

Shared Use Pathway Task Force Bibliography

Source Title	Summary Description	Relevant Evaluation Criteria
<p>2018 Maryland Bicycle Safety Program Area Brief (Maryland Department of Transportation Motor Vehicle Administration)</p> <p>https://mva.maryland.gov/Documents/FY19_Bicycle_ProgramAreaBriefFINAL.pdf</p>	<p>Data on bicycle injuries and crashes between 2013-2017, review of MD safety laws, and safety tips</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety (EC1)
<p>A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. (Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R.; <i>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</i>, 90(5), 751–783, 2006)</p> <p>https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.90.5.751</p>	<p>Meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory and shows that that intergroup contact typically reduces intergroup prejudice</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social Equity (EC7)
<p>Accessible Pedestrian Trails and Shared Use Paths Webinar (Juliet Shoultz and Bill Botton, U.S. Access Board, Aug. 5, 2021)</p> <p>https://accessibilityonline.s3.amazonaws.com/secureDocs/session_110937/M/Handout_Pedestrian_Trails_8-5-2021_2slides_perpage.pdf?AWSAccessKeyId=AKIAJXK6UZXBOSSQGTFQ&Expires=1637975168&Signature=qxf4AsCZ0%2Bd4wHDrEDYEz9rF818%3D</p>	<p>Review of trail, shared use path, & public rights-of-way accessibility requirements/ recommendations, including surface, slope, signage, protruding objects, etc.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety (EC1) • Social Equity (EC7)
<p>Accessible Shared Streets: Notable Practices and Considerations for Accommodating Pedestrians with Vision Disabilities (US Dept of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, 2017)</p>	<p>Review of notable practices and considerations for accommodating pedestrians with vision disabilities on shared streets</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety (EC1) • Social Equity (EC7)

<p>https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bicycle_pedestrian/publications/accessible_shared_streets/fhwahep17096.pdf</p>		
<p>An Integrative Theory of Intergroup Contact. (Brown, R., & Hewstone, M. In <i>Advances in experimental social psychology</i>, Vol. 37, pp. 255–343. Elsevier Academic Press https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(05)37005-5</p>	<p>Review of the development of the contact theory and conditions that would allow the generalization of attitudes and behavior change beyond the specific context in which the contact occurs.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social Equity (EC7)
<p>Bicycle Facility Design Toolkit (Montgomery County Planning Department, May 2018) https://montgomeryplanning.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/Bicycle-Facility-Design-Toolkit-May-2018.pdf</p>	<p>Overview of best practices for bicycle facility design and application, and guidance for designers and planners.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety (EC1) • Social Equity (EC7)
<p>Bicycle Policy and Design Guidelines (Maryland State Highway Administration, rev 2015) https://roads.maryland.gov/OHD2/Bike_Policy_and_Design_Guide.pdf</p>	<p>Bicycle Policy & Design Guidelines to achieve a consistent statewide approach to bicycle design for all state roadways in accordance with accepted national guidelines and standards and best practices used by state and local governments.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety (EC1) • Social Equity (EC7)
<p>Combatting Homelessness: A Data Driven Approach (Kaushik Kuan, Devireddy, Liu; and Shao, David) https://thisisstatistics.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/HighSchool_SevenTreesStats_Presentation.pdf</p>	<p>Study of homelessness in Los Angeles County CA, identifies root causes, myths and misperceptions, and data dispelling the misconceptions.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety (EC1)

<p>Comment (and video of traffic) from WG resident Wendy Harris on behalf of Lower Brown Street Neighbors Group (Aug. 15, 2021)</p> <p>https://docs.google.com/document/d/1mEfbAJ0T3Lims90tzHdcbvO7f2f9UqmN/edit</p>	<p>Concerns regarding traffic and slope safety, and potential safety mitigation strategies for connection at lower Brown Street, among others</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety (EC1) • Impacts on Specific Areas of Town (EC2) • Environmental and Historical Impact (EC3) • Legal Implications (EC4) • Projections of 10-year Use from MC DoT or Other Sources (EC9) • Planning and Construction Timeline and Funding (EC10) • Other Town-wide Impacts (EC11) • Such other criteria suggested by public input or Task Force discussion (EC12)
<p>Comment by WG resident Paula Puglisi re Fare Equity for Ride-On Buses (Oct. 4, 2021)</p> <p>https://docs.google.com/document/d/15LDgXwUd7JuY1LmOnjdhpdy8Y4IKvN4M/edit?usp=sharing&oid=102498758711804131753&rtpof=true&sd=true</p> <p>Link to MCDOT study: https://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/DOT-Transit/fare-equity/</p>	<p>Importance of transportation equity for low-income residents.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social Equity (EC7)

<p>Comment by WG resident Joan Mahaffey with PPT slides attached (Sept. 1, 2021) https://docs.google.com/document/d/1c9eVXxugkJlpEhREndRQB Yoy2aXgfY62H1bWI61_GRA/edit?usp=sharing</p> <p>Link to PPT: https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/16lhENg9rpuUzZ9S20TMshNsDdnPdk7sB/edit?usp=sharing&ouid=102498758711804131753&rtpof=true&sd=true</p>	<p>Provides information about benefits of the Salt Barn Option.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety (EC1) • Impacts on Specific Areas of Town (EC2) • Environmental and Historical Impact (EC3) • Legal Implications (EC4) • Ease of Access to Metro/ Neighboring Communities (EC5) • Recreational Use (EC6) • Social Equity (EC7) • Planning and Construction Timeline and Funding (EC10) • Other Town-wide Impacts (EC11)
<p>Comment from WG resident Jay Everhart (Sept. 27, 2021) https://docs.google.com/document/d/1BFb_HAjKtVr3eMdJ9h05yqgDnm02KOQc/edit?usp=sharing&ouid=102498758711804131753&rtpof=true&sd=true</p>	<p>Comments to the TF regarding connection on Town land and environmental and other issues</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts on Specific Areas of Town (EC2)

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental and Historical Impact (EC3)
<p>Comment from WG resident Jay Everhart in response to Historic Preservation Commission’s (HPC) Evaluation of DOT Alternative #3, Brown Street Connection (Sept. 27, 2021)</p> <p>https://docs.google.com/document/d/1em-rFKjwanryl741cV43-NsGwZET1Tw1G3RwbVD7428/edit?usp=sharing</p>	<p>Concerns re factual basis for statements by HPC related to historic and environmental impacts.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts on Specific Areas of Town (EC2) • Environmental and Historical Impact (EC3)
<p>Comment from resident David Stopack on behalf of the Historic Preservation Commission (Oct. 15, 2021)</p> <p>https://docs.google.com/document/d/1xOnoV_EHi9JIRYVIlc316KP2hskcneF0/edit</p>	<p>History of Town engagement with and retreat from surrounding communities. Connection to Shared Use Path provides an opportunity to re-engage.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts on Specific Areas of Town (EC2) • Environmental and Historical Impact (EC3) • Ease of Access to Metro/ Neighboring Communities (EC5) • Recreational Use (EC6) • Social Equity (EC7) • Potential Mitigations for the Various Connections (EC8)
<p>Comment from the Border Committee (Sept. 21, 2021)</p>	<p>Border Committee has already engaged with Shady Grove Crossing, and Montgomery County has approved funding for a shared use path between WG and Shady Grove Crossing.. Since Montgomery County has already funded design and construction of this shared use path</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts on Specific Areas of Town (EC2)

<p>https://docs.google.com/document/d/1rIN2E52ypz7K-mxE7RH8h9EyJro_AoYi/edit?usp=sharing&ouid=102498758711804131753&rtpof=true&sd=true</p>	<p>connector, the Border Committee has tabled discussion of the joint project between SGC and WG.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ease of Access to Metro/ Neighboring Communities (EC5) • Social Equity (EC7)
<p>Comment from WG Racial and Social Equity Committee (RASEC) re how a shared use path connection would further RASEC goals to build relationships and make amends with neighboring communities. (Aug. 24, 2021)</p> <p>https://docs.google.com/document/d/1FAno05O5DKkH-slUjD6ykKE6z7Xb9Zoz/edit?usp=sharing&ouid=110203488435064833030&rtpof=true&sd=true</p>	<p>Research has shown that opportunities for natural, incidental interactions (i.e., via shared paths) is reliable means to reduce prejudice and improve intergroup relationships.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social Equity (EC7)
<p>Comment from WG resident Shelley Winkler (Sept. 21, 2021)</p> <p>https://docs.google.com/document/d/149oajSTqzkq3GP17y-ggOQCT9QkljuxWkUYqpoA9neA/edit?usp=sharing</p>	<p>Concern that leaflet about Shared Use Path states that the shared use path will not be built on town property</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts on Specific Areas of Town (EC2)
<p>Comment from WG resident Wendy Harris (Sept. 24, 2021)</p> <p>https://docs.google.com/document/d/1_Fqp9xQN5UMBbnew1gtWQx5Vi05XxIDHqvumPg-_0Zo/edit?usp=sharing</p>	<p>Concern that leaflet about Shared Use Path states that the shared use path will not be built on town property</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts on Specific Areas of Town (EC2)
<p>Comment from WG resident Bob Booher re Soliciting Experts' Assessment on Path Options (Sept. 16, 2021)</p>	<p>Alternatives #2 and 3 (Brown St. and Ridge Rd.) will impact historic views and viewsheds that contribute to the significance and integrity of the 2020 Updated and Expanded National Register Historic District. Such impacts are not anticipated with Alternative #1 (Railroad St./Robert's Oxygen).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts on Specific Areas of Town (EC2) • Environmental and Historical Impact (EC3)

