Appendix A

AA/DEIS Comments and Responses

This appendix compiles FTA's and MTA's responses to the many comments received during the AA/DEIS public comment period. FTA received 3,330 comments via hard copy, email, or verbal testimony during the 90-day public comment period and four public hearings that followed the release of the AA/DEIS. Comments came from elected officials, community organizations, government and regulatory agencies, residents, special interest groups, and non-profit organizations.

FTA and MTA considered all comments in the refinement of the Preferred Alternative and preparation of the FEIS. Comments included support or opposition to all or parts of the Purple Line and the alternatives in the AA/DEIS, as well as specific issues, such as the type of transit, the transitway alignment, and potential natural and human environment effects of the Purple Line alternatives.

FTA and MTA grouped the comments into common themes and prepared responses to each theme. This appendix contains FTA's and MTA's topical responses on the following themes:

A. Support for the Purple Line

B. Opposition to the Purple Line

C. Opposition to Alignment along the Georgetown Branch Right-of-Way (Trail)

D. Support for Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)

E. Support for the Jones Bridge Road Alignment

F. Opposition to the Wayne Avenue Surface Alignment, Support for a Tunnel Under Wayne Avenue, and Opposition to a station at Dale Drive

G. Suggestions to Consider other Modes of Transportation or Technologies

H. Opposition to Build Alternatives and Options not included in the Preferred Alternative

I. Cost and Funding

J. Ridership

K. Environmental and Social Concerns

L. Transportation and Safety Concerns

M. Specific Design Concerns

N. Concerns with the Alignment through University of Maryland (UMD)

O. Concerns with the Alignment along Ellin Road and the New Carrollton Station Area

P. Suggestions for Extensions or Connections to Purple Line

Q. Suggestions for Other Alternatives

R. Suggestions to Fund Other Projects

S. Comments Regarding Public Outreach

T. Information Requests

Each topical response contains paraphrased comments followed in italics by FTA's and MTA's responses.

At the end of this Appendix, Section T describes the list of commenters and their topics of interest, and includes a DVD that contains the comments. The DVD is enclosed in hard copies of this FEIS, and the material on the DVD can be accessed via the website. The DVD can also be requested via the website.

A. Support for the Purple Line

Summary of Comments: Overall, the AA/DEIS, public hearings, and comment process generated widespread and strong support for the Purple Line. Approximately 1,570 commenters stated support for the Purple Line. In addition, there were 12 petitions, containing over 3,300 signatures that stated support for the Purple Line and LRT in particular.

Beyond the broad and general support for the project, many of the comments noted various benefits of the project and the light rail transit (LRT) Alternatives as well as noting support for specific elements of what has been defined as the Preferred Alternative (a combination of the medium and high investment LRT alternatives). Finally, there were comments that suggested refinements or options that have since been incorporated into the Preferred Alternative; these comments are noted in the FEIS.

The following characteristics and elements were supported:

- An at-grade alignment in its own right-of-way
- The use of the Georgetown Branch (Master Plan) alignment and the right-of-way was originally purchased by the County for future transit purposes
- The use of Campus Drive through the UMD
- A surface alignment on Wayne Avenue with a future station at Dale Drive
- Connections to the Metrorail and to and between other key places along the corridor
- High ridership levels
- LRT is more cost effective than BRT
- The completion of the Capital Crescent Trail and would improve bicycle and pedestrian connectivity
- LRT is more community and environmentally-friendly than BRT and/or the Purple Line would have a positive impact on neighborhoods/communities
- The Purple Line is needed due to rising energy costs and would help conserve limited energy resources and reduce our dependence on foreign oil
- The Purple Line would improve air quality by taking cars off the road, lessening the emissions that contribute to climate change
- The Purple Line would improve water quality
- The Purple Line has minimal environmental effects for a project of its size

- LRT is the preferred mode over BRT because it has less noise, it is more visually pleasing, and people prefer and would use rail more than buses
- The Purple Line would positively affect safety along the alignment
- The Purple Line would reduce travel times and ease congestion
- The Purple Line using LRT would provide a premium service
- The Purple Line would provide general support for improved transit
- The Purple Line is needed to increase mobility, provide access to jobs/job opportunities, and improve the quality of life in the area
- The Purple Line would provide economic and business benefits
- The Purple Line would support transit-oriented development and promote smart growth

Design refinements and options that were suggested and ultimately incorporated into the Preferred Alternative include:

- An aerial alignment and elevated station, with a transit plaza below, near the Kenilworth Avenue / East West Highway intersection in Riverdale Park
- A simple design for the stations
- Widening the future extension of the Capital Crescent Trail to 12 feet

Finally, people stated that the Purple Line is long overdue and expressed the need to move the project forward in a timely manner and to secure funding for its implementation.

Response: *The Preferred Alternative has been identified for many of the reasons stated above. The Preferred Alternative, described in detail in Section 2.3.2 of the FEIS, would provide new east-west LRT service, providing connections to the Metrorail stations at Bethesda, Silver Spring, College Park, and New Carrollton. The Preferred Alternative would be largely surface-running with one short tunnel section, three aerial sections, and one underpass of a busy roadway, allowing for fast, reliable transit operations. The Preferred Alternative is located primarily in a semi-exclusive or dedicated transitway, with short sections of shared use when necessary.*

The Preferred Alternative uses the Georgetown Branch right-of-way, and it includes construction of the permanent Capital Crescent Trail in the Georgetown Branch right-of-way between Bethesda and the CSXT Metropolitan Branch. Working with trail designers, adjacent communities, and the Montgomery County government (which would own and maintain the trail), the trail design has been developed in response to community concerns.

The Preferred Alternative would provide an efficient, reliable, and accessible high capacity public transit alternative to the automobile for the inner ring suburbs north of Washington, DC. LRT remains the preferred mode due to its ability to better meet the project's purpose and need, higher ridership projections, higher user benefits, greater capacity and the ability to expand.

The definition of the Preferred Alternative is the result of the environmental analysis, feedback from agencies, and the continued involvement of the community. This is true of comments received during the formal comment period, included in this appendix, as well as continuing outreach and coordination throughout the Preliminary Engineering phase of the project. Throughout the development of the Preferred Alternative, refinements were made to reduce project impacts, reduce overall project costs, and to maintain a cost-effective project while providing a high quality system.

Beyond the suggestions received during the comment period and incorporated into the design of the project, public input has resulted in further refinements including the reconfiguration of the Lyttonsville Yard and Glenridge Maintenance Facility, the inclusion of a 5 to 7-foot sidewalk through the underpass in Bethesda under Wisconsin

Avenue and the Apex and Air Rights Buildings, a shift of the alignment into the median of Kenilworth Avenue and a reduction in the proposed roadway section, a shift of the alignment from the median to the south side of Riverdale Road, refined roadway crossings, refinements through the UMD, a reduction in the number of lanes on University Boulevard with associated pedestrian facilities and green space improvements, and numerous enhancements to station access and pedestrian facilities.

