

THE ROCKVILLE SUMMIT 2012: ROADMAP OF THE FUTURE – TRANSPORTATION & TRAFFIC WORKING GROUP

1 BRIEF SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The Transportation and Traffic Working Group (T&T WG)¹ supports the T&T-related goals and objectives in Rockville’s comprehensive master plan (CMP), the City of Rockville Pedestrian Policies, City of Rockville Bikeway Master Plan (2004), the Complete Streets Policy (adopted 2009) [18], (county-level) bike share program [25], Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) plans, and Corridor Cities Transitway (CCT) plan, in conjunction with the recommendations summarized below and supported with Section 4, Table 1 and Table 2.

1. Pursue coordination and cooperation with related governance bodies (e.g. WMATA; County; State), building on common interests, synergizing on common goals, and working with MWCOG. For example, increase rush-hour throughput capacity of public transportation. [4.4.1]

2. Improve quality of life and the environment in Rockville, e.g. “greening”, attracting people to “live where they work.” [4.4.3]

2.1. Disincentivize non-shared, esp. single-occupancy, motor vehicle traffic through the city, in concert with Rockville’s high-density (people; buildings) development and services configuration. [4.2.1]

2.1.1. Strengthen enforcement of pedestrian/bicycle-friendly rules. [4.3]

2.2. Incentivize movement on foot, bicycles, and shared transportation [4.1 - 9], such that people prefer these over single-occupant motor vehicles in Rockville:

2.2.1. An intra-city circulator. [4.1 - 9.2]

2.2.2. Connectivity & efficient movement to areas not easily served by public transit.

2.3. Establish infrastructure to support and promote cleaner, greener transportation, e.g.:

2.3.1. Electric vehicles and automation-assisted vehicles.

2.3.2. Readily accessible recharging stations.

2.3.3. Leverage this infrastructure to enable affordable intra-city “Circulator.” [2.2.1]

3. Minimize neighborhood separation effects of major transportation facilities [Table 1 Goal 6] and provide accessibility for all modes of transportation. Example: Separation of Twinbrook due to CSX/WMATA rail tracks, cutting off access to MD-355. Resolve potential issues:

3.1. King Farm Blvd with the Corridor Cities Transitway (CCT).

3.2. BRT up the middle of MD-355.

3.3. BRT on Veirs Mill Rd.

4. Give greater weight to improving infrastructure for better pedestrian and bike safety [4.2.2-4.2.4], esp. around schools and for seniors, e.g.: more, better sidewalks, bike lanes, secure bike-parking stations; automation-aided enforcement of safety rules.

5. Rockville, as the home of technology-driven businesses, and as a leading technology adopter in the past, should exploit technology aggressively, e.g. in maintenance of paved surfaces [4.2.2-3; 4.2.4-1], enforcement of safety for pedestrians and bicyclists [4.3-2; 4.3-3], and effective, efficient intra-Rockville circulator service [4.1-9].

¹ See Table 3

2 Major Issues identified in intra-WG discussions

1. Pedestrian safety on roads outside Rockville jurisdiction [18].
2. Cooperation and coordination across different governance bodies, e.g.:
 - 2.1. The state controls most major roads passing through Rockville.
 - 2.2. County controls other major roads, traffic lights, and Ride-On bus service.
 - 2.3. WMATA controls Metro rail and bus and their stations.
 - 2.4. Also see in Section 4.4.1 issues # 1.1-1.6.
3. Affordability of housing [18]. (Ref. related policy actions in city [16]).
4. Developments outside Rockville are affecting Rockville beyond its control [17].
 - 4.1. The causes (developments) are outside the jurisdiction of Rockville, i.e., the city is unable to influence those development plans [18].
 - 4.2. The effects (increased traffic; degraded quality of life) are suffered by Rockville residents.
5. People being vested in cars (existing investment; habit and comfort zone; flexibility).
6. Current wait time for mass transit, e.g. 30-minute inter-bus arrival time, is discouraging. See in Sec. 4.4.1, recommendation 3.5.
7. Lack of efficient shared transportation from point of mass transit pick-up or drop-off to destination in Rockville induces people to drive their own vehicle. See in Sec. 4.1 recommendation 9.1.
8. Inability (boxed in; no space) to expand road capacity:
 - 8.1. Little space to increase traffic-carrying capacity of certain existing roads.
 - 8.2. Little space for new roads.
9. Ingress/egress bottlenecks at Shady Grove, Rockville, and Twinbrook Metro stations.
10. Metro governance is not responsive to citizens' needs. Indicators of organizational dysfunction:
 - 10.1. Service degradation since inception in 1976 (hardly 36 years).
 - 10.2. Non-responsiveness to safety findings.
11. The Adequate Public Facility Ordinance (APFO) includes restrictions on traffic at intersections, primarily on state roads. These restrictions tend to limit desired development, for example, in the Town Center area.