<p>Comment from WG resident Darrell Andersen re A Case Against a Shared-Use Path on the Meadow (August 31, 2021)</p>	<p>Given the Town's historic efforts to preserve the meadow, the Town's commitment to keeping the meadow open and in a near-native state is inviolable</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Environmental and Historical Impact (EC3)
<p>Comment from WG resident Dennis Kirschbaum (August 17, 2021)</p>	<p>Given that the County Planning Board has already agreed to move forward with the Brown St. connection on April 29, 2021, going back to the county to propose one of these other alternatives or yet a new alternative is likely to be dismissed by the county or may scuttle the connection to Washington Grove entirely. We can't afford to take the risk of missing this opportunity.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Safety (EC1) ● Impacts on Specific Areas of Town (EC2) ● Environmental and Historical Impact (EC3) ● Legal Implications (EC4) ● Ease of Access to Metro/ Neighboring Communities (EC5) ● Recreational Use (EC6) ● Social Equity (EC7) ● Potential Mitigations for the Various Connections (EC8) ● Projections of 10-year Use from MC DoT or Other Sources (EC9) ● Planning and Construction Timeline and Funding (EC10)

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other Town-wide Impacts (EC11) • Such other criteria suggested by public input (EC12)
<p>Comment from WG resident Jan Davis (September 30, 2021):</p>	<p>Concerns regarding use of electric bicycles on Town roads to connect with Shared Use Path</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety (EC1)
<p>Comment from WG resident Jane Seegal (September 26, 2021):</p>	<p>Believes that increased bicycle traffic will harm safety, quality of life, and opposes the Brown St. Connection. Favor a Salt Barn/Railroad Street route.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts on Specific Areas of Town (EC2) • Environmental and Historical Impact (EC3) • Ease of Access to Metro/ Neighboring Communities (EC5) • Social Equity (EC7) • Projections of 10-year Use from MC DoT or Other Sources (EC9) • Such other criteria suggested by public input or Task Force discussion (EC12)
<p>Comment from WG resident Janet Lottero (Sept. 1, 2021)</p> <p>https://docs.google.com/document/d/1gOHhTI_f3AMApk52k5WFhQ0Y4g0qvZilkvi-ttPxvk/edit?usp=sharing</p>	<p>Concerns about a direct connection between WG and shared use path considering greatly changed conditions since the Bike/Shared Use path was first put on the books many years ago</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety (EC1) • Impacts on Specific Areas of Town (EC2)

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental and Historical Impact (EC3) • Ease of Access to Metro/ Neighboring Communities (EC5) • Potential Mitigations for the Various Connections (EC8)
<p>Comment from WG resident Jay Everhart re other shared use paths in Montgomery County (Aug. 10, 2021)</p> <p>https://docs.google.com/document/d/1SBz1ll1_yMgo-pRu6wBb9HGzN7-Rm9uR/edit?usp=sharing&oid=102498758711804131753&rtpof=true&sd=true</p>	<p>Examples of Twinbrook Connector that runs from Fishers Lane near the Twinbrook metro station, across Rock Creek Park, to Veirs Mill Road</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Such other criteria suggested by public input or Task Force discussion (EC12)
<p>Comment from WG resident Jay Everhart (Aug. 22, 2021)</p> <p>https://docs.google.com/document/d/10X08M_7tOmCW0vVWX1rg2g9OaQtHKxPP/edit?usp=sharing&oid=102498758711804131753&rtpof=true&sd=true</p>	<p>Greatest safety risks from vehicles and Alt. #3 as having lightest environmental impact. Best route to Metro. location of bike racks and costs for parking vs. free racks. Concerns re “no path option” and potential benefits to Town by moving forward.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety (EC1) • Environmental and Historical Impact (EC3) • Ease of Access to Metro/ Neighboring Communities (EC5) • Projections of 10-year Use from MC DoT or Other Sources (EC9) • Other Town-wide Impacts (EC11)

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Such other criteria suggested by public input or Task Force discussion (EC12)
<p>Comment from WG resident Jay Everhart in response to questions re safety and snow removal/lighting (Sept. 15, 2021)</p> <p>https://docs.google.com/document/d/1J2sylvzBxXQ40j2G3gygxX2Bes3Wv2rdB/edit?usp=sharing&oid=102498758711804131753&rtpof=true&sd=true</p>	<p>Bicycling on snow is less of a safety concern than on ice. Icy conditions are dangerous for all wheeled vehicles. Bicyclists often use lights on the front/back of their bicycles to assist with lighting and visibility.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety (EC1)
<p>Comment from WG resident Jay Everhart on Missed Opportunities (Oct. 2, 2021)</p> <p>https://docs.google.com/document/d/1dJ2fXq1f94RRoio4SiVa9MwqPN99WnVQ/edit?usp=sharing&oid=110203488435064833030&rtpof=true&sd=true</p>	<p>Consequences of a "no path" option including eroded trust between Montgomery County and WG, as well as between Town residents and WG.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety (EC1) Impacts on Specific Areas of Town (EC2) Environmental and Historical Impact (EC3) Ease of Access to Metro/ Neighboring Communities (EC5) Recreational Use (EC6) Social Equity (EC7)
<p>Comment from WG resident Jay Everhart re comparison of WG Connector to other trails (Oct. 24, 2021)</p> <p>https://docs.google.com/document/d/1U0fBD07pZUYUi_Rcm6gJY9WoDnAHby_3/edit?usp=sharing&oid=102498758711804131753&rtpof=true&sd=true</p>	<p>Questions the relevance of comparing bike trails such as Bethesda Trolley Trail and the Millennium Trail, to the WG connector, which will be a dedicated path that will have no vehicular traffic.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental and Historical Impact (EC3) Potential Mitigations for the Various Connections (EC8)

<p>Comment from WG resident Jay Everhart re Questions to task force for 1st September 2021 public meeting (Sept. 1, 2021)</p> <p>https://docs.google.com/document/d/12YQIAJJG5djhXRTmuohoobsp6iYV1arQ/edit?usp=sharing&oid=102498758711804131753&rtpof=true&sd=true</p>	<p>Poses questions re safety and environmental impact due to loss of trees. Are there data on the dangers posed to cyclists and pedestrians by backing vehicles?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety (EC1) • Impacts on Specific Areas of Town (EC2) • Environmental and Historical Impact (EC3) • Potential Mitigations for the Various Connections (EC8) • Projections of 10-year Use from MC DoT or Other Sources (EC9) • Other Town-wide Impacts (EC11)
<p>Comment from WG resident Jay Everhart re Rockville Bicycle Advisory Committee (Sept. 9, 2021)</p> <p>https://docs.google.com/document/d/1ccDQ9Htr4KzdxtoTqfXluz2pdR61oErrCYZa5wQq0Zs/edit?usp=sharing</p>	<p>Provided links to the Committee's webpage, Facebook page, and a video about their weekly summer rides.</p> <p>https://www.facebook.com/bikerockville</p> <p>https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tt3wbQNq2B A</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety (EC1) • Impacts on Specific Areas of Town (EC2) • Recreational Use (EC6) • Social Equity (EC7) • Projections of 10-year Use from MC DoT or Other Sources (EC9)