B. Opposition to the Purple Line

Summary of Comments: Approximately 190 commenters expressed overall opposition to the Purple Line project. This does not include those who may oppose a portion of the Purple Line alignment, which are addressed in other responses. Among the issues stated for their opposition are:

- The project is not needed or justified
- The cost of the project can't be justified during the current financial recession
- If built, it will bring unwanted development to the area
- The Purple Line will further the gentrification of areas and force the displacement of low-income households
- The primary beneficiaries of the project will be developers
- It is not part of the WMATA Metro system (not heavy rail)
- There is no capacity to expand the Purple Line system
- The Purple Line will not alleviate traffic congestion or lower travel times significantly
- The Purple Line will damage the natural environment
- The Purple Line will have noise impacts
- The Purple Line will have vibration impacts
- It will further promote energy dependence
- The Purple Line could cause parking problems and promote the need for additional parking
- The Purple Line will create safety concerns along the corridor
- The fares will be too high

Response: *FTA and MTA have considered these concerns, but after comparing the impacts, costs, and benefits of the alternatives, FTA and MTA have decided that the benefits of the Preferred Alternative outweigh the impacts and costs (see Chapter 9—Comparative Evaluation of Alternatives). Following is a response by issue:*

B.1 Project Need and Justification

Summary of Comments: Some commenters expressed disagreement with the purpose and need for the project.

Response: *FTA has considered these objections, but finds that the purpose and need as expressed in Chapter 1 of the FEIS is appropriate for the proposed action. The purpose of the Purple Line is to provide faster, more direct and more reliable east-west transit service in the Purple Line corridor, connecting to the Metrorail system and the major activity centers at Bethesda, Silver Spring, Takoma/Langley Park, College Park, and New Carrollton. This purpose is based on the need to address mobility and accessibility issues in the corridor. Changing land use patterns in Montgomery and Prince George's Counties have created activity centers in the corridor resulting in more suburb-to-suburb travel. Please refer to Chapter 1.0 for more details on the project's Purpose and Need.*

It is estimated that the Preferred Alternative would divert 16,790 trips off existing roads in 2040. An estimated ridership of 74,160 would use the Purple Line each day by the year 2040, and for them it would provide a faster and more reliable transit alternative than exists today. The number of people and jobs in the area is growing and more people are traveling east to west and vice versa. The existing roads are highly congested, and commuting times continue to increase. The existing east-west bus services are unreliable and slow. It is difficult and time-consuming to get from many parts of the corridor to Metrorail. The Purple Line would also provide a direct link to the state's primary university and largest employer in Prince George's County, the UMD. There is a large population in the area that relies on transit, and there are many residents who choose to take transit instead of driving. See Chapter 1, Purpose and Need, for further discussion.

B.2 Project Cost

Summary of Comments: Commenters stated that they believe the project is too costly or that they do not believe the State has the financial resources to build the project.

Response: *Currently, the Preferred Alternative is estimated to cost $2.152 billion in year of expenditure dollars (see Chapter 2 of the FEIS). The cost of the project has to be considered in light of its expected benefits, which include serving 74,160 riders daily, and saving those using the system a total of over 34,800 hours daily. It provides a new, more reliable transit choice with improved transit travel times and access to other existing transit services and Metrorail across the corridor. It will also connect communities and provide access to housing and employment throughout the corridor and beyond. It results in a very cost-effective project when evaluating the cost per user benefit.*

The design of the Preferred Alternative is the result of the environmental analysis, input from agencies, and the continued involvement of the community. Throughout the development of the Preferred Alternative, the MTA made refinements to reduce overall project costs and to maintain a cost-effective project while providing a high quality system. The annual operations and maintenance costs of the Purple Line are estimated to be $38 million in 2012 dollars; MTA would be responsible for these costs.

Project funding is expected to come from federal and State/local sources with up to 50 percent of funding coming from the federal FTA New Starts program. The New Starts program is a discretionary federal program that provides capital grants for the construction of transit fixed-guideway projects. While the Purple Line would compete for New Starts funding with projects from all across the country, the Purple Line is competitive in projected ridership, cost-effectiveness, user benefits, and many other areas as compared to other projects receiving federal funds. The state of Maryland is identifying funding options for its share of the funding.

B.3 Unwanted Development

Summary of Comments: Commenters expressed concern that the Purple Line would generate additional development in the project corridor.

Response: *As discussed in Section 4.2 of the FEIS, the Purple Line corridor comprises a variety of urban and suburban land uses, including residential, commercial, recreational, institutional, and industrial. Clusters of higher density mixed-use development characterize the five major activity centers of Bethesda, Silver Spring, Takoma/Langley Park, College Park, and New Carrollton. Current zoning concentrates urban growth around activity centers to support TOD and surrounding low- to medium-density residential uses. Transit-oriented development opportunities exist in activity centers that Prince George's and Montgomery Counties have identified for transportation improvements, growth and redevelopment opportunities, as well as in areas that could benefit from more efficient transit. Both Montgomery County and Prince George's County have plans or studies approved or under development to promote transit-oriented development around the appropriate Purple Line stations. In*

conjunction with each plan's recommendations, the Purple Line would provide the opportunity to increase mobility, provide access to jobs, and improve the quality of life in the area.

With the exception of the area surrounding the UMD campus and M Square, most of the remainder of developed land in the study area contains low to medium-density residential and commercial uses that are not expected to change substantially. For most communities, the Purple Line provides an opportunity to support wanted growth and redevelopment. Ultimately, all development decisions (including land use and zoning) around the Purple Line or at station areas will be determined by the local jurisdictions.

B.4 Effect on Low-income Households

Summary of Comments: Commenters stated concern that the Purple Line would increase property values, resulting in higher rents on existing properties or redevelopment of properties and forcing out current residents or businesses.

Response: *As discussed in Section 4.19 of the FEIS, the MTA has discussed concerns regarding the preservation of affordable and low-income housing with both Montgomery and Prince George's Counties. Following is a summary of the progress each county has made regarding affordable housing in the Purple Line study area:*

- *A number of public assistance programs, including home and business improvement subsidies and public infrastructure funding, are in place in Prince George's County to address priority needs related to affordable housing, economic revitalization and public services.*
- *The Montgomery County Moderately Priced Housing Law, in effect since 1974, has facilitated the private development of over 13,000 affordable housing units between 1976 and 2010.*
- *Land use and zoning decisions made by the counties also may affect the stock and affordability of local housing. FTA and MTA support appropriate development around stations but will continue to work with the counties, stakeholders, and local advocacy groups to identify and suggest policies to address this issue.*

For further discussion of this issue see Section 4.19, Environmental Justice.

B.5 Potential Benefits to Developers

Summary of Comments: Commenters stated that the beneficiaries of this project will not be the residents, riders or local stakeholders, but private developers.

Response: *The project is being planned by the MTA (under FTA's oversight) to serve the people who live, work, shop, visit and travel through the corridor. The Purple Line will provide tremendous benefit to the commuting public with a new more reliable and efficient transit choice.*

The Land Use Plans, Master Plans, and Sector Plans, discussed in Section 4.2 of the FEIS, establish a conceptual structure and direct the development of overall land use through zoning. Both counties and several municipalities in the study area have developed plans and policies with more detailed visions for land use in their respective jurisdictions. At several of the proposed station locations, particularly Bethesda, East Campus, College Park, M Square, Annapolis Road, and New Carrollton, zoning supports opportunities for re-development and for TOD, emphasizing a pedestrian-friendly, mixed-use environment with a multi-modal transit network.

Increased development and high-density infill surrounding key activity centers and the transportation corridors served by the Preferred Alternative would promote employment by creating new permanent jobs and supporting access to employment opportunities. Commercial, office, and industrial uses throughout the study area would benefit from this improved transit access, as employers in the study area would be able to draw from a larger pool of potential employees. In addition, their customers and clients would have improved access. Businesses also may be influenced by transit service when selecting new sites, resulting in increased intensity of these land uses.

