

MD 355 South Corridor Advisory Committees (CAC) Meeting #5 Summary
December 15, 2015 | 6:30 PM – 9:00 PM
Montgomery County Executive Office Building
101 Monroe Street,
Rockville, Maryland

Attendees:

Members	
Nancy Abeles	Richard O. Levine
Josh Arcurio	Damon C. Luciano
Barbara Moir Condos	Jeremy Martin
Elizabeth Crane	Deborah Michaels
Kristi Cruzat	Philip Neuberg
Ryan Emery	Chad Salganik
Roger Fox	David Sears
Debbie Friese	Ana Milena Sobalvarro
Jerry Garson	Gerard Stack
Celesta Jurkovich	Jan White
Peter Katz	Steven P. Wilcox
Eleanor Kott	Max Wilson
Tony Kouneski	Todd Pearson
Apologies	
Peter Benjamin	Patty Mason
Bill Carey	Sasha Page
Francoise M. Carrier	Andy Palanisamy
Jay Corbalis	Ralph Schofer
Ronit Dancis	Eric Siegel
Jad Donohoe	John Alex Staffier
Miti Figueredo	Emily Vaias
Greg Ford	Francine Waters
Victoria (Tori) Hall	Jon Weintraub
Todd Lewers	
Staff	
Facilitator – Yolanda Takesian	Facilitation Staff – John Paul Weesner
Study Team – Alvaro Sifuentes	Maryland Transit Administration – Kevin Quinn
Lead Facilitator– Andrew Bing	Maryland Transit Administration – Jacquelyn Seneschal
Facilitation Staff – Liz Gordon	Maryland Transit Administration – Rick Kiegel



Facilitation Staff – Conor Semler	Maryland Transit Administration – Kyle Nembhard
Montgomery County DOT – Joana Conklin	State Highway Administration – Jamaica Arnold
Montgomery County DOT – Tom Pogue	City of Rockville – Barry Gore
Montgomery County DOT – Rafael Olarte	Study Team – Ronald Bruno
Public	
Charles Armstrong	Paul Seder
Rebecca Stryer	

Handouts

Handouts provided to CAC Members included:

- Agenda for CAC Meeting #5
- Presentation for CAC Meeting #5
- Summary of CAC Meeting #4
- Breakout exercise handout
- Additional binder dividers
- County Executive’s recent remarks regarding economic development plan

Meeting materials and video of the meeting will be posted on the project website:
www.montgomerycountymd.gov/rts

Introduction

Facilitator Yolanda Takesian welcomed attendees, introduced meeting content, and outlined the agenda.

BRT Project Management Team Update

Kevin Quinn, Director of Planning and Programming with the Maryland Transit Administration (MTA), introduced himself to the CAC members and described the role that MTA plays in the State of Maryland. Kevin explained the recent change in project management roles. Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT), the Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA), and MTA are still the project partners, but MTA has replaced SHA as the lead agency. This is due to changes to the State’s transportation program, with the changes to transit projects such as the proposed Purple Line and the proposed Baltimore Red Line, and additional highway projects added to SHA’s program. He emphasized the continuity of the team members in terms of agency staff and consultant team; if anything, MTA is simply adding resources to the project, including Jackie Seneschal, to help oversee the BRT projects and ensure consistency in how we are approaching BRT statewide and within Montgomery County, and Rick Kiegel, as the Corridor Manager for the MD 355 BRT study.



Clarification of County Executive Statement

Joana Conklin explained the County Executive's recent statement to the press, particularly that he is not currently calling for legislation to create a Montgomery County Transit Authority or similar entity, though he does think that such an entity might be useful in the future. He has asked MCDOT to continue the work on this BRT project with the State. He has also asked that MCDOT look into less expensive options that could be implemented more quickly to improve transit on the corridor, and perhaps a phased approach that identifies things that can be done before full implementation of BRT. Joana also clarified information from a recent Washington Post article that identified the project limits for MD 355 as being from Bethesda to Rockville. Joana stated that the facts in the article were incorrect and that the directive from the County Executive was to look at improvements from Bethesda to Clarksburg for short term options.