3 Major factors that influenced the group's recommendations

1. Because Rockville is "boxed in", growth is more vertical than horizontal, leading to high-density (people; buildings) development. Implication: The traffic & transportation infrastructure must support this growth pattern without compromising quality of life and efficiency of movement.
2. Increasing the number of jobs and residential units in and around Rockville will place greater burden on the Metro, MARC, and the Ride-on bus systems.
3. Increasing the percentage of Rockville Residents who use transit (from 19% to 25%) will also place greater burden on these systems [18]. Implication: Rockville, the County and Metro need to address these together.
4. Factor affecting the future: Rapid Transit plan [16].

5. Trends affecting traffic [16]:
 - 5.1. Less retail shopping; more online shopping.
 - 5.2. Work from home.
 - 5.3. Staggered work hours.
6. Factor inhibiting change: People vested in status quo are more active in community meetings [16].
7. Technological developments will continue to provide more capabilities at lower costs, to support the recommended multi-modal, green transportation vision.

4 Recommendations

The working group recommends unanimously that Rockville should enhance movement in and around Rockville, adjusting to changing circumstances [12], as recommended below.

4.1 Recommendations related to City policy (governance)

Continue pursuing the relevant policies [2, 6], emphasizing the following recommendations.

1. Reduce vehicular traffic; improve pedestrian facilities [16].
 - 1.1. Assign priority to keep sidewalks and bike trails open even in inclement weather.
2. Promote “work where you live” [16].
3. Foster and support innovations to support walking and biking to work [16], e.g.:
 - 3.1. Showers at offices [16].
 - 3.2. Secure bike parking facilities [16].
4. Make Rockville more senior-friendly [18].
5. Create bicyclist-/pedestrian-friendly environment, supporting recommendations 4.2.2-4.2.3.
6. In its sidewalk prioritization policy [2], the utility score should include high weighting for the presence of seniors, school-going children, and people with disabilities (PWD).
7. Update accessibility policy [2] to the latest ADA requirements and guidelines, and direct future planning to consider known requirements, guidelines, and compliance approaches under development.
8. In support of the “green” policy and to manage water drainage, consider pervious surfaces for parking lots sidewalks [16].
9. To incentivize movement on foot, bicycles, and shared transportation, provide “free”² [18] intra-city transportation connecting to shared commuter parking lots and to public transit points.
 - 9.1. Make it more efficient than non-shared vehicular traffic, e.g. limit wait time to 5 minutes.
 - 9.2. Resolve the affordability issue for this intra-city service (intra-city circulator):
 - 9.2.1. Work with the business community.
 - 9.2.2. Consider automation [10, 11] to reduce operational cost.

² Example: Georgetown.

9.2.3. Exploit technology to implement cost-efficient, time-efficient demand-based routing³ and scheduling. Example:

- Establish mobile application or call, which identifies "high cluster" people pick up areas and reserves express bus / van pick up to common destination such as Metro.
- This idea could also reduce the operational cost of the intra-city circulator.