B.6 Relationship to the WMATA Metro System

Summary of Comments: Some commenters stated that they believed the project should be a subway or heavy rail system. They stated that the Purple Line alternatives could not be well integrated with the WMATA Metro system unless it were the same technology.

Response: *WMATA's Metro system is a heavy rail system. It is powered by a high voltage "third rail" on the ground within the transitway. Because of the presence of the third rail and the potential danger of it, Metrorail must be in exclusive rights-of-way with no vehicular or pedestrian crossings of the tracks. Therefore, the entire system is fenced off to prevent anyone from accessing the track. Often the Metrorail tracks are elevated or located in tunnels. During the initial project development and scoping phase of the Purple Line, prior to the publication of the AA/DEIS, heavy rail was studied and deemed inappropriate to meet the goals and objectives established for the Purple Line (see Section 2.1.3 of the FEIS and Volume 2—Technical Reports: 2008 Definition of Alternatives). It would not optimize public investment, as costs would far exceed those of light rail, while very few additional benefits would be offered. Light rail was determined to best serve the proposed project corridor's identified purpose and need and is much more flexible in design and can be integrated into the surrounding communities.*

While it was determined that the Purple Line would be a light rail system, providing better connections to Metrorail services located in the corridor is one of the purposes of the project. Stations locations have been selected to provide convenient connections between the Purple Line and Metrorail. At Bethesda, the Purple Line station is planned directly above the Metro platform. The Purple Line would be directly connected to Metro through the new Bethesda Metro South Entrance project (being designed and financed as a separate project by Montgomery County) which includes elevators from Elm Street down to the Metro station. The elevators would include a stop at the Purple Line level for direct connections between the stations. In Silver Spring, the Purple Line station would be located above and between the Metro station and the new SSTC. The Purple Line station access would be incorporated into the transit center with connections via elevators, stairs, and escalators to Metro and MARC commuter trains. At both College Park and New Carrollton, the MTA has located the Purple Line station platforms as close to the Metro entrances as possible.

B.7 Potential to Expand Capacity of the System

Summary of Comments: Commenters stated their concern that the project be capable of expanding capacity beyond projected ridership for the horizon year 2030 (2040 in the FEIS). Many of these comments expressed support for an LRT alternative for this reason.

Response: *The Preferred Alternative is not anticipated to reach its full capacity until the design year of 2040, leaving additional capacity to accommodate future growth in ridership. To expand ridership after full capacity is reached; trains could run more often to allow for an increase in the number of passengers. Physical expansion of the Purple Line could be considered in long range plans for the region. Specifically, the design in New Carrollton would allow for the future extension of the system farther east. In fact, the ability to accommodate continued growth beyond 2040 was one of the factors considered in selecting LRT as the mode rather than BRT. A BRT system would have much less potential for expansion to accommodate growth. The carrying capacity of a BRT vehicle (140 people) is much less than a two-car train (270 people). The AA/DEIS did assume the addition of "trippers" between Bethesda and Silver Spring during peak hours ("Trippers" are extra buses placed in operation for only the period of time needed to accommodate the demand). If ridership grows even higher in the future, adding even more BRT vehicles to the service and therefore further reducing headways would have caused operational problems including platooning of buses at major intersections (see Section 2.2 of the FEIS).*

B.8 Effect on Roadway Congestion

Summary of Comments: Commenters noted the existing and future roadway congestion in the corridor. Some commenters stated support for the project based on this, since the project would provide an alternative mode of transportation; others opposed the project because it would not reduce congestion.

Response: *The purpose of this project focuses on improving east-west transit service. See FEIS, Section 1.1, Purpose of the Project. The Preferred Alternative will achieve this purpose because it provides new transit service that runs on dedicated or exclusive lanes, through much of the corridor, which allow the transit vehicles to avoid back-ups and delays at many of the congested intersections in the corridor.*

It is projected that 74,160 riders would use the Purple Line each day. For these riders the Purple Line would provide much faster and more reliable transit service than they have now and certainly more than the No Build Alternative.

While the project is not intended to reduce roadway congestion, it will include improvements to area roadways as part of the Preferred Alternative. These roadway improvements include re-aligning intersections, and adding or lengthening turn lanes. The roadway changes would result in localized improvements to vehicular traffic operations. One example of this is the addition of left turn lanes along Wayne Avenue at Cedar Street, Dale Drive, and Manchester Road. The addition of dedicated left turn lanes at these key intersections and a left turn phase as part of the signal would improve traffic operations and further promote safety along the corridor. Another example is the re-alignment of Mustang Drive to connect to Riverdale Road directly across from 62nd Place. Eliminating the current "split" signal would improve traffic operations and facilitate safer pedestrian crossings. Finally, the addition of a dedicated left turn lane on westbound Riverdale Road at 67th Avenue would provide full-time, protected access to the Beacon Heights community.

The Preferred Alternative is estimated to divert 16,790 cars per day from existing roads. While this reduction is small relative to the total number of vehicle trips in the region, it is nonetheless an indication that the project will have some benefits for the roadway network, particularly within the project corridor. See Chapter 3, Transportation Effects.

B.9 Natural Environment

Summary of Comments: Many commenters stated concern about the natural environment. Some opposed the project because of concerns about impacts to the natural environment, particularly in the Georgetown Branch right-of-way. Others supported the project because of the environmental benefits of public transportation in general or light rail specifically.

Response: *The transportation, economic and community benefits of the Purple Line would come with some unavoidable adverse effects. FTA and MTA have strived to avoid or minimize potentially adverse effects by working with resource agencies, stakeholders, and the communities. Chapter 4- Environmental Resources, Impacts and Mitigation discusses a wide range of environmental resources. Throughout the corridor, the MTA has refined the alignment, geometry and right-of-way needs wherever possible to avoid or minimize effects. Following are some examples that are described further in Sections 4.13 and 4.14 of the FEIS:*

- *The MTA has and continues to strive to avoid long-term water quality and quantity impacts to aquatic biota by minimizing the amount of new impervious surface associated with the transitway, yard, and maintenance facility, either through reducing the amount of new paved surfaces or possibly using green track, which would allow for some water absorption.*
- *In response to agency concerns about impacts to the tributary of Paint Branch, the MTA shifted a portion of the transitway south to minimize impacts to the riparian zone. In addition, the project has been designed so that stormwater associated with the transitway would not be discharged directly into the tributary of Paint*

Branch. As part of project-wide avoidance and minimization efforts, the footprint of the Glenridge Maintenance Facility was adjusted to minimize impacts to a tributary of Brier Ditch. Additionally, impacts to a stream are avoided due to the modification of the alignment along Ellin Road.

- *MTA is considering the use of green track, which would allow for some water absorption, thereby reducing the movement of contaminants to surface water bodies, and reduces impervious cover, reduces stormwater runoff, and increases local air humidity.*
- *Where unavoidable forest impacts occur, the MTA would offset those impacts by reforestation, which is planting trees in cleared areas, and afforestation, which is planting trees in areas not previously forested.*

B.10 Noise

Summary of Comments: Commenters expressed concern about noise impacts, generally to residents.