<p>Comment from WG resident Joan Mahaffey (Sept. 27, 2021)</p>	<p>Questions the Montgomery County (Presentation on 2-17-21), which states that the Railroad Street option involves 26,000 sq.ft. of forest area given that the area was disturbed with the construction of the salt barn in 2013.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental and Historical Impact (EC3)
<p>Comment from WG resident Joey Fones re other shared use paths in Montgomery County (Aug. 7, 2021)</p> <p>https://docs.google.com/document/d/1UAbuahxxCDN3sgc81E_Pie98x-cKA2bt/edit?usp=sharing&oid=102498758711804131753&rtpof=true&sd=true</p>	<p>I was very glad that there was finally movement on this and am pretty disheartened to feel like that work is back-tracking or at risk. A bike path, to me, is forward progress.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety (EC1) • Impacts on Specific Areas of Town (EC2) • Ease of Access to Metro/ Neighboring Communities (EC5) • Such other criteria suggested by public input or Task Force discussion (EC12)
<p>Comment from WG resident Krista Zanetti re how the town will address snow removal, lighting, and intersections (Sept. 6, 2021)</p> <p>https://docs.google.com/document/d/1FDVvKkCoqUpr1VaiOE6yHM1GksAZYTDmC/edit?usp=sharing&oid=102498758711804131753&rtpof=true&sd=true</p>	<p>Concerns about improving snow removal procedures and lighting for bicycle safety and about modifying intersections (i.e., markings, signage, speed bumps).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety (EC1)
<p>Comment from WG resident Liz Everhart re cost a biking to metro vs parking car (Aug. 11, 2021)</p> <p>Please see this website for more information: https://www.wmata.com/service/index.cfm</p>	<p>WMATA website shows that daily parking at the Metro (M-F) is \$5.20/day. There are some bicycle lockers available at the Shady Grove Metro station and they are \$120/year; however, there are bicycle racks at the Metro station that are available for free.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ease of Access to Metro/ Neighboring Communities (EC5) • Recreational Uses (EC6)
<p>Comment from WG resident Liz Everhart re legal issues (Aug. 17, 2021)</p>	<p>The town insurer has already affirmed that the Town is covered as long as it adheres to regular maintenance.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legal Implications (EC4)

<p>Comment from WG resident Liz Everhart re width of paths (Aug.17, 2021)</p>	<p>Clarifies, per communication with Kyle Lucas, that the County has "planned for a 10' wide path with 2' buffers on either side." So, the total width of the trail and buffer would be 14', not 18'</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts on Specific Areas of Town (EC2) • Potential Mitigations for the Various Connections (EC8)
<p>Comment from WG resident Liz Everhart re April 29, 2021 Montgomery County Planning Board meeting minutes (Aug. 25, 2021)</p> <p>https://docs.google.com/document/d/1pkKxKeK7nEmU8O17i1Z4GLsJTCjNb1NzxJCw3KeufBY/edit?usp=sharing</p>	<p>The Planning Board voted in favor of the Brown Street option. Please see item 5, pages 10-11 for the meeting discussion/vote in this link: https://montgomeryplanningboard.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/4-29-21-APPROVED.pdf</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other Town-wide Impacts (EC11)
<p>Comment from WG resident Liz Everhart re current options being studied. (August 23, 2021)</p>	<p>The County is not currently studying three options. The County has chosen one option for funding for planning/ construction.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other Town-wide Impacts (EC11)
<p>Comment from WG resident Liz Everhart (Sept. 2, 2021)</p> <p>https://docs.google.com/document/d/1pkKxKeK7nEmU8O17i1Z4GLsJTCjNb1NzxJCw3KeufBY/edit?usp=sharing</p>	<p>Clarifies that MCDOT conducted a second effort for public input following the meeting on 2/13/2020. This second effort was done via a survey following the public meeting on 2/17/2021 and received response from fifty-five individuals.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning and Construction Timeline and Funding (EC10) • Such other criteria suggested by public input or Task Force discussion (EC12)
<p>Comment from WG resident Margo Cavenagh (October 6, 2021)</p> <p>https://docs.google.com/document/d/1rwQscJESHck_D6Oh5n6l1N7-oJouJr1_/edit?usp=sharing&oid=110203488435064833030&rtpof=true&sd=true</p>	<p>Quality of life advantages for those who are older and aging in place.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social Equity (EC7)
<p>Comment from WG resident Margo Cavenagh (Oct. 6, 2021)</p>	<p>"Those who do not drive" includes a lot of people: school-aged children, persons with physical or mental impairments, people who cannot afford to own a car, those who choose not to for ethical or health reasons, etc.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety (EC1)

<p>https://docs.google.com/document/d/1JHZPdakC6zhkTr2ofGduEnDHO2jecx2/edit?usp=sharing&oid=102498758711804131753&rtpof=true&sd=true</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental and Historical Impact (EC3) • Recreational Use (EC6) • Planning and Construction Timeline and Funding (EC10) • Other Town-wide Impacts (EC11)
<p>Comment from WG resident Nancy Helme re potential consequences of the Town recommending widening of Railroad St. (Oct. 10, 2021 at 3:49 PM)</p> <p>https://drive.google.com/file/d/1LiGy6NEZD8B_hRsdJ4MiZhVgwQZOKJ9w/view?usp=sharing</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts on Specific Areas of Town (EC2) • Ease of Access to Metro/ Neighboring Communities (EC5) • Planning and Construction Timeline and Funding (EC10)
<p>Comment from WG resident Nancy Helme with links regarding Heavy Dashed Red Line Shared Use Path Connection (Oct. 11, 2021)</p> <p>https://docs.google.com/document/d/1KLXN3rdxqGQyP4KyUrXwztRuQHxKCxvmaUIFrwozegY/edit?usp=sharing</p>	<p>Summary history of the Town's public opposition to various proposals by the County to expand the Humpback Bridge to four lanes and to widen Railroad Street with the goal of connecting it to Crabbs Branch Way.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety (EC1) • Impacts on Specific Areas of Town (EC2) • Environmental and Historical Impact (EC3) • Potential Mitigations for the Various Connections (EC8)

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning and Construction Timeline and Funding (EC10)
<p>Comment from WG resident Rick Silton (Sept. 21, 2021)</p>	<p>The Shared Use Path will improve overall safety. Prefer Alt #2 followed by Alt #3. Each area of the town is subject to unequal impact of whatever "features" are in their area. To deny the benefits of the bike path just because it impacts some homes more than others would be a shame, and unfair to the rest of the town. Supporting the bike path makes us good neighbors and provides evidence that Grove residents care about other communities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts on Specific Areas of Town (EC2) • Ease of Access to Metro/ Neighboring Communities (EC5) • Planning and Construction Timeline and Funding (EC10)
<p>Comment from WG resident Sarah Kobrin (Sept. 24, 2021)</p>	<p>Bike path will make it easier to stay out of car. Biking or walking on Oakmont is terrible and dangerous. I hope the bike path feeds safely into the Brown St extension.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts on Specific Areas of Town (EC2) • Legal Implications (EC4) • Ease of Access to Metro/ Neighboring Communities (EC5) • Recreational Use (EC6) • Social Equity (EC7) • Potential Mitigations for the Various Connections (EC8) • Projections of 10-year Use from MC DoT or Other Sources (EC9)

<p>Comment from WG resident Tom Land re Soliciting Experts' Assessment on Path Options (Aug. 26, 2021)</p> <p>https://docs.google.com/document/d/1OegGBXubBpSCh-ZtghRJ0zB_eMDS-pRnKE1GTOzsMiY/edit?usp=sharing</p>	<p>Offer to connect TF with regional experts .and support actions by the Task Force to get assessments by experts in other jurisdictions regarding the various path options being considered by the Task Force. Provided list of experts with contact info.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Other Town-wide Impacts (EC11) ● Such other criteria suggested by public input or Task Force discussion (EC12)
<p>Comment from WG resident Tom Land re Soliciting Experts' Assessment on Path Options (Sept. 20, 2021)</p> <p>https://docs.google.com/document/d/1OegGBXubBpSCh-ZtghRJ0zB_eMDS-pRnKE1GTOzsMiY/edit?usp=sharing</p>	<p>Offered to connect TF with regional experts. Believes that regional experts will express serious concerns about the safety of mixing pedestrians, bicyclists, and vehicles where Railroad, Ridge and the Roberts Oxygen's fence line meet due to the unavoidable blind corners in any configuration. Recommends this alignment should not even be considered due to the likelihood of accidents and/or death.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Safety (EC1) ● Impacts on Specific Areas of Town (EC2) ● Environmental and Historical Impact (EC3) ● Ease of Access to Metro/ Neighboring Communities (EC5) ● Other Town-wide Impacts (EC11)
<p>Corridor Forward: The I-270 Transit Plan Preliminary Recommendations (Maryland-National Capital Park & Planning Commission Report, October 1, 2021. Link sent by WG Resident Nancy Helme. Oct. 20, 2021)</p> <p>https://montgomeryplanningboard.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/09/2021.10.01_PB-Staff-Report_FINAL.pdf</p>	<p>Preliminary recommendations seek to further the vitality of existing and planned centers of activity, facilitate compact, corridor-focused growth, and improve regional transit connections to the county's north and outvote recommendation for the long term possible closure of the Washington Grove MARC stop and the redline metro extension along the railroad tracks with acquisition of right of way.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Impacts on Specific Areas of Town (EC2) ● Ease of Access to Metro/ Neighboring Communities (EC5) ● Planning and Construction Timeline and Funding (EC10)