10. To incentivize movement on foot, bicycles, and shared transportation, establish monetary incentives, e.g. city tax rebate; free bus ride for a month.

4.2 Recommendations for City actions, e.g. planning and engineering

While the policy-level recommendations in Section 4.1 above include implicit follow-up planning and engineering actions, additional recommendations are given below concerning congestion, bicyclists, pedestrians, and the transportation infrastructure.

4.2.1 Recommendations concerning traffic congestion

Disincentivize non-shared, esp. single-occupant, motor vehicle traffic through the city, in concert with Rockville's configuration of high-density (people; buildings) development and services, e.g.:

1. Reduce space available for parking, especially as the areas slated for higher density development come on line (future phases of town center, Twinbrook station, etc).
2. Levy congestion charge on larger, more polluting low-occupancy vehicles⁴ [24].

4.2.2 Recommendations concerning bicyclists and pedestrians

Implement the relevant plans [3, 4, 6] towards the respective goals and objectives (see Table 2), working with the Citizens Bike Advisory Committee (CBAC), continuing the good interdepartmental cooperation, and emphasizing the following.

1. Designate areas, zones or spaces limited to pedestrian and bicycle traffic only.
2. Provide ample, secure parking of bicycles (ref. 1.F in [4]), e.g.:
 - 2.1. Rack at every store. Implication: It requires change in zoning ordinance.
 - 2.2. Lock stations.
3. For cost-effective construction or maintenance of sidewalks and bikeways, seek technological innovation opportunities aggressively. Also see 4.2.4-1.
4. Make extraordinary provisions to keep sidewalks and bike trails open even in inclement weather.
5. Implement recommendations from the bikeway plan [4, 6] not yet fulfilled.
6. Protect high traffic bike lanes with barriers, e.g. rumble strips, so that vehicle-driver can feel and hear when too close to bicycle lane.

4.2.3 Recommendations concerning pedestrians

1. Create a master plan, as an explicit component of the CMP [1], such that it supports Rockville's pedestrian policies [2] and facilitates safe, efficient pedestrian movement [14].
2. Create more senior-friendly⁵, child-friendly, PWD-friendly pedestrian paths and crosswalks [17].

³ Example: Base pickup and drop off points on current and projected traffic patterns [18].

⁴ Relieve smaller, greener vehicles.

- 2.1. Seek more effective crosswalk signals⁶.
- 2.2. Employ automation-assisted⁷ enforcement.
- 2.3. Make areas around schools more pedestrian friendly for children [18].

4.2.4 Recommendations concerning transportation infrastructure

1. Explore techniques to improve (faster; cheaper) process of road and sidewalk repairs, e.g. through automation [16].
 - Build on Rockville’s history of being progressive and innovative in road repairs [23]⁸.
 - Explore possibility of getting grant for innovation.
2. Minimize neighborhood separation effects of major transportation facilities [Table 1 Goal 6] and provide accessibility for all modes of transportation. Example: Separation of Twinbrook due to CSX/Wmata rail tracks, cutting off access to MD-355. Resolve potential issues:
 - King Farm Blvd with the Corridor Cities Transitway (CCT).
 - BRT up the middle of MD-355.
 - BRT on Veirs Mill Rd.

4.3 Recommendations concerning enforcement in Rockville

1. Strengthen enforcement of pedestrian/bicycle-friendly rules and laws.
 - More physical enforcement could create more jobs⁹.
2. Employ best available technological support, e.g. traffic-imaging automation, to detect and cite violations. For optimum cost-effectiveness, complement with patrol surveillance as needed, e.g.
 - Foot patrol.
 - Bicycle patrol.
 - Segway scooter.
 - Patrol or vigilance by entity (organization; people) other than city-employed police force.
3. Make provision for citizen-observers to report violations immediately, e.g. with cell-phone applications to send message and photo of violation, automatically inserting location coordinates.