Response: *As described in the AA/DEIS and Section 4.12 of the FEIS, the MTA performed an impact analysis for noise following FTA noise guidance and assessing impact using FTA criteria. Extensive noise impact analysis and monitoring has been performed. Potential noise impacts from LRT line and yard operations and horn noise near stations and at-grade crossings were considered as part of the noise analyses performed. The Preferred Alternative includes several noise-mitigating measures as part of its design. These include "skirts" on LRT vehicles to cover the wheels and short noise panels retaining walls along the residential portions of the Georgetown Branch right-of-way. East of the Georgetown Branch right-of-way, six residences and two apartment buildings (containing approximately six units each) would be moderately impacted due to warning horns associated with grade crossings or stations. Constructing sound barriers would block driveway access and pedestrian walkways, and not be reasonable to mitigate horn noise; however, MTA is investigating the options that may be available instead of horns to maintain safety, yet reduce the impacts. .*

Additional potential noise sources include the PA systems used to announce the arrival of the LRT vehicles, wheel squeal, and the hum associated with the traction power substations (TPSS). The PA system would have automatic volume adjustment controls designed to maintain announcement volume at a specified few dBA above ambient noise levels. With proper use, short-term noise from the PA system announcements is not expected to be a noise annoyance to sensitive receptors adjacent to stations. Regular maintenance of the wheels and brake pads would minimize the noise generated by wheel squeal. The TPSS would be designed in accordance with the MTA design criteria intended to minimize the noise from the transformer hum.

Refer to Chapter 4.11 and the Noise Technical Report for more detailed information on potential noise impacts and any proposed mitigation measures.

B.11 Vibration

Summary of Comments: Commenters expressed concern about vibration impacts, particularly to residents, but also to University of Maryland research facilities.

Response: *For the AA/DEIS, the Purple Line Project's impact on vibration related issues was studied according to the general assessment procedures outlined in the Federal Transit Administration's Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual (May 2006). The analysis was refined for the FEIS, resulting in impacts to four residences and one apartment complex, containing approximately six units. The apartment complex would exceed FTA's impact threshold due to high existing vibration levels caused by daily CSXT freight train pass-bys. MTA would address operational vibration impacts by evaluating and implementing specific materials and construction methods in the construction of the transitway, including using resilient fasteners, ballast mats, resiliently supported ties, or other vibration damping measures as deemed necessary. These options would be evaluated by MTA with regard to both reasonableness and feasibility. MTA would perform site-specific assessment of the areas warranting mitigation for impacts related to vibration during completion of design work.*

Regarding vibration near the UMD Campus, as agreed upon between UMD and MTA, MTA would analyze extremely vibration sensitive research buildings located within the UMD campus through a detailed vibration study to be undertaken during completion of design work. The study would establish criteria, guidelines, monitoring requirements, and exceedence protocols. MTA will design the guideway adjacent to vibration sensitive facilities to minimize ground-borne vibration consistent with proven industry practices and maintenance requirements to meet the greater of the ambient vibration levels or the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) criteria of 42 dBA within 100 feet of the nearest track centerline at existing and potential research laboratories for a period of 30 years, after which UMD and its research partners will design their research activities to accommodate the background conditions resulting from the Project. Where the Preferred Alternative transitway centerline would be within 100 feet of existing or potential research laboratories, the transitway would be designed to meet the more restrictive of the ambient vibration levels or the NIST criteria of 42 VdB.

Refer to Chapter 4.12 of the FEIS and the Vibration Technical Report for more detailed information on potential vibration impacts and any proposed mitigation measures. See Chapter 5 for a discussion of construction activities.

B.12 Effect on Energy Dependence

Summary of Comments: Commenters expressed support for transit, and light rail in particular, to reduce our reliance on petroleum.

Response: *Presently, petroleum makes up the largest portion of transportation fuel use in Maryland and the United States as a whole. The Purple Line would provide an alternative to traditional petroleum-based automobile travel. In addition, transit use typically increases with increased gasoline prices and the Preferred Alternative could accommodate additional riders and take more cars off the road with little to no additional energy consumption.*

As stated, the Purple Line would provide an alternative mode of transportation that would offer energy efficient mobility and accessibility to the Maryland suburbs surrounding the Washington, DC region. Light rail averages 855 Btus per passenger-mile compared to the average for automobile travel of 2,740 Btus per passenger mile (see Section 4.18 of the FEIS).

B.13 Effect on Parking

Summary of Comments: Commenters expressed concern about Purple Line commuters parking in residential neighborhoods near stations.

Response: *As discussed in Section 3.1.3 of the FEIS, Purple Line patrons are expected to access the system primarily by foot/bicycle and by transfer from other transit including Metrorail and bus. No new parking facilities would be constructed as part of the Purple Line. Publicly and privately-owned public parking garages exist near the Bethesda, Silver Spring, College Park and New Carrollton stations which are the stations with the highest projected ridership. In addition, some people who currently drive to a Metrorail station to park could instead walk to the Purple Line, and use that to connect to the Metrorail, reducing the need for parking. Overall, the travel forecasting analysis showed that adequate parking supply was available for the changes in parking demand with the Purple Line (see Purple Line Travel Forecasts Results Report, 2013)*

Regarding parking spaces to be affected by the construction of the project, out of the almost 18,000 existing parking spaces, the Preferred Alternative would remove 1,239 spaces. As shown in Table 3-11 in Section 3.4.3, the largest impact would be the taking of approximately 897 non-residential parking lot spaces. Mitigation of permanent parking loss is not proposed in lots where the current parking is underutilized and remaining parking capacity exceeds parking utilization. Where parking spaces on private property are lost through acquisition of property for the project, MTA will purchase the property at fair market value. See Section 3.4 for further discussion of Parking.

B.14 Purple Line Safety

Summary of Comments: Commenters expressed concern about the safety of light rail operations, particularly in areas of high pedestrian activity.

Response: *Special attention has been given to situations where roadway traffic shares a lane with the transitway, or is adjacent to or crosses the transitway. Measures will include signing, signal phasing and coordination, the addition of turn lanes, and the inclusion of curbs, barriers, and gates, as appropriate. Pedestrian and bicycle enhancements are also included throughout the corridor, and pedestrian crossings will be well marked and delineated. New trail and sidewalk connections are included, as well as bicycle lanes along certain roadways. In addition, speeds will be limited in areas of high pedestrian activity such as on the UMD campus. Finally, station access will be well marked, safe, and convenient, and stations will be monitored by closed circuit television (see Section 3.6 of the FEIS).*

B.15 Transit Fares

Summary of Comments: Commenters questioned the proposed fare policy and were often concerned about the transfer fare policy.

Response: *Purple Line fares are assumed to be a flat fare following the regular Metrobus fares and policies. Transfers to other local services are proposed to be equal to existing bus-to-bus transfer policies (see Section 2.3.2 of the FEIS).*

C. Opposition to Alignment along the Georgetown Branch Right-of-Way (Trail)

Summary of Comments: Approximately 1,170 comments, as well as one petition, recommended locating the transitway somewhere other than the Georgetown Branch right-of-way to ensure that the Capital Crescent Trail retains the character of the existing Georgetown Branch Interim Trail (i.e., the unpaved trail that currently exists within a portion of the Georgetown Branch right-of-way). While some comments expressed overall opposition to any alignment that locates a transitway within the Georgetown Branch right-of-way, others raised specific concerns related to the potential presence of the transitway combined with the trail along this alignment. These issues included the following:

- The Georgetown Branch Interim Trail is an irreplaceable community resource with a large number of users
- Recreational users and commuters who currently use the trail will be hindered by the design
- The close proximity of the Purple Line to the trail would negatively affect safety for trail users
- Mature trees, other vegetation, and wildlife habitat along the trail will have to be removed due to construction of the Purple Line
- A transit line along the extension of the Capital Crescent Trail would be visually and aesthetically unpleasing
- The introduction of transit will create noise and vibration, hampering the enjoyment of the trail
- Trains will park on the tail track in Woodmont Plaza, ruining the ambiance and safety of the open space.