Project Process and Schedule

Jackie Seneschal explained what staff is currently working on in the context of the ongoing planning process. She explained that it is presumed that some portion of the BRT project will be eligible for Federal Transit Administration (FTA) funding, so the project team has sought to create a process that will lay the groundwork for the State and Federal environmental processes that may take place at a future date. This process is consistent with the newest FTA guidance on how we do project planning. Since this project is operating within SHA's right-of-way it also needs to be consistent with SHA's project planning process and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requirements should federal funding be pursued.

An important difference between the FTA and FHWA process is that the FTA process only allows a project to be in the project development phase for two years. This phase is where a project gains environmental approvals and completes 30% design. This really puts a lot of emphasis on ensuring that the work done during project planning is robust.

The team is currently finalizing a Preliminary Purpose and Need document to release to CAC members for review. It will pull together the information presented to the CAC over the past few months. It will be ready for distribution the week of December 21. The section for the evaluation measures will be incomplete because we are currently working on those. The Preliminary Purpose and Need document along with the Measures of Effectiveness and the Conceptual Alternatives will be presented at the Spring Public Meetings. We will not have the results of the analysis for the different alternatives. We will come back in the Fall with the analysis comparing the alternatives. With this analysis we will be able to determine which alternatives are reasonable and feasible to take to the next phase of the study. This phase is referred to as the Alternatives Retained for Detailed Study (ARDS). The ARDS will include the No-Build alternative and a Transportation System Management (TSM) alternative, in addition to other build alternatives deemed reasonable and feasible. This project is currently funded through the selection of the ARDS stage.

A longer term schedule of elements includes steps not currently funded. It ends with the selection of a Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). The additional elements not currently funded would include additional engineering refinements, another round of traffic and ridership analysis, another round of environmental technical analysis, and an additional public meeting. These steps could be completed by early 2019, assuming funding is available to continue working on the project.

Once an LPA is selected and the decision is made to seek FTA funding then we would follow the NEPA process and use many of the documents developed prior to the NEPA phase. It is at that point that the Purpose and Need statement would be approved by FTA.

CAC Member Comment: *I think we are basically in the first phase because we don't have any data on existing conditions. In addition some of the MD 355 Ride On Plus improvements should be considered as one of the alternatives.*

Response: *What we will provide you in the Preliminary Purpose and Need document is the traffic information that we have to reflect existing conditions. It has been calibrated, and we believe it reflects existing conditions. I also want to remind you where we are in the process, which is that we have the universe of concepts before us, and upon which we will be conducting detailed analysis. We are currently not at the stage of selecting a locally preferred alternative.*

Question: *When will this portion of the project be completed?*

Response: *We expect this portion of the project to finish in the Fall of 2016.*

Question: *Will the alternatives analyzed select from among the different corridors the County is currently studying?*

Response: *No, our alternatives are for MD 355 only. The County will prioritize the corridors.*

Question: *What will the Draft Purpose & Need include? Will it include comments from the CAC?*

Response: *The Draft Purpose & Need is a summation of the work being done by our team and some guidance provided by the committee. This is a first draft of a preliminary document. Your comments will help us make changes to improve it before we release the document for public review. However, this is not the only chance you will have to submit comments.*

Question: *At the RTS Steering Committee the members were given the opportunity to work on measurement criteria. How will that feed into this process?*

Response: *Joana has shared those comments with us. We are currently working on those measures and we will take those comments into consideration and expect to present those to you at our February meeting.*

Question: *Can we distribute to the CAC members the MD 355 Ride-On Plus grant application and the December 3rd presentation [a presentation to locally elected officials]?*

Response: *CAC members will be sent a link to the document locations on the web.*