4.4 Recommendations for advocacy by city

Advocacy recommendations are in three groups: Section 4.4.1 concerns coordination with other governance bodies, Section 4.4.2 concerns community awareness and education, and Section 4.4.3 concerns other Rockville Summit 2012 working groups.

4.4.1 Coordination with other governance bodies

1. Pursue coordination and cooperation with related governance bodies (e.g. WMATA; County; State), building on common interests, synergizing on common goals, and working with MWCog. Examples of issues that show need for inter-government coordination [14]:

⁵ Support recommendation from another WG seeking more housing for seniors

⁶ Example: Signal for crosswalk across Chapman, west of Twinbrook Metro station, is more effective than the average signal.

⁷ It can not only pay for itself and change the culture, but also serve as a benign revenue-source.

⁸ See pages 176, 211, and 216; read about the 1959 invention of “SmoothSeal” collaborating with Asphalt Institute.

⁹ Jobs could be through city-employment or contracted services.

- 1.1. Montgomery County traffic impact studies exclude the impact on Rockville, but Rockville conducts studies in which it includes impact on neighboring communities and informs them.
- 1.2. City of Rockville has no influence [14] on the (poor) condition of the Rockville Metro station.
- 1.3. Great Seneca Science Center project planning was not coordinated with City of Rockville.
- 1.4. The service roads along Veirs Mill Rd are city streets and that right of way could be the difference between a successful and true BRT vs one in name only.
- 1.5. Although the State is responsible for certain highways, it does not take responsibilities for sidewalks¹⁰ or bike trails along these highways [2].
- 1.6. Rush-hour throughput capacity of public transportation is inadequate – see recommendation 3.
2. Coordinate with “Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments” (MWCOC) [14].
 - 2.1. Build on common interests, synergizing on common goals.
 - 2.2. Seek change in Metro governance to get responsiveness to citizens’ needs, orchestrating action with other governing bodies.
3. Improve mass transit (e.g. bus-rail) infrastructure:
 - 3.1. Increase Metro Red Line capacity.
 - 3.1.1. Extend to Shady Grove trains that stop at Grosvenor¹¹.
 - 3.1.2. Use 8-car trains when needed to seat all passengers.
 - 3.1.3. Reduce time-interval between trains when needed to seat all passengers.
 - 3.2. Improve Metro Rail platforms at Shady Grove, Rockville, and Twinbrook.
 - 3.2.1. Improve throughput of escalator and stairs, with multiple egress/ingress points.
 - 3.2.2. At Rockville, reduce time to transfer between MARC and Metro trains.
 - 3.2.3. Improve availability of escalators and elevators.
 - 3.2.4. When implementing CCT through King Farm Blvd, improve the Shady Grove station.
 - 3.2.5. When implementing CCT through King Farm Blvd, improve the crossing at MD-355.
 - 3.3. Improve bus punctuality and arrival prediction; leverage technology.
 - 3.4. Shelter and protect users of public transportation from bad weather, at least for high traffic stops; leverage technology to identify those high pickup areas.
 - 3.5. Reduce wait time to the level that public transportation is more attractive than private low-occupancy vehicle, e.g. 5 minutes.
 - 3.6. Also see recommendation 2.1.

4.4.2 Community awareness and education

Orchestrate the culture-change necessary to realize the vision for Rockville’s future, including, but not limited to, the following:

1. Driver education.
2. Work with employers to encourage employees to respect the safety of pedestrians and bicyclists.

¹⁰ City had to construct sidewalks for pre-eighties state highways; city maintains all sidewalks.

¹¹ Ref recent report by the APFO Committee.

4.4.3 Ideas for other Rockville Summit 2012 working groups

The following recommendations relate to the working groups for “job growth and workforce” and “housing.”

1. Improve quality of life and the environment in Rockville, e.g. “greening”, attracting people to “live where they work.”
 - 1.1. Make housing affordable.
 - 1.2. Incentivize living in Rockville; Disincentivize commuting from outside.
2. (From the perspective of reducing traffic) incentivize employers to hire locally or to encourage/incentivize their employees to live within Rockville, shorten commute, or to telework.
3. Promote the shop local concept [13].
4. Promote growth in local businesses rather than chains [16].