Response: *FTA and MTA recognize the Capital Crescent Trail as an important community asset and consider completion of the Capital Crescent Trail between Bethesda and Silver Spring to be an integral part of the Purple Line project. Working with trail designers, adjacent communities, Montgomery County, Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC), and the Montgomery County government (which will own and maintain the trail), FTA and MTA have developed a Preferred Alternative that accommodates both the transitway and the Capital Crescent Trail within the Georgetown Branch right-of-way.*

The consideration of the Georgetown Branch right-of-way in this study took place against the backdrop of more than two decades of planning by the County regarding the future use of that corridor. Until the mid-1980s, the right-of-way remained in use for an active freight railroad. In 1988, after freight rail use was discontinued, the County purchased the Georgetown Branch right-of-way for potential use as a transitway and trail. In January 1990, the Montgomery County Council approved the Georgetown Branch Master Plan Amendment, which officially designated the right-of-way for a combined transitway and trail. Since then, a variety of transit alignments for a transitway connecting Bethesda to Silver Spring have been evaluated. For the reasons documented in Chapter 2 of this FEIS, FTA and MTA have determined that an alignment along the Georgetown Branch right-of-way remains the most desirable route for providing fast, efficient, and reliable transit, and also have determined that the adjacent Capital Crescent Trail can be safe and attractive. Therefore, the Preferred Alternative includes a transitway and the paved Capital Crescent Trail in the Georgetown Branch right-of-way. The permanent Capital Crescent Trail would be constructed within the Georgetown Branch right-of-way for a distance of 3.3 miles between Bethesda and the CSXT Metropolitan Branch. At the junction with the CSXT the trail is planned to continue on the north side of the CSXT corridor to the SSTC. The completion of the trail along the CSXT corridor is contingent on agreement with CSXT on the use of their property on the north side of the CSXT tracks for the trail. If agreement is not reached by the time the Purple Line construction occurs, MTA would construct the trail from Bethesda to Talbot Avenue. From Talbot Avenue to Silver Spring an interim signed bike route on local streets would be used until such time as agreement is obtained. The completion of the Capital Crescent Trail all the way into downtown Silver Spring would provide an important link in the regional trail system. The design of the Preferred Alternative takes into account the safety of trail users, as described below.

C.1 Popularity of Trail

Summary of Comments: Commenters noted the popularity of the trail and the very high levels of usage. Generally this was cited as the basis for opposition to the use of the right-of-way for transit.

Response: *FTA and MTA recognize that the trail in the Georgetown Branch right-of-way is an important community asset. In response to the popularity and the large number of users of the trail, and the need to provide for their safety, Montgomery County specified that the trail will be a 12-foot wide paved trail plus 2-foot unpaved shoulders. This width is greater than the County's standard trail width. To further promote safety, the trail will be separated from the transitway with fencing, and Montgomery County has budgeted for landscaping and enhanced lighting (beyond the County standard) along portions of the trail.*

As part of the Preferred Alternative, the Capital Crescent Trail would be constructed within the Georgetown Branch right-of-way for a distance of 3.3 miles between Bethesda and the CSXT Metropolitan Branch. At the junction with the CSXT, the trail is planned to continue on the north side of the CSXT corridor to the SSTC. The MTA will plan, design, and construct the Capital Crescent Trail between Bethesda and Silver Spring concurrently with the Purple Line. The Capital Crescent Trail would replace the existing Georgetown Branch Interim Trail which currently extends from Bethesda to Stewart Avenue within the Georgetown Branch right-of-way. At the junction with the CSXT Metropolitan Branch (after the Georgetown Branch right-of-way ends), the trail is planned to continue on the north side of the CSXT corridor to the SSTC in Silver Spring. The completion of the trail along the CSXT corridor is contingent on agreement with CSXT on the use of their property on the north side of the CSXT tracks for the trail. The Capital Crescent Trail would replace the existing Georgetown Branch Interim Trail which currently extends from Bethesda to Stewart Avenue within the Georgetown Branch right-of-way. The Capital Crescent Trail will be owned and operated by Montgomery County, which will be responsible for obtaining the funds to construct it. Because the Capital Crescent Trail will be a county facility, Montgomery County has determined design elements such as the trail width, the type of surface, and inclusion of additional amenities such as lighting.

C.2 Trail Design

Summary of Comments: Commenters had various suggestions and comments on the design of the trail. Many wanted a wider trail than the originally proposed 10-foot trail.

Response: *In response many comments and to the popularity and the large number of users of the trail, Montgomery County specified that the trail would be a 12-foot wide paved trail plus 2-foot shoulders wherever possible. It would avoid at-grade crossings of major roadways such as Connecticut Avenue and Colesville Road. A landscaped buffer or vegetated swale would be included between the trail and the transitway, where space permits, and to further promote safety the trail would be separated from the transitway with fencing.*

Neighborhood access to the trail would be maintained in specific areas and enhanced with 23 formal access points included in the design. The trail would also serve as access to many of the Purple Line stations and trail users would have easy access between the trail and the station areas. Finally, the trail would cross Colesville Road at a lower level than the Purple Line. This would facilitate more efficient access between the trail, the various transit services at the SSTC, the Silver Spring area itself, and the Metropolitan Branch Trail.

C.3 Safety

Summary of Comments: Commenters stated concern about the safety of light rail operations next to the trail.

Response: *FTA and MTA have worked with the County to increase the number of grade-separated intersection crossings of the trail and busy streets. This includes a new bridge carrying the trail over Connecticut Avenue, an underpass at Jones Mill Road, and a new trail along the CSXT corridor into downtown Silver Spring, avoiding the need to use local roadways.*

FTA and MTA also have worked with the community and representatives from Montgomery County to maximize the number of trail access points. The Preferred Alternative would provide new "formal" trail access at Pearl Street, East West Highway, Sleaford Road, Kentbury Drive, Newdale Road, Rock Creek Trail, Lyttonsville Place, Michigan Avenue, 4th Avenue, Lyttonsville Road, 16th Street, 3rd Avenue, Spring Street, and Apple Avenue, the SSTC, and Bonifant Street. In addition, existing trail access at Elm Street Park, Lynn Drive, Jones Mill Road, Connecticut Avenue, Grubb Road, and Stewart Avenue would be maintained and improved.

In October 2002 the MTA researched light rail lines that operated next to trails, both active and proposed, and found a wide range of conditions, with separations ranging from 6 feet to 50 feet and no consistent use of fencing or barriers.[1]

The second safety issue raised was derailments. Light rail is very different from heavy rail. A description of rail vehicles "catapulting from the rail or transit right-of-way" is not applicable to light rail. Light rail vehicles very rarely derail and when they do they tend to sit on the tracks. Because they do not operate in long trains they do not have the momentum created by the mass of other train cars pushing the derailed car forward or over. Their low center of gravity keeps them from tipping over. On bridges, particularly on curves, light rail tracks will include a guard rail to keep a train on the tracks.

C.4 Removal of Trees and Vegetation

Summary of Comments: Commenters stated concern about the removal of matures trees within the Georgetown Branch right-of-way.