<p>Current Town draft 2021 Update to the Comprehensive Plan (Link sent by WG Resident Nancy Helme. Oct. 20, 2021)</p> <p>https://washingtongrovesmd.org/wp-content/uploads/master-plan-2019/2021-comprehensive-plan-working-draft-062121.pdf</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Such other criteria suggested by public input or Task Force discussion (EC12)
<p>Cycle Highway Manual</p> <p>https://cyclehighways.eu/design-and-build/design-principles/slopes-and-gradients.html</p>	<p>Addresses requirements/recommendations for gradient, slope to ensure safety on bicycle ways.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety (EC1)
<p>Data visualization on Crime Rates Around Homeless Shelters in DC</p> <p>https://www.arcgis.com/apps/MapSeries/index.html?appid=a9897b3738b4e73a8bbad1d8e768b5e</p>	<p>The map shows a very weak correlation between location of homeless shelters and crime rate.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety (EC1)
<p>Effect of emergency winter homeless shelters on property crime (Faraji, Sara-Laure; Ridgeway, Gregory, and Wu, Yuhao Journal of Experimental Criminology, J Exp Criminal 14, 129–140. Jan. 2018)</p> <p>https://doi.org/10.1007/s11292-017-9320-4</p>	<p>Findings from study of shelters in Vancouver, WA, show that property crime (i.e., vehicle theft and vandalism) increases within 100 meters of a shelter, but then dissipates beyond 400 meters of the shelter.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety (EC1)
<p>Email correspondence with Kyle Lucas re Public Poll and Input from 55 people referenced in Presentation on Feb. 21, 2021. (Sept. 6, 2021)</p>	<p>A link to the survey results was provided</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Such other criteria suggested by public input or Task Force discussion (EC12)
<p>Email exchange with Patricia Shepherd, MCDOT (Aug. 27, 2021)</p>	<p>There is currently some existing bicycle infrastructure near WG but mostly south of the Town. There are also some bike paths that run from Forest Oak MS through Kelley Park and</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ease of Access to Metro/ Neighboring Communities (EC5)

<p>https://docs.google.com/document/d/1RQXBYuA-N1EPY0xhZgFO1shVa_ucl8SCsWfVDA3sYnM/edit?usp=sharing</p>	<p>along Airpark Rd. Bike infrastructure is relatively limited in the area and nothing connects directly to WG. The connection from WG to Crabbs Branch Way would make it a bit easier to get south of WG. Suggestions of local bicycle groups, including Rockville Bike Hub and Bike Gaithersburg.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recreational Use (EC6) • Social Equity (EC7)
<p>Email from Kyle Lucas on reducing impacts related to aesthetics/scenery of residents near the path (Aug. 17, 2021)</p> <p>https://docs.google.com/document/d/1OrJCOfckflNueePYh8AaF_IDykAI_uJL/edit?usp=sharing&ouid=102498758711804131753&rtpof=true&sd=true</p>	<p>When we enter a more detailed stage of design, we are absolutely planning to discuss how to mitigate any tree impacts, visual impacts, and other design considerations with the public. We'll likely host at least one design charette. We are committed to collecting as much public input and feedback as possible so we can de a path that works for the community.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety (EC1) • Impacts on Specific Areas of Town (EC2) • Potential Mitigations for the Various Connections (EC8)
<p>Email from Kyle Lucas re April 29, 2021 Montgomery County Planning Board meeting (Aug. 24, 2021)</p> <p>https://docs.google.com/document/d/1gmvcg1c_PmqhCortS4v80DybGpRbqFGeqqWH7ISli28/edit?usp=sharing</p>	<p>MCDOT presented the Washington Grove Connector project to the Planning Board on 4/28 and the Planning Board voted to endorse the Brown Street connection. Once everything clears through the appropriate groups, we will then advance the project to phase II of facility planning. This stage is where we will conduct much more detailed design of the selected alternative and dive into much of the details that the taskforce is likely interested in.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other Town-wide Impacts (EC11)
<p>Email from Kyle Lucas re bike plans for Gaithersburg and Rockville (Aug. 17, 2021)</p> <p>https://docs.google.com/document/d/1NN7C05u4I4_IF0nWn0Y_SpDCMLy_rj9JGjnbDceDYyo/edit?usp=sharing</p>	<p>Provides links to the Gaithersburg Master Plan which discusses bicycling and a draft of the Rockville Bicycle Master Plan.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ease of Access to Metro/ Neighboring Communities (EC5) • Recreational Use (EC6) • Social Equity (EC7)

<p>Email from Kyle Lucas re installation of sidewalks and pedestrian crossing for a possible Railroad St. option. (Aug. 17, 2021)</p> <p>https://docs.google.com/document/d/1NN7C05u4I4_IF0nWn0Y_SpDCMLy_rj9JGjnbDceDYyo/edit?usp=sharing</p>	<p>This an expensive and challenging project. I know DOT has looked at this corridor before, but nothing has advanced partly because of how challenging it is.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety (EC1) • Impacts on Specific Areas of Town (EC2) • Legal Implications (EC4) • Potential Mitigations for the Various Connections (EC8) • Planning and Construction Timeline and Funding (EC10)
<p>Email from Kyle Lucas re safest way for pedestrians/bicyclists to get to metro (Aug. 17, 2021)</p> <p>https://docs.google.com/document/d/1NN7C05u4I4_IF0nWn0Y_SpDCMLy_rj9JGjnbDceDYyo/edit?usp=sharing</p>	<p>Two existing routes. Not aware of any current plans to construct bike lanes that would connect directly to the Metro entrance.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recreational Use (EC6) • Social Equity (EC7)
<p>Email from Kyle Lucas re safety lighting. (Aug. 17, 2021)</p> <p>https://docs.google.com/document/d/1NN7C05u4I4_IF0nWn0Y_SpDCMLy_rj9JGjnbDceDYyo/edit?usp=sharing</p>	<p>Decisions within the Town should be handled independently by the Town itself. Along the path itself, lighting makes sense</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety (EC1) • Impacts on Specific Areas of Town (EC2) • Legal Implications (EC4) • Potential Mitigations for the Various Connections (EC8)

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning and Construction Timeline and Funding (EC10)
<p>Email from Kyle Lucas re whether Town Roads are a Neighborhood Greenway (Aug. 17, 2021)</p> <p>https://docs.google.com/document/d/1NN7C05u4I4_IF0nWn0Y_SpDCMLy_rj9JGjnbDceDYyo/edit?usp=sharing</p>	<p>Town would need to make these designations and handle planning and design. There are likely streets which would be a great fit for Neighborhood Greenway style treatments that include traffic calming, traffic diverters, signage, etc. T</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts on Specific Areas of Town (EC2) • Legal Implications (EC4) • Planning and Construction Timeline and Funding (EC10)
<p>Email from Kyle Lucas to the TF with attachment of updated trail alignments (Aug. 30, 2021)</p> <p>https://docs.google.com/document/d/14js0-1JHJVdJ6WThVy2L2Le40xSLfA7b/edit?usp=sharing&oid=102498758711804131753&rtpof=true&sd=true</p>	<p>The updated alignments show how a trail could be built from Crabbs Branch Way to Brown Street and on to Amity Dr with and without the road connection. The current plans for the Washington Grove Connector would be to build just to the Town and then later build either the trail/road or just trail connection to Amity Drive.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts on Specific Areas of Town (EC2) • Environmental and Historical Impact (EC3) • Ease of Access to Metro/ Neighboring Communities (EC5) • Recreational Use (EC6) • Social Equity (EC7) • Potential Mitigations for the Various Connections (EC8) • Projections of 10-year Use from MC DoT or Other Sources (EC9) • Other Town-wide Impacts (EC11)

<p>Email from Kyle Lucas with clarifications re side paths on both sides of Crabbs Branch Way (Aug. 17, 2021)</p>	<p>The bicycle master plan calls for side paths on both sides of Crabbs Branch Way all the way to the terminus, but there are no currently planned projects for these side paths.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other Town-wide Impacts (EC11)
<p>Email from Steve Werts re Town Snow Removal Procedures (Sept. 14, 2021)</p>	<p>The Town does not use any chemicals on the roadways- only sand is spread on hilly areas and intersections. Please be aware that, although sand does give traction, it will still freeze. TF should address the Mayor and Council re any additional needs due to a shared use path connection.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety (EC1) • Impacts on Specific Areas of Town (EC2) • Legal Implications (EC4) • Potential Mitigations for the Various Connections (EC8)
<p>Email from Virginia Quesada re Lighting (Sept. 14, 2021)</p>	<p>Currently, there are no plans to change Town historic lighting as the Shared Use Path will not be on town property. If a public-use path is to be designated through town then lighting will be one of the considerations.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety (EC1) • Impacts on Specific Areas of Town (EC2) • Environmental and Historical Impact (EC3) • Legal Implications (EC4) • Potential Mitigations for the Various Connections (EC8)
<p>Email from WG Mayor John Compton re safety and potential mitigations (Sept. 20, 2021)</p>	<p>The Town should be fully prepared to consider modest and easily installed measures if actually warranted in advance, but take no dramatic or controversial actions in advance, and actively</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety (EC1)