References

1. [Division of Long Range Planning and Redevelopment](http://www.rockvillemd.gov/government/cpds/long-range/plans.html), “City of Rockville Comprehensive Master Plan” 2002 URL: <http://www.rockvillemd.gov/government/cpds/long-range/plans.html>
2. City of Rockville Pedestrian Policies URL: http://www.rockvillemd.gov/transportation/pdf/Pedestrian_Policies.pdf
3. Rockville Bikeway Master Plan update URL: <http://www.rockvillemd.gov/masterplan/bikeway/index.html>
4. City of Rockville Bikeway Master Plan adopted April 26, 2004 URL: <http://www.rockvillemd.gov/masterplan/bikeway/BikeMasterPlan4-26-04.pdf>
5. Excerpts from bikeway master plan, recommended by Sara Moline: URL: <https://docs.google.com/file/d/0B40QROK4dTwYYWtKNjY2eGpzWkE/edit>
6. Bicycling in Rockville URL: <http://www.rockvillemd.gov/recreation/bicycling/>
7. Stephen S. Fuller, “The Rockville Summit Roadmap for the future, the City of Rockville, Maryland, Current economic conditions and future directions” October 18, 2011 URL: http://www.rockvillemd.gov/events/images/summit/Fuller_Rockville_Economic_Report_rev.pdf
8. Complete Streets Policy, adopted July 2009, the City of Rockville, Maryland URL: http://www.rockvillemd.gov/transportation/pdf/complete_streets_policy_adopted.pdf
9. Montgomery County Blue Ribbon Panel on Pedestrian and Traffic Safety, Final Report, Setting Safety in Motion: Recommendations for creating walkable communities in Montgomery County, Maryland, Delegate William A. Bronrott, Chair, January 2002 URL: http://www6.montgomerycountymd.gov/content/dot/dir/pedsafety/pdf/blue_ribbon_panel_final_report.pdf
10. Google gets license to operate driverless cars in Nevada URL: http://articles.cnn.com/2012-05-07/tech/tech_nevada-driveless-car_1_sebastian-thrun-driverless-cars-autonomous-vehicles?_s=PM:TECH
11. Google self-driving car license approved in Nevada URL: <http://abcnews.go.com/blogs/technology/2012/05/google-self-driving-car-license-approved-in-nevada/>
12. 2012-06-12 meeting notes (Rockville Summit Transportation & Traffic Working Group, 2012)
13. 2012-06-26 meeting notes (Rockville Summit Transportation & Traffic Working Group, 2012) URL: <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1QjMREwU7NhaOq7rtK-wOd8DYAXadb0KOAj6aWtSHnhU/edit>
14. 2012-07-10 meeting notes (Rockville Summit Transportation & Traffic Working Group, 2012) URL: <https://docs.google.com/file/d/0B40QROK4dTwYTzJFY1U2YzVRQmM/edit>
15. Information obtained from city staff through answers to WG questions. URL:
16. 2012-08-14 meeting notes (Rockville Summit Transportation & Traffic Working Group, 2012) URL: <https://docs.google.com/file/d/0B40QROK4dTwYU2i4S29DS1FEeIE/edit>
17. 2012-08-28 meeting notes (Rockville Summit Transportation & Traffic Working Group, 2012) URL: <https://docs.google.com/file/d/0B40QROK4dTwYWXUxV1Z5TEVDdDQ/edit>
18. 2012-09-02 report draft proposed by Herb Baum URL: https://docs.google.com/document/d/1vwJfeVWFKBlw2kxuhm1ZP1o_CTTIp4dV3hgLRbrPiYo/edit
19. 2012-09-11 meeting notes (Rockville Summit Transportation & Traffic Working Group, 2012) URL: <https://docs.google.com/file/d/0B40QROK4dTwYNVZ3bjR5Z2pZS1k/edit>
20. 2012-09-11 Notes on flipcharts by Samborn, Telesco, Stein, Moline URL: <https://docs.google.com/file/d/0B40QROK4dTwYUWo1Mnpwanlsd0k/edit>
21. 2012-10-02 meeting notes (Rockville Summit Transportation & Traffic Working Group, 2012) URL:
22. Review comments by Mark Pierzchala URL: <https://docs.google.com/open?id=0B40QROK4dTwYU1FTNmotdXF3RGs>
23. McGuckian, Eileen S, “Rockville, Portrait of a City” Hillsboro Press, Franklin, TN, 2001