Goals & Objectives / Preliminary Purpose and Need

Rick Kiegel introduced the Preliminary Purpose and Need document. The purpose of the presentation was to recap the work that was done in CAC Meetings # 2 and # 3 and how that information helped shape the Preliminary Purpose and Need Document and the Goals and Objectives for the Corridor. In meeting #2, needs and values were the main topics of discussion. The presentation included images of the “rating” from that meeting, and members’ comments on needs and values. Those comments were aggregated with comments and findings of other agencies to develop goals and objectives. In meeting # 3 we introduced the purpose and need language of the project to the CAC members. The document that will be shared with the CAC members starts pulling all of the information presented together.

The team took the comments from CAC Meeting # 2 and utilized some of those to develop Goals and Objectives for the project. In addition there are a number of agencies and groups also involved that provided input into the Goals and Objectives.

Rick emphasized that the Preliminary Purpose and Need is a working document, and changes will be made based on CAC member comments before it’s presented to the wider public. The project team seeks to compare the different concept alternatives to one another statistically. A current project focus is developing quantifiable goals and objectives, along with quantitative measures of effectiveness, to make this comparison.

The CAC needs were captured and quantifiable objectives were developed. They lead to the goals and objectives presented at the meeting. The first goal introduced was improving quality of transit service and the objectives under that goal. The second goal looks at what does the transit system do to enhance the quality of life. The third is related to multimodal opportunities and where we can provide better choices to those that ride transit. Another goal is to develop transit services that support master planned development, thinking about the needs of the future. The last goal is related to sustainability and cost effectiveness.

The Preliminary Purpose and Need document is being written in the same format as the NEPA purpose and need so that the process can be as efficient as possible, finding ways to use a lot of the work in the current project phase for the formal environmental process, if Federal funding is later sought. Rick said that the document will be shared with the CAC members the week of December 21 with comments from the CAC members due before the end of January.

CAC Member Comment: *It is good to see that people have reached some consensus on the future of transit and vehicle ownership, car sharing. But we are thinking about the current mode preference of people. We should be thinking about people born today. We need to make sure we invest in what people will need in the long term.*

Response: *We are using the best tools we have available to predict the future.*

CAC Member Comment: *We are missing measures on flexibility and cost-effectiveness.*

Question: *The Goals and Objectives reflect visionary ideals. When do you weigh issues of commuters against the “commuted upon?”*

Response: *We are continuing to refine the Goals and Objectives and will be using them to compare the various alternatives to each other.*

Question: *Isn't this part of the NEPA process? Shouldn't we plan for transitioning this project into NEPA?*

Response: *We are planning on advancing into NEPA but that decision has not officially been made and that stage is also not funded yet.*

CAC Member Comment: *In my experience the NEPA process and federal requirements force illogical outcomes, particularly the cost effectiveness criterion which has produced counterintuitive results.*

Response: *The weight of the cost effectiveness criterion has been reduced under the current administration.*

CAC Member Comment: *In addition after the Alternatives Analysis (AA) process we were already locked into a route by the time we were able to look into more urban design details and deal with property owners. After that your hands are tied, locked into that route. It didn't provide us with a lot of flexibility.*

CAC Member Comment: *Choosing to follow the NEPA process without a guarantee of federal funding would be the worst of all worlds. The issues of urban design are of the highest interest to this group.*

Question: *If we are planning for a bus trip from Clarksburg to Bethesda, can we really provide “competitive and reliable” service?*

Response: *We do not see a trip from Clarksburg to Bethesda as a feasible operations plan. We do not foresee someone riding the BRT from Clarksburg to Bethesda. If you live in Clarksburg and want to head to Bethesda, you typically would take the BRT to Shady Grove and then take the Metro to Bethesda.*

CAC Member Comment: *To create multimodal options we need to stop at transfer centers.*

Conceptual Alternatives Development

Alvaro Sifuentes described how the development of the Preliminary Purpose and Need and CAC member input on the document are critical milestones to begin the development of the conceptual alternatives. A conceptual alternative has to be defined from Bethesda to Clarksburg and is comprised of three elements: the running way, station locations and the service plan. The running way describes the physical location of the BRT and the interaction with the surrounding environment. The station locations identify the specific location of BRT stops. Finally the service plan describes the operational characteristics of the BRT including (headways/service frequencies, hours of service, and bus routing).

