



A SERVICE DISABLED
VETERAN-OWNED
SMALL BUSINESS

CORPORATE OFFICE
Baltimore, MD

Suite H
9900 Franklin Square Drive
Baltimore, Maryland 21236
410.931.6600
fax: 410.931.6601
1.800.583.8411

DELMARVA OFFICE
443.290.4060

FIELD LOCATIONS

Arkansas
Georgia
Maine
Maryland
New York
North Carolina
Ohio
Pennsylvania
South Carolina
Texas
Utah
Virginia
West Virginia

July 14, 2020

Mr. Andre Futrell
District Engineer
MDOT SHA, District 3
9300 Kenilworth Avenue
Greenbelt, Maryland 20770

ATTN: Mr. Kwesi Woodroffe

RE: Takoma Junction
POINT-BY-POINT RESPONSE
MDOT SHA Tracking No. 19-AP-MO-008-xx
Montgomery County, Maryland
Our Job No.: 2016-0409

Dear Mr. Futrell:

This letter has been prepared to provide responses to your correspondence dated May 8, 2020, in reference to the submission of the Traffic Impact Study for the Takoma Junction development.

Regional and Intermodal Planning Division (RIPD) Comments (By: Kandese Holford):

Comment No. 1 – Please note the State’s fiscally constrained FY 2020-2025 Consolidated Transportation Program (CTP) includes projects under construction and/or development and evaluation. The CTP includes no projects affecting MDOT SHA facilities analyzed in this TIS.

Response No. 1 – So noted.

Comment No. 2 – Please note the State’s fiscally unconstrained Highway Needs Inventory (HNI), the State’s long-range plan, includes projects that are critical to Maryland’s transportation needs. The HNI includes no projects affecting MDOT SHA facilities analyzed in this TIS.

Response No. 2 – So noted.

Comment No. 3 – Please note Montgomery County Ride-On Bus and WMATA Metrobus serve the development site. All roadway improvements to MDOT SHA roadway facilities should provide for and maintain full ADA-compliant access to existing and potential future transit facilities.

Response No. 3 – So noted.

Comment No. 4 – Please note the December 2000 Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC) Takoma Park Master Plan as amended, in which this development lies, includes the following recommendations affecting MDOT SHA facilities analyzed in this TIS:

- Provide streetscape improvements along MD 195 (Carroll Avenue) from Takoma Junction to Takoma Old Town. Extend the existing character of Old Town by adding trees and improving the sidewalk on the south side along with other streetscape enhancements.
- Provide frequent safe pedestrian crossings to ensure good access to the combined pedestrian/bicycle routes from surrounding neighborhoods.

Response No. 4 – These items are being taken into consideration in the development of the site plan in accordance with the SHA Vision Study.

Comment No. 5 – Please note the December 2018 M-NCPPC Bicycle Master Plan, as amended, includes the following recommendations affecting MDOT SHA facilities analyzed in this TIS:

- A proposed on-road striped bike lane along MD 195 (Carroll Avenue) from west of Sycamore Avenue to Tulip Avenue. All roadway improvements to MDOT SHA roadway facilities should provide for and maintain bicycle facilities as well as full ADA-compliant pedestrian facilities.
- A proposed shared-use path along the north side of MD 410 (Ethan Allen Avenue) from east of MD 195 to MD 650.
- Proposed shared-lane roadway markings on MD 195 Carroll Avenue from Lee Avenue to Ethan Allen Avenue.

Response No. 5 – The bike lane along the site frontage is reflected on the revised plan.

Travel Forecasting and Analysis Division (TFAD) Comments (By: Scott Holcomb):

Comment No. 1 – On Exhibit C-2 for Development #3, the retail pass-by trips were included in the PM total, while the restaurant pass-by trips were excluded. Revise the trips to account for both, or explain why the retail pass-by trips only were included in the PM total.

Response No. 1 – The retail pass-by were based on a background development and should not have been included. The revised report will be adjusted accordingly.

Comment No. 2 – We defer to MNCPPC regarding the use of the previously approved background developments as the Scoping report is from 2018.

Response No. 2 – So noted.

Comment No. 3 – The trip generation for the TIS appears to be in compliance with the LATR standards and the ITE Trip Generation Manual 10th edition.

Response No. 3 – This is correct.

Comment No. 4 – The SimTraffic model used in the study should be validated with the current traffic condition such as queue lengths or corridor speeds/travel times. This should be done to properly analyze the relocated intersection and the site access point.

Response No. 4 – The SimTraffic model was validated using accepted practices when it was developed.

Comment No. 5 – On Exhibit 13 for the Total Traffic and Total with improvement scenarios, include the WB queues for Intersection #2 as the SimTraffic reports show queues.

Response No. 5 – The queue lengths were left out in error but will be reflected in the revised study.

Comment No. 6 – In Exhibit 13 the eastbound storage of Intersection #1 is shown to be 300 feet, while in the SimTraffic reports, the storage link distance is 239 feet. If the table used an actual storage distance, the SimTraffic model should be adjusted so that the distance output can be shown to match the link storage.

Response No. 6 – 300 feet is the actual storage length in between the two intersection. The 239 feet of link distance shown in the SimTraffic Queuing Report reflects the length between the two stop lines. The 239 feet is an actual distance and cannot be changed. The 300 feet is based on the queuing calculation.

Comment No. 7 – Exhibit 13 shows that the northbound queue out of the site is projected to be 140 feet. Is this feasible given the small size of the site?

Response No. 7 – This queue will exist internal to the parking garage and can be accommodated.

Comment No. 8 – If the left turn-in and -out at the site access intersection are allowed, the EB storage with improvement should not be 430 feet for the site access intersection. Also, with the Site Access intersection, the WB Carroll Ave storage should not be 260 feet.

Response No. 8 – The storage availability is being reviewed and will be adjusted accordingly in the revised report.

Comment No. 9 – Include the EB queue for the Site Access intersection in Exhibit 13.

Response No. 9 – There is no eastbound queue for the Site Access itself.

Comment No. 10 – The evaluation of the design of the site access will need to determine if proper sight distance will be available for a full movement access, with the roadway curvature on the west and the truck layover and bus stop on the east. Would the left turn out at the site access be feasible even with the improvement option at Intersection #1?

Response No. 10 – Based on field measurements, we feel adequate sight distance will be available for the proposed access in both directions. We are reconsidering the design of this access.

Comment No. 11 – The site plan on the last page of the appendix shows the revised access for the adjacent Co-Op business. Is this access out of the site onto MD 410 feasible immediately adjacent to the relocated intersection? Exiting traffic would appear to be blocked even with a queue length of 1 eastbound vehicle at the intersection. And left turns out would be extremely challenging.

Response No. 11 – The current proposed plans assume that access to the Co-Op property will be to and from Sycamore Avenue and that no access will exist along MD 410.

Comment No. 12 – The mitigation at the Carroll Avenue intersection should be coordinated with the recent Takoma Park Vision Study recently conducted by MDOT SHA.

Response No. 12 – Any work recommended in this area will take into consideration the recommendations of the Takoma Junction Vision Study recently conducted by MDOT SHA.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,



Glenn E. Cook
Senior Vice President

GEC:amr