24. London congestion charge URL: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/London_congestion_charge
 25. Montgomery County bike share program coming. URL <http://www.wjla.com/articles/2012/09/montgomery-county-bike-share-program-coming-79725.html>

Table 1: Traffic & Transportation Working Group recommendations on CMP goals & objectives

CMP [1] Goal	Supporting Objectives [1]	T&T WG recommendation
1. Enhance mobility of people, goods, and services	1. Reduce travel time to activity centers.	Example 1: Circulator service on demand. Example 2: Establish mobile application or call, which identifies "high cluster" people pick up areas and reserves express bus / van pick up to common destination such as Metro. This option could include the intra-city circulator.
	2. Minimize congestion where appropriate.	Disincentivize individual vehicle traffic, e.g., consider reducing space available for parking, especially as the areas slated for higher density development come on line (future phases of town center, Twinbrook station, etc).
	3. Maximize incentives for demand management strategies.	Support
	4. Construct multi-modal transportation improvements to support the impacts resulting from land development (Adequate Public Facilities).	Support
2. Promote a transportation system that is multi-modal, accessible, and friendly to all users.	1. Improve pedestrian connections from households to activity centers.	Support
	2. Improve bicycle connections from households to activity centers.	Support
	3. Increase transit use by residents and employers.	Support
	4. Increase carpool and vanpool use.	Support
	5. Ensure multi-modal access to new developments.	Support
3. Respect and protect neighborhoods especially from the impacts of regional traffic.	1. Minimize non-local traffic in neighborhoods.	Support
	2. Minimize transportation noise impacts in neighborhoods.	Support
	3. Minimize the use of neighborhood streets by heavy trucks.	Support
4. Protect the environment.	1. Minimize the impact on the natural environment.	Support
	2. Minimize the impact on the cultural environment.	Support
	3. Minimize the impact on the socioeconomic environment.	Support
5. Foster a safe and maintainable transportation network that encourages the observance of traffic laws.	1. Improve pedestrian and bicycle safety.	Support
	2. Improve the lighting on city streets.	Support
	3. Improve vehicular safety on city streets.	Support
	4. Maintain quality traffic controls at city	Support

	intersections.	
	5. Maintain streets in superior condition.	Support
6. Minimize the neighborhood separation effects of major transportation facilities.	1. Retrofit pedestrian and bike connections between existing neighborhoods that are divided by major transportation facilities.	Provide accessibility for all modes of transportation. See Sec 1 recommendation 3 and Sec. 4.2.4 recommendation 2. Also recommended in [4, 5]
	2. Retrofit the existing street network to “bridge” the gap between the communities.	Support

Table 2: Traffic & Transportation Working Group recommendations on Bikeway master plan goals & objectives