RUNNINGWAY

At CAC meeting #3 a series of running way options was introduced. The different options are not meant to be applied from beginning to end, but are meant to be mixed and matched along the corridor. Not every option is appropriate for every segment of the MD 355 corridor. The considerations for the different running way options deal with the different tradeoffs between them related to the operation of the BRT, traffic, visibility, connectivity and impacts associated with the different options.

BRT in Mixed Traffic

BRT under this option would operate in mixed traffic with all traffic on the road operating within the existing roadway footprint. The BRT would be subject to the same delay and congestion experienced on the roadway. This BRT option could include enhanced transit features such as fewer stops and minor operating improvements like transit signal priority (TSP).

BRT Queue Jump Lanes

BRT under this option would also operate in mixed traffic with all other vehicles on the road within the existing roadway footprint. This option would however include BRT queue jumps at intersections where feasible. The BRT queue jump lane would allow the bus to get in the front of the queue and, through a protected signal phase, get ahead of all other vehicles still waiting at the signal. This BRT option could also include enhanced transit with limited stops and minor facility improvements such as TSP.

Reversible / Bi-Directional Dedicated BRT Lane

This option would provide a lane dedicated to the BRT. The difference between the two options is the way the BRT operates. Under a reversible BRT lane, directionality of the dedicated BRT lane would be determined by peak hour demand. Peak direction BRT buses in the one-way reversible lane would stop at new BRT stations, while off-peak direction BRT buses would operate in mixed traffic and could use existing bus stops retrofitted for BRT. The bi-directional dedicated BRT lane would serve BRT buses traveling in both directions. What is necessary to meet that operational characteristic is a passing zone located at appropriate and feasible locations along the route. The dedicated lane can be achieved via an additional lane or repurposing of an existing travel lane.

Dedicated Median BRT Lanes

Under this option, BRT buses would operate in dedicated lanes located in the median. This option would provide the highest level of service compared with other BRT options since the buses would operate in the median. However by being in the median, left turn movements would only occur at signalized intersection or under a protected movement. Many of the existing mid-block crossings along MD 355 would need to be closed and the movements relocated to the nearest signalized intersection. The dedicated lanes can be achieved via additional lanes or repurposing of existing travel lanes.

Dedicated Curb BRT Lanes

Under this option, BRT buses would operate in dedicated lanes located curbside. Since the dedicated lanes are on the outside near the curb, these lanes would have to be shared with local buses and all right turn movements to and from MD 355. This reduces the efficiency of the BRT travel times. The dedicated lanes can be achieved via additional lanes or repurposing of existing travel lanes.

STATION LOCATION

The second component of an alternative is the station location. The project began with the station locations as identified in the Countywide Transit Corridors Functional Master Plan but has since made revisions based on input from the Cities of Rockville and Gaithersburg. The considerations for the location of the station include the adjacent land use, proposed development, ease of access and connectivity to existing and proposed transit service. A few pictures of both median and curb stations were presented.

OPERATIONS PLAN

The third and final component of an alternative is the service or operations plan. This plan discusses the BRT routings and spurs the bus may take to serve a specific area, the transfer points to existing and proposed transit service, and the headway or frequency of the buses at particular points along the corridor. A sample operations plan was presented for discussion purposes.