Response: *The project has been designed to minimize tree loss during construction (see Section 4.13 of the FEIS). Even with these minimization measures, much of the Georgetown Branch right-of-way would need to be cleared for the construction of the transitway and the trail. MTA is working closely with the Maryland Department of Natural*

[1] Light Rails with Trails: a study of current practices in the United States and England. Parson Brinckerhoff, October 2002

Resources (MDNR) to ensure that all tree and forest loss due to the project are being mitigated in accordance with the Forest Conservation Act. The MTA is currently identifying afforestation/reforestation mitigation sites and forest mitigation banks in close proximity to the project area with a goal to protect or create habitat within the same watershed.

C.5 Visual/Aesthetics

Summary of Comments: Commenters stated concern about the changing visual effects in the Georgetown Branch right-of-way from the removal of trees and the existing canopy.

Response: *The visual effects analysis in the FEIS follows the FHWA guidelines, refer to Section 4.9 of the FEIS. The FEIS recognizes that the visual character of the trail would change due to the reduction in tree canopy and the addition of the new transit facilities. The MTA will prepare the finishes and design of the walls and fences along the trail in consultation with the County and the community. To further enhance the trail, Montgomery County has identified funding for additional landscaping and amenities along the trail.*

C.6 Noise and Vibration

Summary of Comments: Commenters stated concern about noise and vibration along the Georgetown Branch right-of-way.

Response: *The addition of the Purple Line will add more noise and vibration, however as designed, the Preferred Alternative does not exceed FTA's noise criteria along the Georgetown Branch right-of-way. The MTA has included measures to reduce the potential noise effects through this area. The first is the inclusion of skirts on the vehicles. As most of the noise associated with light rail vehicles is generated from the wheels on the tracks, the inclusion of skirts will provide an 8 decibel reduction in noise. Further, although not required by FTA's noise criteria, MTA is including a minimum 4-foot retaining wall/noise panel adjacent to residential areas that abut the Georgetown Branch right-of-way. This will provide at a minimum, an additional 4 decibel reduction in project-related sound levels. The combination of both measures would provide a total of 12 decibels in noise reduction (see Section 4.11 of the FEIS).*

C.7 Bethesda Tail Track

Summary of Comments: Commenters stated opposition to the proposed trail track in Bethesda, and expressed concern that trains would be stored there.

Response: *Trains are planned to be stored in the Lyttonsville Yard, not along the tail track in Bethesda. The tail track in Bethesda will not extend more than 100 feet outside the tunnel. They would only be used in rare circumstances if a train had to move beyond the end of the platform.*

D. Support for Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)

Summary of Comments: Approximately 100 commenters specifically stated a preference for BRT, with many of the comments stating support for BRT due to their preference for the Jones Bridge Road alignment as opposed to the Georgetown Branch right-of-way alignment, and several others specifically cited their support of the Medium Investment BRT.

Commenters who supported BRT felt that in comparison to LRT:

- BRT would be more cost effective
- BRT would have higher ridership
- BRT would be more visually or aesthetically pleasing

- BRT would be more energy efficient or environmentally friendly, with lower noise and vibration levels, and less air pollution
- BRT would have less negative effects to communities and neighborhoods

As stated above, many of the comments supporting BRT were due to the preference for the Jones Bridge Road alignment as opposed to using the Georgetown Branch right-of-way. These comments are addressed in Section E—Support for the Jones Bridge Road Alignment.

There were also commenters in opposition to BRT. Commenters noted that LRT would be more cost-effective, carry higher ridership, result in lower noise and be more visually pleasing, be more energy efficient, and have a positive impact on communities as compared to BRT. The response to this comment is included in Section H—Opposition to Build Alternatives or Options Not included in the Preferred Alternative.

Response: *The AA/DEIS included a detailed analysis of three BRT alternatives, and three LRT alternatives, a Transportation System Management (TSM) Alternative, and a No Build Alternative. Based on consideration of the information in the AA/DEIS, as well as input from the public, the local jurisdictions, and elected officials, Governor Martin O'Malley identified a Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). The LPA was similar to the Medium Investment LRT alternative as defined in the AA/DEIS, but included elements from the High Investment LRT alternative that provided improved travel times while balancing potential community and environmental impacts at an acceptable and affordable cost. After the LPA was announced, MTA continued with conceptual and preliminary engineering, and continued to engage in public involvement, soliciting input from the public. In coordination with FTA, MTA made many refinements to avoid or minimize environmental or community impacts, improve traffic and transit operations, improve safety, and to reduce project costs. This work resulted in the Preferred Alternative that is analyzed in this FEIS. The Preferred Alternative would offer high levels of user benefits and increased projected ridership while minimizing impacts to the surrounding communities and the environment (see Chapter 9: Comparative Evaluation of Alternatives.*

D.1 Cost-Effectiveness

Summary of Comments: Commenters stated concern about the cost-effectiveness of the project, especially given the high capital cost. They supported the BRT because of its cost-effectiveness.

Response: *Cost-effectiveness is one of many factors considered in the identification of a Preferred Alternative. It is true that the BRT alternatives required a lower initial cost and had a better cost-effectiveness rating than the LRT alternatives. However, the BRT alternatives provided lower user benefits than the LRT alternatives; the BRT alternatives were less reliable, did not provide the same level of travel time savings, and had lower projected ridership. In addition, the BRT alternatives were limited in their ability to handle increased ridership in the future beyond the design year. There was stronger public and stakeholder support for LRT. The Montgomery County Planning Board, Council, and County Executive endorsed the adoption of the Medium Investment LRT Alternative with several modifications. Light rail was identified as the "more viable long-term option" because of its consistency with the Master Plan, its higher projected ridership, its shorter travel times, and the fact that it would better support transit-oriented development. The Prince George's County Planning Department, DPW&T, and County Council supported light rail based on its future capacity and because of the economic and transit-oriented development benefits (see Section 2.1 of the FEIS).*

D.2 Ridership

Summary of Comments: Some commenters question the ridership projections, particularly the difference between the ridership for BRT as compared to LRT.

Response: *The BRT alternatives would not have higher overall ridership. The analysis in the AA/DEIS showed that the LRT alternatives were projected to have higher ridership than the BRT alternatives by a minimum of 10,000*

riders, depending on the alternative, and had the capacity to accommodate higher ridership in the future (see Table 6-2 in Chapter 6—Evaluation of Alternatives in the AA/DEIS). Further detail about ridership is discussed below in Section J, in Section 3.1 of the FEIS, and in the Purple Line Travel Forecasts Results Report, March, 2013.

D.3 Visually or Aesthetically Pleasing

Summary of Comments: Some commenters stated that the ancillary elements of the light rail, the overhead wire systems and the poles would detract from the visual environment in the project corridor and, therefore, they supported BRT.

Response: *Aesthetics can vary by personal preference, and comments were heard on both sides of the discussion. LRT would have visual elements not included with BRT, most notably the overhead wires and poles associated with the power supply system. The Preferred Alternative is being designed to be visually compatible with the community. Additionally, the Art-in-Transit program would be used to enhance or embellish structural elements (see Section 4.9 of the FEIS).*

D.4 Energy Efficient and/or Environmentally Friendly

Summary of Comments: Commenters stated that they believed BRT would be more environmentally friendly or energy efficient than LRT.