Bikeway Master Plan [4] Goal	Objective	T&T WG recommendation
1. Enhance the mobility of bicyclists by improving the bicycle facility network	1.1.Install the bike paths, lanes, signs, crossings, signals and other facilities recommended on the Rockville Bicycle Facilities Recommendations map.	Support
	1.2.Remove significant barriers to bicycling.	Support
	1.3.Continue to maintain existing facilities.	Support
	1.4.Continue to gather public input and other data to determine where new facilities and improved maintenance are needed.	Support
2. Provide bicycle facilities during development and redevelopment to improve the continuity of the bikeway network	2.1.Objective 2.1. Add bicycle facilities during roadway construction, reconstruction, or resurfacing.	Support
	2.2.Objective 2.2. Require developers to provide bicycle facilities in new developments.	Support
	2.3.Objective 2.3. Ensure that Rockville’s Roadway Design Standards are bicycle-compatible.	Support
3. Improve the safety of children bicycling to school	3.1. Objective 3.1. Expand the City’s Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Education Program to all	Support
	3.2. Rockville elementary schools.	Support
	3.3. Objective 3.2. Develop a Safe Routes to Schools Program and use it to generate interest in and ideas for improving bicycle facilities near Rockville schools and on routes children use to access these schools.	Support
4. Protect the environment	4.1.Develop media packets on the environmental benefits of bicycling and walking and present them to the Mayor and Council, television, radio, and newspaper media, and the general public.	Support
	4.2.Continue to evaluate the environmental impacts of all proposed bikeway facilities.	Support
5. Promote a transportation system that facilitates bicycling and develop community pride in bicycling	5.1.Create a user-friendly bicycle map and distribute it at public libraries, bicycle shops, and government buildings throughout the City.	Support
	5.2.Promote the Rockville Bikeway Network by designing a distinctive system of signs, maps and markings.	Support
	5.3.Establish incentive programs to encourage citizens to bicycle.	Support
	5.4.Expand Bicycle Recycling Program to offer more free and reduced price bicycles to low-income families.	Support
	5.5.Work with the local bicycle advocacy groups and a diverse group of citizens to implement the Bikeway Master Plan Update.	Support

Table 3: Traffic & Transportation working group participants and roles

Participant	Role
Herbert Baum	Working group member till Sept 10, 2012. Note taker for the first two meetings. Chaired meetings on July 10, Aug 28. Represented the group at the chair meeting.
Sushil Birla	Working group member. Contributed questions for city staff. Took notes for meetings dated July 10 and 24, August 14 and 28, Sept 11, Oct 2. Edited report. Led Sept 11 and Oct 2 meetings.
John Britton	Working group member. Connected WG with PTSAC. (With Mark Pierzchala) Linked WG with back history.
Tom Loggia	Working group member. (With Sushil Birla) Drafted report outline. Provided links to references.
Sara Moline	Working group member. Provided materials for visual aids. Set up social media accounts to invite public input. Extracted recommendations from bikeway master plan [5]. See Table 2.
Mark Pierzchala	Liaison with City Council.
Scott Samborn	Working group member. Chaired WG meetings on June 12 and 16, August 14.
Anita Segreti	Working group member.
Mike Stein	Working group member. Reviewed CMP [1] and extracted recommendations; see Table 1, Table 4. Provided links to references.
Emad Elshafei	Answered WG questions concerning traffic & transportation planning in Rockville. Provided review comments on draft report.
David Levy	Answered WG questions concerning long-range planning in Rockville. Provided review comments on draft report.
Ann Wallas	Answered other WG questions. Attended WG meetings as interface with City Staff. Provided review comments on draft report.

Appendix A: Premises and Assumptions

1. Rockville (residents and businesses) will continue to grow, whereas city land available for development will not... Forecast job growth of 16-18% by 2020.

Implication: Density of occupancy will grow:

- Requiring higher utilization of transportation channels
 - Requiring more efficient movement
 - Leaving less accessibility by car
 - Requiring higher assurance for ability to get around on foot
2. Age of population will continue to rise. Implications:
 - Aging population will want to drive less and use public/shared transportation more.
 - Higher need and value on safe, dependable movement on foot.
 3. Multi-modal transportation will continue to be an attractor to visitors.

Implication: Counting on inter-city, inter-neighborhood transportation facilities to continue being an attractor, the next area of focus should be movement on foot to/from the public transport stop or station.

