The fact that we had this session tells me that you are paying attention to our needs and what we are asking for. Thank you.

Question: Not including a BRT route on New Hampshire Avenue makes your model out of sync; these projects should really be done together and in sync. I don't know how to fix that even just to model it. But it seems like an important detail.

- **Answer:** Just this morning there was a request that was provided to include New Hampshire Avenue study at the same time. The response the state provided was no, the State does not want to complete it at this time. County Council would like the study to start at the same time but the State has a lot of studies underway and there are a lot of issues that have to be addressed. When the New Hampshire Ave. study is started it will involve the same people and processes, which should give it a faster start and we would hope to get the study moving quickly, but that's not where we are now.

Next Steps

The facilitator will communicate with the group via email regarding future meetings as dates are set.

Following a review by the internal project team, the meeting summary will be circulated to the members for feedback before being finalized and posted online.