Response: *The AA/DEIS did a comparative analysis of the six alternatives to identify significant differences among them, including air quality, noise, vibration, and energy consumption. The Preferred Alternative was not chosen solely on the air quality, noise, and vibration impacts and energy consumption, but on many factors, including how well the alternative would meet the defined purpose and needs. As shown in Sections 4.7, 4.8, and 4.15 of the AA/DEIS, the impacts associated with air quality, noise, vibration, and energy consumption are minimal to none for all of the Build Alternatives. For a full description of the analyses of the BRT and LRT alternatives, see the AA/DEIS Air Quality Technical Report, and the Noise and Vibration Technical Report available on the Purple Line website. The analyses have been updated for the FEIS and are described in detail in Sections 4.10, 4.11, 4.12, and 4.19.*

D.5 Communities and Neighborhoods

Summary of Comments: Similar to aesthetics, comments varied widely on how BRT and LRT would affect communities. Some people felt that BRT would be less intrusive, while others felt that LRT provided a better, more lasting investment in the community.

Response: *Each mode would provide a new transit choice and improved mobility, and each could be designed to avoid or minimize adverse impacts to the surrounding community. The Preferred Alternative is being designed to be compatible with the sense of place of the community and to provide enhanced transit and improved bicycle and pedestrian facilities (see Section 4.3 of the FEIS.*

E. Support for the Jones Bridge Road Alignment

Summary of Comments: Approximately 200 commenters stated support for the Jones Bridge Road alignment as opposed to the Georgetown Branch right-of-way, most noting support for BRT. General comments relating to BRT are addressed in Section D—Support for BRT.

While some comments noted general support for the Jones Bridge Road alignment, other comments focused specifically on the potential for the Jones Bridge Road alignment to better serve the Medical Center area, which is located near the western terminus of the Jones Bridge Road alignment. Comments included:

- Ridership estimates and demand for service along Jones Bridge Road did not fully consider the growth in ridership that would result from the relocation of Walter Reed Army Medical Center (Walter Reed) to the National Naval Medical Center (NNMC) as part of the congressionally-mandated Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) process. The NNMC was re-named the Walter Reed National Military Medical Center (WRNMMC) as a result of the BRAC process.
- The Jones Bridge Road alignment was not fairly considered because it was included only as part of the Low Investment BRT Alternative, which had slower service overall than the Medium and High Investment alternatives. Claims were also made that the MTA had not optimized the Low Investment BRT Alternative.
- The Jones Bridge Road alignment was not fairly considered because it was only evaluated as part of the BRT alternatives, not the LRT alternatives.

There were also some comments opposed to the Jones Bridge Road alignment. Many of these commenters also noted that the Georgetown Branch right-of-way was purchased for and planned to have rail in the future. These comments were made in conjunction with people expressing overall support for the project and are addressed in that location.

Response: *Over the course of project development, a variety of alternative modes and alignments have been evaluated as a means for providing fast, efficient, and reliable transit within the east-west Purple Line corridor. The AA/DEIS considered a wide range of alternatives in the alternatives screening stage, and then carried forward the following alternatives for detailed study: three BRT alternatives (Low, Medium, and High Investment), three LRT alternatives (Low, Medium, and High Investment), a TSM Alternative, and a No Build Alternative. The Low Investment BRT Alternative included an alignment along Jones Bridge Road. Under the Low Investment BRT Alternative, the BRT service on Jones Bridge Road would be mixed with traffic, rather than operating in a dedicated or exclusive lane.*

E.1 Effect of BRAC on Transit Ridership

Summary of Comments: Commenters stated that the changes resulting from the Base Realignment and Closure Act, which relocated Walter Reed Army Hospital to the National Naval Medical Center, would create a large demand for transit directly to the Medical Center. For this reason they supported the Jones Bridge Road alignment.

Response: *Generally, transit ridership modeling conducted using a methodology approved by FTA found that the projected volume of employment and population in downtown Bethesda far exceeds that of the Jones Bridge Road area and makes the planned Bethesda Station included in the Preferred Alternative the best location for this terminal station. As planned, the Bethesda Station has one of the highest projected ridership levels on the Purple Line, second only to the SSTC, and the Georgetown Branch right-of-way provides higher speeds, reduced travel times, and reliable service that provide benefits throughout the 16-mile system.*

Prior to release of the AA/DEIS, MTA was asked to study the implications of the BRAC process for transit ridership in the Bethesda area. In response to this request, MTA conducted two different analyses, one focusing on new work trips and one focusing on new visitor trips.[2]

In the first analysis, MTA assessed potential riders on the Purple Line resulting from BRAC employment shifts based on a geographic analysis of home locations for employees currently working at the Walter Reed campus (see Implications of the Defense BRAC Process, March, 2008). The findings indicated that ridership to the Medical Center area (following the relocation of Walter Reed) would not be greatly increased due to the dispersion of

[2] MTA, *Visitor Trips to the Walter Reed National Military Medical Center*, August 2008
MTA, *Implications of the Defense Base Realignment and Closure Process*, March 2008

employee home locations and the limited number of employees that are within the identified Purple Line service area. An estimated 60 peak hour trips would be added to the Purple Line daily ridership.

A second analysis was performed in 2008 to augment the earlier study and to assess the impact of the approximately one million annual visitor trips anticipated for the combined facility after it opened in 2011 (see Purple Line—Visitor Trips to the Walter Reed National Military Medical Center, August, 2008). This study used information provided in the March 2008 Department of the Navy Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for WRNMMC.

MTA analysis of potential visitor trips to the WRNMMC was conducted using methods to assume the highest possible figure for passengers who are patients and family members. The Medical Center considers patients and their family members as "visitors." Using data from the Medical Center about the place of residence of visitors, it was estimated that the maximum number of additional patient riders expected to utilize the Purple Line would be 149 daily. The combined total of daily visitors and employees that would use the Purple Line was estimated to be less than 250.

Even rounding up to 200 the numbers of patients and family members, and to 100 the number of employees, this is only 300 daily passengers. When compared to the projected daily ridership for the Build Alternatives, which ranged between 40,000 and 68,000, this increase would be a minuscule percentage of the projected ridership.

The WRNMMC FEIS offered several recommendations for mitigation measures to offset the projected traffic impacts of the BRAC action including adding or lengthening turn lanes and adding traffic signals. One additional recommendation for improvement from the WRNMMC FEIS pertains to transit and involved investigating the feasibility of a pedestrian connection between the Medical Center Metrorail station and the WRNMMC to reduce pedestrian and vehicle conflicts along Rockville Pike.

Since the publication of the WRNMMC FEIS, the intersection and transit access improvements recommended in that document have been the subject of several studies conducted by the SHA and Montgomery County, and many have begun to be implemented. These projects will facilitate greater, more efficient access to the Medical Center Metro Station, making transfers to and from Bethesda and the Purple Line more convenient.

When evaluating the Purple Line alternatives, the congested traffic conditions expected along Jones Bridge Road contribute travel delay to trips arriving from the east. For those traveling to the WRNMMC, it actually would be similar or faster to take the Purple Line to Bethesda via the Georgetown branch right-of-way, and then transfer to the Red Line for the trip north from Bethesda to the WRNMMC. If the Purple Line followed Jones Bridge Road, the attractiveness of travel to and from the Bethesda CBD from the east would be affected with the significant travel delay associated with travel along Jones Bridge Road and an overall reduction in ridership.