<p>https://docs.google.com/document/d/1mel45xAQKDi8juMwEc7kpS0NzbMYvJysg9G9qPjTURc/edit?usp=sharing</p>	<p>monitor safety as real-world experience takes place.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts on Specific Areas of Town (EC2) • Potential Mitigations for the Various Connections (EC8) • Projections of 10-year Use from MC DoT or Other Sources (EC9)
<p>Email from WG resident Audrey Maskery (Aug. 11, 2021)</p> <p>https://docs.google.com/document/d/1pbUUIk7b5PsdmYBIL2ZisbTjIEgae0A87yCoUBxMzNU/edit?usp=sharing</p>	<p>Asks whether the TF has ruled out requesting an option for Oakmont from Gaithersburg,</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Such other criteria suggested by public input or Task Force discussion (EC12)
<p>Email from WG resident Bob Booher (Aug. 29, 2021)</p> <p>https://docs.google.com/document/d/1TkcWKyR9WZfDCK6BloxFJ792Gewx6jXMtsoQQZnijZY/edit?usp=sharing</p>	<p>All 3 of the proposed MCDOT alternates have a conflict with their proposed Crabbs Branch Amity road connector that will cause much of the shared use path to be demolished and reconstructed when/if they approve construction of the roadway connector.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental and Historical Impact (EC3) • Potential Mitigations for the Various Connections (EC8) • Projections of 10-year Use from MC DoT or Other Sources (EC9) • Other Town-wide Impacts (EC11)
<p>Email from WG residents Joli and Ken McCathran (Jul. 26, 2021)</p> <p>https://docs.google.com/document/d/1PWuQXDdFn8UgGuEknn4rnhnP1e7_N7FNy1aUFD8L-Pw/edit?usp=sharing</p>	<p>Concerns about opening up private roads in town to others. Do not want a connection to a shared use path in town. Support a connection outside of town. Concerns regarding town liability.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legal Implications (EC4) • Such other criteria suggested by public input or Task Force discussion (EC12)

<p>Email with Heather Bouslog, Senior Archaeologist, Cultural Resources Stewardship Section Montgomery Parks regarding historic impact of connection options. (Wed, Oct. 13, 11:09 AM)</p> <p>https://docs.google.com/document/d/1IY14umR0MZ_BvEFNFbPzn7wWfnHfo9Yf/edit</p>	<p>No matter which route is chosen an archaeological investigation will occur. Compared to the other proposed routes, the Brown Street option has the smallest impact on parkland and archaeological resources.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts on Specific Areas of Town (EC2) • Environmental and Historical Impact (EC3)
<p>Email with Kyle Lucas re any data available for traffic changes on new pathways that were connected to older existing pathways over the following years (Aug. 25, 2021)</p> <p>https://docs.google.com/document/d/1NN7C05u4I4_IF0nWn0Y_SpDCMLy_rj9JGjnbDceDYyo/edit?usp=sharing</p>	<p>No data. Forecasting bicycle and pedestrian usage is extremely difficult in general, especially on a small scale</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Projections of 10-year Use from MC DoT or Other Sources (EC9)
<p>Email with Kyle Lucas re building a 14 ft pathway through the Conservation Meadow (Aug. 25, 2021)</p> <p>https://docs.google.com/document/d/1NN7C05u4I4_IF0nWn0Y_SpDCMLy_rj9JGjnbDceDYyo/edit?usp=sharing</p>	<p>Would likely be difficult to obtain agreement from the Parks and Planning Dept. The Planning Department and Planning Board have supported the Brown Street connection as their preferred alignment as well.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other Town-wide Impacts (EC11)
<p>Email with Kyle Lucas re decision not to pursue widening of Oakmont in the near future (Aug. 25, 2021)</p> <p>https://docs.google.com/document/d/1NN7C05u4I4_IF0nWn0Y_SpDCMLy_rj9JGjnbDceDYyo/edit?usp=sharing</p>	<p>The Bicycle Master Plan calls for adding a Sidepath to the east side of Oakmont Ave. DOT still views this as an important connection but we currently do not have Oakmont Ave in future years of our Facility Planning Program and as such any improvements to Oakmont Ave are a ways off.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Such other criteria suggested by public input or Task Force discussion (EC12)
<p>Email with Kyle Lucas re decision to fund a connection between Picea View Ct and Ridge Rd, close to a curve on Ridge Rd (Aug. 25, 2021)</p> <p>https://docs.google.com/document/d/1NN7C05u4I4_IF0nWn0Y_SpDCMLy_rj9JGjnbDceDYyo/edit?usp=sharing</p>	<p>Picea View Ct / Ridge Rd connection was added to the study following public input at our first public meeting. If the trail connection to Amity Dr is not built immediately, then access from the Washington Grove Connector Trail and Amity Dr could still be made from Railroad St.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental Impacts on Specific Areas of Town (EC2)

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ease of Access to Metro/ Neighboring Communities (EC5) • Social Equity (EC7) • Other Town-wide Impacts (EC11)
<p>Email with Kyle Lucas re gated strip of land between the wood fence behind the houses on the S. side of Brown St and the salt barn (Aug. 25, 2021)</p> <p>https://docs.google.com/document/d/1NN7C05u4I4_IF0nWn0Y_SpDCMLy_rj9JGjnbDceDYyo/edit?usp=sharing</p>	<p>The first parcel is owned by Robert's Oxygen and is bounded by Railroad St and the second parcel. The second parcel, which the salt barns are located on, is owned by Montgomery County. WSSC also holds an easement between the salt barns and Town over their sewer line.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Such other criteria suggested by public input or Task Force discussion (EC12)
<p>Email with Kyle Lucas re impact of vote to proceed with Amity Drive Connection on plans for WG Connection (Aug. 25, 2021)</p> <p>https://docs.google.com/document/d/1NN7C05u4I4_IF0nWn0Y_SpDCMLy_rj9JGjnbDceDYyo/edit?usp=sharing</p>	<p>Likely, there would be no impact. A more likely scenario would be that we construct the Washington Grove Connector and then extend the trail to Amity Dr with the road section being constructed later.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ease of Access to Metro/ Neighboring Communities (EC5) • Social Equity (EC7) • Other Town-wide Impacts (EC11)
<p>Email with Kyle Lucas re impacts related to aesthetics/scenery of residents who live near the path (Aug. 17, 2021)</p> <p>https://docs.google.com/document/d/1OrJCOFckfINueePYh8AaF_IDyKAI_uJL/edit</p>	<p>Discussion on how to mitigate any tree impacts, visual impacts, and other design considerations with the Town will take place once the project enters the more detailed stage of design,</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety (EC1) • Impacts on Specific Areas (EC2) • Potential Mitigations for the Various Connections (EC8)
<p>Email with Kyle Lucas re impacts related to aesthetics/scenery of residents who live near the path (Oct. 10, 2021)</p>	<p>Measurement of slope, status of the DoT analysis of the Connection, what the end of Brown Street would look like at the start of the trail, methodology that produced the forestland</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety (EC1)

	<p>impacted numbers, meetings with other neighborhood groups outside of WG</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Impacts on Specific Areas of Town (EC2) ● Potential Mitigations for the Various Connections (EC8) ● Planning and Construction Timeline and Funding (EC10) ● Other Town-wide Impacts (EC11) ● Such other criteria suggested by public input or Task Force discussion (EC12)
<p>Email with Kyle Lucas re Old Town Gaithersburg decision not to pursue a shared use pathway option. (Aug. 25, 2021)</p>	<p>Recommend reaching out to Old Town Gaithersburg. I believe they are still interested in a connection but are not currently exploring options via Diamond Ave given the challenges.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Ease of Access to Metro/ Neighboring Communities (EC5) ● Social Equity (EC7)
<p>Email with Kyle Lucas re permission and funding to widen Railroad St. (Aug. 25, 2021)</p>	<p>Funding would be up to the County Council and WG. The County and Town would need to work together and go through the planning and design process if the roadway were ever considered for widening.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Legal Implications (EC4) ● Other Town-wide Impacts (EC11) ● Such other criteria suggested by public input or Task Force discussion (EC12)