Question: *What is the difference between a bus in mixed traffic and what we have today?*

Response: *BRT buses in mixed traffic would have preferential treatments such as queue jumps and transit signal priority. Moreover, mixed traffic would likely occur only in sections, not along the entire alignment.*

Question: *Are we getting feedback from cities with BRT?*

Response: *Team planners and engineers have experience learned from work on BRT systems in many other places.*

Question: *Can you provide the feedback provided by Gaithersburg and Rockville?*

Response: *Gaithersburg and Rockville are developing plans that are available online; CAC members will be sent a link to these websites.*

Question: *How will passengers access stations in the median?*

Response: *If a station is located in the median, the design would have to include either a signalized crosswalk or an overpass or underpass.*

Question: *Most of the photos show buses located at grade. Will these BRT concepts feature level boarding?*

Response: *Yes, stations will meet buses at boarding level for BRT buses.*

Breakout Exercise

The CAC members worked in groups based on their geographic area of interest, to look in depth at opportunities and challenges of accommodating BRT on specific sections of the corridor. One group looked at the section of MD 355 through Rockville Town Center, from Edmonston Drive to Mannakee Street. Two groups looked at the section of MD 355 from Security Lane to Halpine Road. And two other groups looked at MD 355 between Jones Bridge Road and I-495 Capital Beltway.

Each group designated a recorder and reporter, to present their discussion to the wider group of CAC members. The groups were asked to consider questions related to the general topic areas of running way types; station locations, surroundings and access; and service and operations.

The CAC members were instructed that the purpose of the breakout sessions is to receive individual feedback, comments, concerns and ideas and to allow the CAC members to dialogue with each other. The purpose is not to seek consensus or agreement on any ideas shared by fellow CAC members.

Breakout Exercise Group Report-Out

SECTION 3: EDMONSTON DRIVE TO MANNAKEE STREET

The group that discussed the segment of MD 355 between Edmonston Drive and Mannakee Street reported to the wider group the following highlights from their discussion:

- On the subject of running way type, the discussion focused on the Rockville Town Center.
 - The group noted that the Rockville draft plan shows two dedicated median running lanes in the southern portion of the Town Center.
 - Right-of-way is constrained all the way to Gude Drive. It might be appropriate to consider mixed traffic in this area.
 - There is a concern about the number of transitions from outside to inside lanes.
 - Buses could run in mixed traffic beyond Veirs Mills Road.
 - Alignment needs to also consider the Veirs Mills Road BRT plans.
 - Consider an alternate route for Veirs Mills Road BRT.
 - Consider BRT grade separation.
- On the subject of station locations, surroundings and access, the group focused on providing high quality station amenities and access.
 - The high bus volumes anticipated on account of the BRT service justifies greater station accommodations
 - Is it possible to connect Veirs Mill Road on the back?
 - The Rockville Pike Plan has very wide right-of-way because of pedestrian accommodations.

- These modes could be accommodated on parallel routes.
- There is a need to drastically improve pedestrian access across MD 355 and other adjoining main roads, particularly because of the existing concentrations of housing and potential for redevelopment.
 - Consider better pedestrian access near the pedestrian bridge over MD 355; possible median station location.
 - Transfer to Red Line is a big draw.
 - Consider reconfiguring open area of station along MD 355.
 - The ridership at Edmonston Drive/MD 355 is high; this area is unsafe for pedestrians. Consider one large BRT stop for that area; median BRT along apartment complex.
 - Beall Avenue and MD 355: parallel routes for bigger bike/ped amenities.