4. Growth in number of residents will continue - more than Rockville's surroundings.
5. Residents' income or affluence level will continue to grow.
 - 5.1. Concern about this assumption: Other reports indicate a shrinking future, e.g.
 - 5.1.1. Businesses are leaving Montgomery County, due to higher costs¹².
 - 5.1.2. Affluent residents are migrating to other regions (better value)
 - 5.1.3. Poorer people have been moving in. Implication: Public transportation, esp. pedestrian facilities will be needed and valued more.
6. The status of improvements planned in Rockville's CMP, as provided by the city staff on September 28, 2012 is as shown in Table 4.

Table 4: Status of roadway improvements planned in Rockville's Comprehensive Master Plan (CMP)

#	Item	Status
1	Fallsgrove road network	Complete
2	King Farm road network	Complete
3	Montrose Parkway – with bike path and truck restrictions	Complete
Street Extensions		
4	Chapman Avenue – extended north to 355	Planning Phase/Development
5	Chapman Avenue – extended south to Randolph Road	Possibly coming with White Flint II (County)
6	Choke Cherry – extended to south to Piccard Drive	Complete
7	Dawson Avenue – extended east to Hungerford Drive (MD 355)	Planning Phase/CIP
8	Fleet Street – extended to connect existing segments	Planning Phase/Rockville Pike Neighborhood Plan
9	Maryland Avenue – extended north to Dawson Avenue extension	Planning Phase/CIP
10	Nebel Street – extended north to Bou Avenue (in County just south of Rockville)	Planning Phase/County
11	Pleasant Road – extended to connect existing segments	Eliminated: M&C decision, based on public hearing
Interchanges		
12	I-270 at Gude Drive (Future MD 28)	Still on County's priority list
Transit		
13	Corridor Cities Transitway through King Farm	Planning Phase (decision was made on BRT mode)
14	MARC station at Twinbrook Metro or at Randolph Road/Nebel Street	Not considered at this time
Grade Separations		
15	East Jefferson Street (MD 28) and Rockville Pike (MD 355)	Not considered at this time
16	First Street (MD 911) and Rockville Pike (MD 355)	Not considered at this time
17	Gude Drive and Frederick Road (MD 355)	Still on County priority list
18	King Farm Boulevard and MD 355 – bike and pedestrian crossing to Shady Grove Metro	Could be considered as a part of the CCT project. See in Sec. 4.4.1 recommendation #3.2.5
19	Middle Lane and Hungerford Drive (MD 355)	Not considered at this time
20	Montrose Road and Rockville Pike (MD 355), with a crossing of the Metro tracks at Randolph Road (outside of city)	Possibly coming with White Flint II (County)
21	Veirs Mill Road and (MD 586) and First Street (MD 28)	Modified based on public hearing and SHA redesign of the intersection

¹² Cost issue is recognized in the Fuller report

Other		
22	Church Street and Metro/CSX tracks- future study for connection in this area	Not considered at this time
23	King Farm – improve Shady Grove Road ramp/Redland Road/King Farm Boulevard (study circulation)	Not considered at this time. See in Sec. 4.4.1 recommendation #3.2.4
24	Woodmont Bikeway- Should Woodmont Country Club redevelop, a bikeway and pedestrian connection to the Millennium Trail along Wootton Parkway, and to other bikeways shown in the Bikeway Master Plan, should be provided.	Planning Phase/Rockville Pike Neighborhood Plan
25	Stonestreet Avenue – realign near intersection with Park Road	Modified the island at the traffic signal
26	Redesignate MD 28- from West Montgomery Avenue/Jefferson Street to Gude Drive	Still in negotiation with SHA as a possibility
City of Rockville Comprehensive Master Plan		
27	Wootton Parkway. Improvements include turn lanes, pedestrian facilities and transit shelters.	Not recommended for widening within the time horizon of the Plan. However, the existing right-of-way should be preserved for future improvements to be determined through study and a collaborative process with affected neighborhoods.

8. Technological developments will continue to provide more capabilities at lower costs, to support the recommended multi-modal, green transportation vision.