<p>Email with Kyle Lucas re projections of traffic on proposed shared use path (Aug. 25, 2021)</p>	<p>Forecasting bicycle and pedestrian usage is extremely difficult in general, especially on a small scale, and I'm not aware of any reliable metrics for forecasting or studies that compare forecasts to actual ridership</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Projections of 10-year Use from MC DoT or Other Sources (EC9)
<p>Email with Kyle Lucas re responsible parties for maintaining pathway through Conservation Meadow (Aug. 25, 2021)</p>	<p>DOT and Parks would need to work out a maintenance agreement if this were built.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legal Implications (EC4) • Other Town-wide Impacts (EC11)
<p>Email with Kyle Lucas re the likelihood that the County will consider connection options other than the end of Brown St. (Aug. 25, 2021)</p> <p>https://docs.google.com/document/d/185yEQp6a9Ib-CaUVVqP2wY4ugfDqpzla/edit</p>	<p>The County is open to and interested in the findings the Task Force makes and will consider the implications. However, choosing a different option could significantly delay or put the project on hold.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other Town-wide Impacts (EC11) • Such other criteria suggested by public input or Task Force discussion (EC12)
<p>Email with Kyle Lucas re trailhead at the bottom of Brown Street (Sept. 2, 2021)</p> <p>https://docs.google.com/document/d/1NoDMsAuC8_cmlxXoqkQr_E2t4M1L1gWCwBa1IsOWH5c/edit?usp=sharing</p>	<p>MCDOT and WG can work together to minimize environmental impact of the trailhead. The "impact area" need not be any wider than the path itself. Kyle confirmed that the intention would be to make a ninety-degree turn off the bottom of Brown Street towards the salt barn.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety (EC1) • Impacts on Specific Areas of Town (EC2) • Environmental and Historical Impact (EC3) • Potential Mitigations for the Various Connections (EC8) • Other Town-wide Impacts (EC11)
<p>Emergency Homeless Shelters in North America: An Inventory and Guide for Future Practice (Gilderbloom, John I.; Squires, Gregory G.; and Wuerstle, Margaret. Housing and Society. Volume 40, 2013 - Issue 1. Jun 9, 2015)</p>	<p>Documents trends and regulations for homeless shelters in Canada and the United States and identifies best practices to assure safety, security, overcrowding and health concerns.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety (EC1)

https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/08882746.2013.11430607		
<p>Florida Bicycle Law, Substandard-Width Lanes</p> <p>https://flbikelaw.org/2010/01/substandard-width-lanes-updated/</p>	<p>Addresses the question of what a substandard-width lane is, and what are the responsibilities of cyclists and motorists?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety (EC1)
<p>FW: Town insurance coverage for bicycle accidents</p> <p>(Email from town Insurer to Mary Challstrom. Mon, Jun 28, 2021 at 3:53 PM)</p> <p>https://docs.google.com/document/d/1luwJ167_DKSVf-uShO0ctZ9pCNa-deA__AdDXzCwSU/edit?usp=sharing</p>	<p>Connection to from Washington Grove to Shared Use Path would not pose a significant liability concern.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legal Implications (EC4)
<p>Guide for Maintaining Pedestrian Facilities for Enhanced Safety Research Report</p> <p>(Huber, Tom; Luecke, Kevin; Hintze, Michael; Coffman, Virginia; Toole, Jennifer; and VanOosten, Matt for the U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration. Oct, 22, 2013)</p> <p>https://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/ped_bike/tools_solve/fhwasa13037/research_report/</p>	<p>Guidance for maintaining pedestrian facilities with the primary goal of increasing safety and mobility. The Guide addresses the needs for pedestrian facility maintenance; common maintenance issues; inspection, accessibility, and compliance; maintenance measurers; funding; and construction techniques to reduce future maintenance.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety (EC1)
<p>Guide for Maintaining Pedestrian Facilities for Enhanced Safety</p> <p>https://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/ped_bike/tools_solve/fhwasa13037/</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety (EC1)
<p>How Do Friendships Form?</p> <p>(Marmaros, David and Bruce Sacerdote. <i>The Quarterly Journal of Economics</i>, Volume 121, Issue 1, Feb. 2006, Pages 79–119)</p>	<p>Findings show that geographic proximity and race are greater determinants of social interaction than are common interests, majors, or family background.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social Equity (EC7)

https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/121.1.79		
<p>Impact of Supported Housing on Neighborhood Crime Rates (Galster, G.; Pettit, K.; Santiago, A.; Tatian, P. Journal of Urban Affairs. Volume 24, 2002 - Issue 3. Dec. 2, 2016)</p> <p>https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1111/1467-9906.00128</p>	<p>Study findings suggest that attention to facility scale and siting can avoid negative neighborhood impacts.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety (EC1)
<p>Important Pedestrian Safety Laws in Maryland (Goldberg Finnegan Blog Post, February .7, 2018)</p>	<p>Summary review of Maryland state laws for both motorists and pedestrians to ensure pedestrian safety.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety (EC1)
<p>Interagency Commission on Homelessness Annual Report 2020 (Montgomery County, Maryland, Department of Health and Human Services, Services to End and Prevent Homelessness. Dec. 2020)</p> <p>https://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/Homelessness/Resources/Files/Documents/Annual%20Reports/2020-ICHAnnual%20Report.pdf</p>	<p>Updates of Montgomery County's Plan for ending homelessness and updates on the emergency shelters (including the shelter on Crabbs Branch Way) and impact of COVID 19 on occupancy rates and need for social distancing within the shelters.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety (EC1)
<p>Justice for all: Promoting social equity in public administration (Eds. Johnson, N., & Svara, James H. <i>Transformational trends in governance & democracy</i>. Armonk, N.Y.: M.E. Sharpe, 2011)</p>	<p>Comprehensive examination of social equity in American public administration, looking at-theory, context, history, implications in policy studies, applications to practice, and an action agenda.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social Equity (EC7)
<p>Letter from the WG Historic Preservation Commission (Aug. 29, 2021)</p> <p>https://docs.google.com/document/d/1pETZ-hEFz6JZrYl_M7JQ_dYSgR4nbzMe6XJiX3NyEa0/edit?usp=sharing</p>	<p>Impact on historic views and viewsheds for Alternatives 1 and 2 that contribute to the significance and integrity of the 2020 Updated and Expanded National Register Historic District. The forested buffer zone associated with Alternatives 2 & 3 zone lies within an area considered archaeologically sensitive. Alternative One will result in the fewest impacts to historic or archaeological resources.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts on Specific Areas of Town (EC2) • Environmental and Historical Impact (EC3)

<p>Letter from the WG Historic Preservation Commission proposing alternate route. (Aug. 27, 2021)</p> <p>https://docs.google.com/document/d/1mf-9yE86YpMctMJ2I4HE-NCKGtGI4UXU/edit?usp=sharing&oid=102498758711804131753&rtpof=true&sd=true</p>	<p>Recommends an alternative route through the Conservation Meadow be presented to the Town as was intended when the Town advised MCDOT to consider 3 Alternatives at the February 2020 meeting</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Impacts on Specific Areas of Town (EC2) ● Environmental and Historical Impact (EC3) ● Ease of Access to Metro/ Neighboring Communities (EC5) ● Recreational Use (EC6) ● Potential Mitigations for the Various Connections (EC8) ● Other Town-wide Impacts (EC11)
<p>Making Bicycling Equitable: Lessons from Sociocultural Research (McCullough, SR; Lugo, A.; van Stokkum, R. 2019)</p> <p>https://escholarship.org/uc/item/37s8b56q</p>	<p>Guidance on integrating recommendations re complex sociocultural forces, including class and race, into advocacy, policy, and planning, leading to greater equity in representation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Social Equity (EC7)
<p>Map of five shared use path connection options</p> <p>https://drive.google.com/file/d/1c4HWAhMTGZFEVt9ajOnhTqq4bLBKhdgG/view</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Impacts on Specific Areas of Town (EC2) ● Environmental and Historical Impact (EC3) ● Ease of Access to Metro/ Neighboring Communities (EC5)