SECTION 2: SECURITY LANE TO HALPINE ROAD

The groups that focused on the segment of MD 355 from Security Lane to Halpine Road reported to the wider group the following highlights from their discussion:

GROUP 1:

- On the subject of running way type, the preference among most participants of the first group was a curb-running BRT lane, with one alternate proposal moving the BRT service off MD 355 through this section.
 - Major right-of-way problems, with business parking adjacent to the sidewalk. Some of the new developments are very close to sidewalks. Not enough sidewalk space along Rockville Pike.
 - One member proposal would turn the BRT service off MD 355 at Edson Lane, follow it to Huff Court, with a stop at Security Lane and Huff Court, left at Marinelli Road, before continuing onto a future road (B-11), make right on to Old Georgetown Road, left on Nebel Street then turn onto Bou Avenue. Finally it would turn right onto Chapman Avenue to serve the Twinbrook Metro Station before continuing back toward MD 355. Then make a left on Halpine to MD 355.
 - Other group members questioned this proposal because it would require a lot of turns which would slow service.
 - Service could be enhanced with signal timing and priority.
 - Queue jumps are needed near the White Flint Metro Station.
 - Curb operations make sense in this area.
 - Buses cannot run in mixed traffic here, it would go too slowly.
 - Discussed possibility of building underground tunnels for pedestrian crossing from one side of Rockville Pike to the other.
- On the subject of station locations, surroundings and access, the first group identified several station locations, with some thinking there should be three stations through this section and others preferring four.

- Curb stations could be located at:
 - Bouic Avenue
 - Bou Avenue
 - Old Georgetown Road
 - Security Lane
- Future RideOn bus service will change in response to BRT implementation.
- Stops should not be at the corners but at mid-block locations.
- Recommended stops at Shady Grove Road and the Lake Forest Park and Ride.
- On the subject of service and operations, the first group varied on required headways, but identified several other operating characteristics:
 - Frequencies need to be five to eight minutes for the service to be competitive.
 - Demand only warrants 12 minute headways.
 - Key transfers at Twinbrook Metro station.
 - Consider making Ride On service free.
 - Increase frequencies on the Red Line.

GROUP 2:

- On the subject of running way type, the second group considered both curb-running and median-running options for the BRT alignment and also suggested diverting a portion of the service off MD 355.
 - Start with White Flint, which is a multimodal transit center.
 - The running way of BRT should be as close to White Flint Metro as possible. This would provide the opportunity for an intermodal station.
 - Some agreed with the master plan for White Flint. Other segments should be consistent with proposed layout.
 - The perception of proximity to BRT is more appealing if it runs in mixed traffic.
 - Does the Rockville City Plan accommodate dedicated lanes?
 - Use Chapman Avenue for southbound service: it is more marketable and has increased visibility.
 - There is a constraint north of Old Georgetown Road; is there enough right-of-way?
 - A dedicated median would provide the most reliable service.
 - Pinch points at Montrose Parkway overpass, NE corner at Old Georgetown Road.
- On the subject of station locations, the second group focused on access to transit stations.
 - A second Metro Station entrance should be considered.
 - Walking distance is an important consideration.
 - Stations should be as close to development as possible.
 - Is there a back-up plan for the tunnel?
 - Connect closer to Twinbrook Avenue.
 - People going to DC will get on at Twinbrook rather than White Flint.
 - A northbound routing along Chapman Avenue could facilitate better access to Twinbrook Metro.
- On the subject of service and operations, the second group focused on short bus headways and cross jurisdictional and service coordination.

- Target 6-minute headways.
- Headways should be coordinated with other services, such as Metro, Metrobus, and Ride On.
- Integration with other systems, such as bikeshare.
- There should be consistency between jurisdictions.
- Density is coming: headways must make transit faster than driving a car.

SECTION 1: JONES BRIDGE ROAD TO I-495 CAPITAL BELTWAY

The groups that focused on the segment of MD 355 between Jones Bridge Road and I-495 Capital Beltway reported to the wider group the following highlights from their discussion:

GROUP 1:

- On the subject of running way type, the first group considered different running ways within the segment and discussed balancing BRT needs with traffic impacts.
 - Can we have dedicated lanes during the peak hour or not?
 - Intersections need to have dedicated lanes or queue jumps.
 - Transit signal priority is also needed at intersections.
 - The service should better feed Metro from neighborhoods.
 - The north portion could have dedicated lanes or mixed traffic with queue jumps.
 - Use existing infrastructure due to restrictions.
 - Need to be integrated with current systems such as Metro.
- On the subject of station locations the first group also discussed the number of stations needed in this segment.
 - A station at Medical Center should stop near the BRAC tunnel.
 - A stop at Cedar Lane could go anywhere there is space but needs to be looked at for safety reasons.
 - A Pooks Hill station should be moved south away from the high-speed area near the ramps. It should also provide a pedestrian overpass.
 - The planned development in this area is very important.
 - There is no sidewalk on the east side of the street.
 - The right-of-way is tight in this area.
 - Solutions should balance needs for transit and motorists.
- On the subject of service and operations, the first group talked about service characteristics, pricing structure, and connections to other transit services.
 - Need to serve low income families without access to cars. Service needs to be affordable.
 - Give riders a choice of service: Metro/Bus/Bikes/Walking.
 - Split off service at Old Georgetown Road to service areas from White Flint to Bethesda Metro/Purple Line, offices, and Suburban Hospital.
 - Consider a Grosvenor to Montgomery Mall spur.
 - Some services will be duplicated.

- All day service should be 15 minutes.
- Ingress and egress for communities needs to be considered.
- Traffic sits in this area.
- A lot of staff from NIH and Naval Medical Center travel from out of the area so BRT would not service a lot of them, but perhaps could connect to buses or rideshare. Needs to be looked into.
- Don't try to pull BRT ridership from Metro.

GROUP 2:

- On the subject of running way type, the second group discussed various running way options and identified opportunities and challenges associated with each.
 - Run BRT in a median dedicated lane near the Beltway in both directions.
 - A stop is needed at Pooks Hill Road because people cannot get to NIH.
 - Many people don't or can't walk to NIH.
 - Grade separation across from Bethesda Meeting House; dedicated curb or queue jump. The median concept won't work.
 - Another suggestion was to run the service in a dedicated reversible lane. The Stone Ridge School impacts traffic morning and night. The Cedar Lane improvement will help.
 - Traffic is heaviest southbound in the morning and northbound in the evening, sensitive to school traffic.
 - A discussion about the Stone Ridge/Cedar Lane median lanes noted it would be problematic for left turns. With a median running service, all turns must be signalized. This could cause problems for commuters and would increase congestion.
 - Others lobbied for the median BRT ("if we're going to do it, we should do it right") with frequent service.
 - There is no silver bullet; complexities associated with developing each.
- On the subject of station locations, surroundings and access, the second group focused on station locations and serving adjacent properties.
 - The group stated that it is important for BRT service to have a station serving Naval Medical/NIH.
 - Still others suggested having just two stations: at NIH and Pooks Hill Road.
 - The Cedar Lane location is problematic due to the traffic congestion.
 - Others felt all three stations were important.
 - BRT is flexible and we could always add a stop later.
 - A station at Medical Center is logical, but it would be hard to cross into the median lane. A curb lane might be better here.
 - Another idea is to have the station near the Stone Ridge School.

Additional Question & Answer Session

Question: *The first groups talked about right-of-way. What are the impacts of the BRT service?*

Response: *We will study right-of-way impacts as part of the alternatives development process.*

CAC Member Comment: *Aside from the BRT planning, there is a need for more Red Line service.*

CAC Member Comment: *I'm concerned about how tonight's information will be used. We all bring particular perspectives, but each is individual and may not capture the entirety of the issues and considerations along the corridor. Do not put this stuff down as gospel.*

Response: *The project team is developing concepts and will use the information from this group to help us understand issues in the area. Our process also relies on objective data and analysis. Future meetings will bring this analysis to the discussion of various alternatives for all corridor segments.*

CAC Member Comment: *We would like to see what zoning regulations will allow along the corridor.*

Additional Question & Answer Session from Public

Public Comment: *Suggest not to plan for even 10 years out, let alone 40 years. Start small and then evaluate what happens.*