<p>Maryland Law for Motorists Fact Sheet (Maryland Highway Safety Office, State Highway Administration)</p> <p>https://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/DOT-PedSafety/Resources/Files/Resource_files/md_ped_law.pdf</p>	<p>Overview of Maryland Pedestrian Safety Law for Drivers</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety (EC1)
<p>Maryland SHA Bicycle and Pedestrian Design Guidelines (Maryland State Highway Administration, Chapter 6)</p> <p>https://www.roads.maryland.gov/ooots/Chapter%206%20-%20Shared%20Use%20Paths.pdf</p>	<p>Accessibility guidance for shared use path designers, in alignment with the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials' (AASHTO's) Guide for Development of Bicycle Facilities and the American with Disabilities Act (ADA).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social Equity (EC7)
<p>Maryland State Code</p> <p>https://mdcourts.gov/lawlib/research/gateway-to-md-law/code-rules-laws-sources</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legal Implications (EC4)
<p>MCDOT 2021 Online Survey Results re Shared Use Path Connections</p> <p>https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1z8jVZdzSgsuBmuU9h4256X1M1xwn4Gz2/edit#gid=87461997</p>	<p>Summary of the average scores of the four Connection alternatives. Overall, Alternative #3 (Brown Street) scored the highest at 6.59, with Alternative #4 (Picea View Court) coming in second. Alternative #2 (Ridge Road) received the lowest average score at 4.33."</p>	
<p>MCDOT Washington Grove Connector & Crabbs Branch Way Extension Virtual Public Meeting #1 Slides. (Kyle Lucas, Feb. 13, 2020)</p> <p>2-13-2020_WashGroveConnector_CrabbsBranchExtension.pptx (live.com)</p>	<p>Planning process and proposed timeline for Washington Grove Connection to the Shared Use Path and the Crabbs Branch Way Extension.</p>	<p>Background</p>
<p>MCDOT Washington Grove Connector & Crabbs Branch Way Extension Virtual Public Meeting #2 Slides. (Kyle Lucas, Feb. 17, 2021)</p>	<p>Summary of Project Plan and Timeline, and Review of Findings from Initial Public Input re Washington Grove Connection and Crabbs Branch Way Extension.</p>	<p>Background</p>

https://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/dot-dte/Resources/Files/WashGrove/2-17-2021_WashGroveConnector_CrabbsBranchExtension_Public_Meeting_2.pdf		
<p>Model with Maps of Washington Grove Traffic Flow with 5 Pathways</p> <p>https://docs.google.com/document/d/1uSngu0EmOUWtqNK54tEZjyIMc5XX_hw3aW755gtfse0/edit</p>	<p>Description of the traffic flow and the potential impact of increased bike traffic on various areas of Washington Grove. Include images.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts on Specific Areas of Town (EC2)
<p>Montgomery County Code, Chapter 7 on bicycles.</p> <p>https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/montgomerycounty/latest/montgomeryco_md/0-0-0-3452</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legal Implications (EC4)
<p>Needwood Road Path will connect Shady Grove Metro to the ICC Trail (Posted by Joe F on WashCycle. Dec. 30, 2016 at 06:40 PM)</p> <p>https://www.thewashcycle.com/2016/12/needwood-trail-and-clopper-road.html</p>	<p>Status and phases for development of Needwood bicycle side path along connecting Shady Grove Metro to ICC.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ease of Access to Metro/ Neighboring Communities (EC5)
<p>NIMBY to Neighbors: A Series of 'NIMBY' Fact Sheets (Victoria Coalition to End Homelessness)</p> <p>https://victoriahomelessness.ca/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/NIMBY-Package-Print_FINAL.pdf</p>	<p>Facts sheets highlight and provide facts to address common neighborhood concerns related to homeless shelters and supported housing, including crime/safety, property values, neighborhood character, and characteristics of new residents.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety (EC1)
<p>Pedestrian and Bicyclist Road Safety Assessments (U.S. Department of Transportation Summary Report, Oct. 2015)</p> <p>https://www.transportation.gov/sites/dot.gov/files/docs/BIKEPED-assessments-summary-report-508.pdf</p>	<p>In the fall of 2014, the United States Department of Transportation (U.S. DOT) field offices began organizing pedestrian and bicycle safety assessments, on-the-ground examinations of transportation facilities conducted by a multidisciplinary,</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety (EC1)

	multi-agency team. This report summarizes results from this effort.	
Pedestrian and Cyclists Safety Tips (Maryland Highway Safety Office, State Highway Administration) https://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/DOT-PedSafety/Resource/Safety_Tips.html	Tip sheet with do's and don'ts for drivers, pedestrians, and cyclists to ensure safety.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety (EC1)
Pedestrian Safety Guide and Countermeasure Selection System (Zegeer, Charles V.; Nabors, Dan, and Lagerwey, Peter. Prepared for the Federal Highway Administration, Office of Safety. 2013) http://www.pedbikesafe.org/pedsafe/index.cfm	Identifies and analyzes factors affecting pedestrian safety, and discusses best practices in pedestrian facility design, including safety countermeasures that can be selected and implemented to increase safety and Accessibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety (EC1) • Social Equity (EC7)
Property Value/Desirability Effects of Bike Paths Adjacent to Residential Areas (Racca, David P. and Amardeep Dhanju. Project Report for the State of Delaware Dept. of Transportation. Nov. 2006) https://www.railstotrails.org/resourcehandler.ashx?id=4482	Study finds there is not much evidence of negative impact on property values and concurs with the National Parks Service that "Increases in nearby property values depend upon the ability of developers, planners and greenway proponents to successfully integrate neighborhood development and open space."	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety (EC1) • Other Town-wide Impacts (EC10)
Proposed Public Rights-of-Way Accessibility Guidelines (U.S. Access Board Supplemental Notice for Proposed Rulemaking, Jul. 26, 2011)	Recommendations/rules for accessible trail, shared use path, & public rights-of-way, including surface, slope, signage, transition, width, protruding objects, etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety (EC1) • Social Equity (EC7)
Pursuing Equity in Bicycle and Pedestrian Planning (US Dept of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, 2016) https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bicycle_pedestrian/resources/equity_paper/	Recent research findings related to the travel needs of traditionally underserved populations and the role of pedestrian and bicycle planning in addressing equity concerns. Also includes strategies, practices, and resources to address bicycle and pedestrian planning inequities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social Equity (EC7)

<p>Rail-Trails and Safe Communities: The Experience on 372 Trails (Tracy, Tammy, and Hugh Morris. Rails to Trails Conservancy in cooperation with National Park Service; Rivers, Trails, and Conservation Assistance Program. Jan. 1998)</p> <p>https://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/ped_bike/docs/rt_safecomm.pdf</p>	<p>Objectives of the study were to (1) document the levels of crime on urban, suburban and rural rail-trails with current statistics and comprehensive data, (2) examine trail management strategies that can mitigate crime and improve trail safety, and (3) put crime on trails in perspective.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety (EC1)
<p>SF's Specialized Homeless Shelters Do Not Bring More Crime, No Matter What Angry Neighbors Say (Coale, Kristi. FRISC Special Report. May 26, 2020)</p> <p>https://thefrisc.com/sfs-specialized-homeless-shelters-do-not-bring-more-crime-no-matter-what-angry-neighbors-say-d7322054a568</p>	<p>Findings show that, immediately close by or slightly farther afield, there is no pattern of rising crime in the months that follow the opening of a center.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety (EC1)
<p>Shady Grove Sector Plan, Minor Master Plan Amendment (Spring 2020)</p> <p>https://montgomeryplanning.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/03/Shady-Grove-Minor-Master-Plan-Amendment-Public-Hearing-Draft-3-29-20-web.pdf</p>	<p>Master plan to expand shared use pathways, suitable for cyclists and pedestrians, that could connect local communities with the Shady Grove Metro, with amendment addressing linkages of new parks and open spaces with existing and proposed bikeways and trails and retention of existing public parks as public open space.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Background
<p>Sidewalks and Shared-Use Paths: Safety, Security, and Maintenance. (O'Donnell, E; Knab, A. and A they, L. Institute for Public Administration, College of Human Services, Education & Public Policy, University of Delaware. 2007)</p> <p>https://www.americantrails.org/files/pdf/SharedUsePathSafetyDE.pdf</p>	<p>Synopsis and analysis of key findings from literature review, key informant interviews, and a policy forum addressing the safety, security, and maintenance of shared use paths and sidewalks.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety (EC1) • Social Equity (EC7)
<p>Strategies for Monitoring Multiuse Trail Networks: Implications for Practice (Lindsey, Wilson, Wang and Loh. Transportation Research</p>	<p>Compares strategies used by ten organizations for monitoring traffic on multiuse trails and</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety (EC1)

<p>Record: Journal of Transportation Research Board. Nov. 14, 2016)</p> <p>https://www.railstotrails.org/media/472549/strategiesformultiusetrailmonitoringtrb2017nov14.pdf</p>	<p>summarizes outcomes and implications for practices.</p>	
<p>TF Note from Gary Temple on Walking to the Metro (Thu, Aug 12, 10:01 PM)</p> <p>https://docs.google.com/document/d/1Vf-SZM3jWKGKFKBwgCjhpXomjMqtPkOu/edit</p>	<p>Describes the length of time and experience of walking to the Metro from WG.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ease of Access to Metro/ Neighboring Communities (EC5)
<p>The Economic, Health, and Environmental Benefits of Completing the Capital Trails Network (Econsult Solutions, Inc. Apr. 28, 2021)</p> <p>https://www.capitaltrailscoalition.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/The-Economic-Health-and-Environmental-Benefits-of-Completing-the-Capital-Trails-Network-1.pdf</p>	<p>Report evaluates the impacts of the Capital Trails Network across the Washington, DC metropolitan region, which includes Montgomery County in Maryland. The study describes the network's "economic footprint."</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recreational Use (EC6) • Social Equity (EC7)
<p>The New Majority, Pedaling Toward Equity (Report by the League of American Bicyclists and the Sierra Club)</p> <p>https://www.bikeleague.org/sites/default/files/equity_report.pdf</p>	<p>Facts/findings on perceptions, and other equity issues regarding bicycle use and transportation for people of color /marginalized communities. Recommendations for leveling the playing field re access to safe, efficient, and well-connected bike travel for all communities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social Equity (EC7)
<p>Town of Washington Grove 2009 Master Plan (Link sent by WG Resident Nancy Helme. Oct. 20, 2021)</p> <p>https://washingtongrovermd.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/2009_MasterPlan.pdf</p>	<p>Section 3.4 addresses Walkway/Bikeway</p>	
<p>Trail Access, Diversity and Awareness Plan (Montgomery County, PA, Planning Commission, 2020)</p>	<p>Accessibility recommendation include the following categories: signage and connectivity; gateway/trailhead improvements; corridor</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety (EC1) • Social Equity (EC7)

https://www.montcopa.org/DocumentCenter/View/28900/Mo-ntco-Trail-Access-Diversity-and-Awareness-Plan_August-2020_Final	improvements; public art; programming, and events; and marketing and communications.	
<p>Trail Effects on Neighborhoods: Home Value, Safety, Quality of Life (Webel, Suzanne. Boulder Area Trails Coalition. Sept. 2000)</p> <p>https://www.americantrails.org/resources/trail-effects-on-neighborhoods-home-value-safety-quality-of-life</p>	Findings show that trails don't increase (or have no effect on) property values, have no measurable effect on public safety, and have an overwhelming positive influence on the quality of life for trail neighbors as well as the larger community.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety (EC1)
<p>Trail Safety: The Perception and Reality (Young, Mark A. Parks and Recreation Magazine. Jul.1, 2014. National Parks and Recreation Association)</p> <p>https://www.nrpa.org/parks-recreation-magazine/2014/july/trail-safety-the-perception-and-reality/</p>	Review of findings from 1998 study of over 372 trails nationwide by Rails-to-Trails Conservancy showing that crime on trails is not a significant issue and provides recommendations for safe trail design.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety (EC1)
<p>Trails and Pathways to Enhance Recreation and Active Transportation (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) Fact Sheet)</p> <p>https://www.cdc.gov/nccdphp/dnpao/state-local-programs/health-equity-guide/pdf/health-equity-guide/Health-Equity-Guide-sect-4-3.pdf</p>	Considerations, recommendations, & strategies to advance social and health equity in planning and designing trails & shared use paths	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recreational Value (EC6) • Social Equity (EC7)
<p>Washington Grove Connector – Crabbs Branch Way Extension Facility Planning Study Briefing at the MoCo Planning Board (Aldrich, Stephen and Jason Sartori. Montgomery County Planning Department, Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission. Apr. 29, 2021)</p> <p>Washington-Grove-Connector-Crabbs-Branch-Extension-Briefing-jks_Final_4-22-21.pdf (montgomeryplanningboard.org)</p>	Results of online survey of the connection options with input from fifty-five individuals. Staff recommendation that Washington Grove Connector Alternative #3 (Brown Street) be advanced as the preferred trail alignment.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts on Specific Areas in Town (EC2) • Environmental and historical impacts (EC3)

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning and Construction Timeline and Funding (EC10) • Such other criteria suggested by public input or Task Force discussion (EC12)
<p>Washington Grove Listing in National Register of Historic Places (Aug. 19, 2020)</p> <p>https://drive.google.com/file/d/1bSv1PB2SpHb6L1pP87o9-KXtqaEYf4zr/view?usp=sharing</p>	Washington Grove historic district's setting, including landscape characteristics and identifying contributing resources and historic associated features, as well as a description of the district's architectural resources, covering all five periods of Washington Grove's development.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental and historical impacts (EC3)
<p>Washington Grove Town Charter</p> <p>https://washingtongrovermd.org/government/government-overview/town-charter/</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legal Implications (EC4)
<p>Washington Grove Town Ordinances</p> <p>https://washingtongrovermd.org/government/government-overview/ordinances/</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legal Implications (EC4)
<p>Washington Post Census Tract Demographics Map (Washington Post, Aug. 16, 2021)</p> <p>https://www.washingtonpost.com/nation/interactive/2021/racial-makeup-census-diversity/?utm_campaign=wp_post_most&utm_medium=email&utm_source=newsletter&wpisrc=nl_most&carta-url=https://s2.washingtonpost.com/car-ln-tr/3465046/61169fce9d2fda2f47f25a26/5e6e5249ae7e8a5948480391/15/74/61169fce9d2fda2f47f25a26&geoid=24031700710</p>	Newly released tract-level census data reveals the shift in racial/ethnic composition for Washington Grove and surrounding communities, as reflected in the interactive demographic map published by the Washington Post.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social Equity (EC7)
<p>Width of WG Roads Likely to be Used by Shared Use Pathway Traffic to Reach A Crabbs Branch Connection</p>	Physical measurements of road widths throughout town.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety (EC1)

<p>Pathway (Temple, Gary and Kriss Grisham. Oct. 20, 2021)</p> <p>https://docs.google.com/document/d/1bmBLbq-NUmaClf0qll_m5ZG6AdJ-3noV/edit</p>		
<p>Woods Committee Input to WG Bike Task Force (Submitted by Joan Mahaffey, Oct. 20, 2021)</p> <p>https://docs.google.com/document/d/1meI45xAQKDi8juMwEc7kpS0NzbMYvJysg9G9qPjTURc/edit?usp=sharing</p>	<p>Routes under consideration area that the County previously designated for afforestation, Wetlands exist between Crabbs Branch and the Town border. Important to maintain a “green buffer” on the Town borders. Committee questions how WG will restrict access to bike path if connection produces negative effects.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental and Historical Impact (EC3) • Potential Mitigations for the Various Connections (EC8)

<i>Useful Websites</i>	<i>URL</i>	<i>Description</i>
American Trails	https://www.americantrails.org/	Website provides comprehensive information and resources for planning, designing, building, funding, managing and supporting trails and greenways.
Bicycle Advisory Committee of Arlington County	Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC) – Official Website of Arlington County Virginia Government (arlingtonva.us)	Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC) advises the County Manager on issues that affect cycling in Arlington, including safety, education, community involvement, awareness and promotion, and the development, operation and maintenance of on- and off-street bicycle transportation and recreation facilities. The website features information on transportations studies, plans and projects, as well as events and other information.
Howard County Bicycle Master Plan	https://bikehoward.com/bike-howard-bicycle-network/	Website features planning and implementation information for Howard County’s Bicycle Master Plan, as well as safety resources, events, and networking opportunities.
Maryland’s Bike Safe	https://roads.maryland.gov/mdotsha/pages/Index.aspx?PagelId=357	Website educates Marylanders on best practices to Drive Safe, Walk Safe and Bike Safe. For Bike Safe, the reminder to both bicyclists and drivers is that We’re On This Road Together.

Rockville Bike Advisory Committee	https://www.rockvillemd.gov/327/Rockville-Bike-Advisory-Committee	The Committee assists in the development of the city's bicycle and pedestrian specific policies, as well as other policies that affect the conditions for bicycling in the city. Provides information about this Committee which is appointed by the Rockville Mayor and Council, with links to meeting agendas, minutes, planning and development activities, and other updates.
Rockville Bike Hub	http://rockvillebikehub.org/content/about-organization	The Bike Hub aims to enable members of the community to obtain, recycle and maintain bicycles, to repair and donate to the needy unused and unwanted bicycles, to educate community members about benefits of biking and to enhance the health of our community and environment by promoting bicycle transportation.
Trails & Blueways Council of Prince William County	https://www.pwcva.gov/department/planning-office/trails-blueways-council	Prince William County Trails and Blueways Council is an advisory council established by the Prince William Board of County Supervisors to provide services for the development of trails and blueways in Prince William County. Website has information on the County Master Plan, upcoming events and meetings, and information about trails in Prince William County.
US Federal Highway Administration, Dept. of Transportation	https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bicycle_pedestrian/publications/accessible_shared_streets/fhwahep17096.pdf	Webpage has links to publications that provide insight into the planning and decision process common to building a connected, multimodal transportation system that focuses on accessibility and safety.
Washington Area Bicyclist Association	https://waba.org	WABA empowers people to ride bikes, build connections, and transform places. We envision a just and sustainable transportation system where walking, biking, and transit are the best ways to get around. Website has resources related to advocacy, programs, events, classes, and a multitude of other resources. You can join as a member and get discounts.