The Bethesda area exists today and in the future as a major employment and population center exclusive of the BRAC changes. The 2008 analysis showed that combined employment around the Medical Center Metro Station was expected to grow by over 6,000 jobs to 2030. The Bethesda CBD was expected to grow by 5,000 jobs in that same period. The BRAC changes, while large, were a small percentage of the expected 72,000 jobs in the Bethesda CBD / Medical Center area in 2030. This conclusion and trend is consistent with the 2040 horizon year employment projections used in this FEIS, indicating that even with the BRAC changes at WRNMMC, downtown Bethesda remains a far greater travel market.

The transportation and ridership models used in support of this FEIS have been updated to year 2040. This includes the most recently approved land use projections for the region, Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (MWCOG) Round 8.0, which includes the BRAC-related and other planned changes in the project area. FTA has reviewed and approved of the model and methodology. The revised analysis and projections validate the findings of the previous analysis.

E.2 Consideration of Jones Bridge Road with Medium Investment BRT

Summary of Comments: Commenters stated that the Low Investment BRT Alternative, which used Jones Bridge Road, was not fairly evaluated because the Jones Bridge Road portion was linked to the Low Investment BRT alignment in the rest of the corridor.

Response: *As noted above, the alternatives carried forward for detailed study in the AA/DEIS included a Jones Bridge Road alignment as part of a Low Investment BRT Alternative. The initial decision to consider the Jones Bridge Road alternative solely as part of the Low Investment BRT Alternative was based on analysis conducted early in the planning process, when MTA evaluated the opportunity to widen Jones Bridge Road to add a dedicated transitway. This analysis found that the close proximity of residences to the road, the variation in grades (particularly at the eastern end of Jones Bridge Road), and the presence of federal facilities on the roadway, including WRNMMC, meant that widening Jones Bridge Road would be very difficult, with substantial impacts (see White Paper Medium Investment BRT Variations Service Medical Center Purple Line AA/DEIS, August, 2008). During the development of the AA/DEIS, the Town of Chevy Chase requested an analysis of a BRT alignment that used Jones Bridge Road in conjunction with the Medium Investment BRT Alternative, to serve ridership generated by the relocation of Walter Reed to the Medical Center. In response to that request, FTA and MTA analyzed a variation of the Medium Investment BRT that would use Jones Bridge Road, instead of the Georgetown Branch right-of-way, west of Jones Mill Road. This variation would connect first to the Medical Center and then head south along Wisconsin Avenue to downtown Bethesda. The main advantage of this variation is that it would provide a one-seat ride to the Medical Center and downtown Bethesda at the western end of the corridor, while also providing the benefits of the Medium Investment BRT Alternative in the eastern portion of the corridor (i.e., east of Jones Mill Road).*

The analysis of this variation found that it provide much slower transit service between Silver Spring and downtown Bethesda: with this variation, the travel time between those locations would have been 24 minutes, whereas the original Medium Investment BRT Alternative (along the Georgetown Branch right-of-way) would have completed this trip in 10 minutes. The longer travel time would result in a loss of more than 2,000 daily riders. The travel market in downtown Bethesda (defined as the number of residents and jobs near a proposed station) is almost twice the size of the Medical Center travel market (see FEIS, Figure 2-2). Based on this analysis, FTA and MTA decided not to carry forward a separate Medium Investment LRT Alternative that used the Jones Bridge Road alignment. For more information, refer to the FEIS Volume 2: Alternatives Technical Report.

E.3 Low Investment BRT Optimization

Summary of Comments: Commenters stated that the Low Investment BRT alternative should be optimized along Jones Bridge Road.

Response: *The Low Investment BRT is the least costly option for BRT developed and tested as an alternative to assess whether the least capital-intensive option meets the goals and objectives of the Purple Line project. As a consequence, Low Investment BRT does not include some features, such as dedicated travel lanes, which would require additional cost. The effect of running in mixed traffic without a dedicated travel lane or queue-jump lane has an effect on running time, and as a result, on ridership.*

MTA investigated signal priorities that could be implemented, but limited benefit could be achieved due to the levels of traffic on Jones Bridge Road and the dominant movements north-south on Connecticut Avenue and Wisconsin Avenue /Rockville Pike. The major radial roadways that cross the corridor, such as Connecticut Avenue, Georgia Avenue, New Hampshire Avenue, Riggs Road, Adelphi Road, US 1, Kenilworth Avenue, and Annapolis Road, are the major sources of delay and unreliability. These arterial roadways carry very heavy traffic flows into and out of Washington DC and other activity centers. There is very little opportunity to introduce signal preferences at these intersections without causing a major exacerbation of traffic congestion.

Queue jump lanes, which can provide a travel time reliability advantage enabling transit vehicles to get to the intersection and limit the delay to one or two traffic signal cycles, were included at several locations, including Jones Mill Road. This would allow westbound BRT vehicles to bypass traffic waiting to turn onto Wisconsin Avenue/Rockville Pike. Another westbound queue jump lane was included at the intersection of Connecticut Avenue and Jones Bridge Road. Finally, an eastbound queue jump lane was provided at the intersection with Jones Mill Road to allow BRT vehicles to turn right onto Jones Mill Road.

In 2009 Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA) developed plans for a number of intersection improvements to address projected traffic increases due to BRAC expansion. After reviewing the proposed improvements, it was apparent that it would be difficult to implement some of the queue jump lanes which had been proposed by the MTA for a Jones Bridge Road alignment, and any additional widening would potentially result in residential displacements.

The approach on Wayne Avenue is to have transit vehicles share the inside travel lanes with vehicular traffic. This is no different than the Low Investment BRT sharing travel lanes with traffic on Jones Bridge Road. What is different is the level of congestion and delay that exists on Jones Bridge Road. On Wayne Avenue, left turn lanes were added at key intersections to reduce delay. On Jones Mill Road, although left turn lanes exist and additional intersection improvements are recommended in support of the BRAC initiatives, these improvements would not alleviate the delay experienced by BRT vehicles that would have to travel this route.

E.4 LRT on Jones Bridge Road

Summary of Comments: Commenters stated that Jones Bridge Road should have been considered for a light rail alternative.

Response: *Light rail service along Jones Bridge Road would require reconstruction of the street for the installation of rails and catenary, impacts to National Institute of Health (NIH) including sensitive environmental areas (as described in the DEIS), right-of-way impacts, and slow speeds and operations due to traffic and signals. The narrow right-of-way at the eastern end of Jones Bridge Road would have resulted in substantial impacts to the adjacent residences due to the acquisition of property and the construction of retaining walls in yards. For this reason, a LRT alternative along Jones Bridge Road was not carried forward for detailed analysis in the AA/DEIS (see AA/DEIS, p. 2-3). The availability of the Georgetown Branch right-of-way, owned by Montgomery County and designated for use as a transitway and trail, and the potential to build a transitway within a nearly exclusive operating environment with few grade crossings, provide the opportunity for a transit service unimpeded by traffic conflicts and therefore allowing for reliable service and faster travel times between Bethesda and Silver Spring. For more information, refer to the FEIS Volume 2: Alternatives Technical Report.*

E.5 NIH and NNMC comments

Summary of Comments: Both the NIH and the former NNMC provided comments on the AA/DEIS. NIH recognized the value of an inter-county transit facility that would serve the region for NIH employees who now commute daily on congested roadways across Montgomery and Prince George's Counties and staff at the future WRNMMC. However, they noted that the Low Investment BRT Alternatives and the Medium Investment BRT alternative options (both of which would use Jones Bridge Road) would have negative impacts on NIH and Montgomery County's efforts to manage stormwater, the established campus perimeter buffer, and potentially, the archaeologically sensitive areas associated with the site. NIH noted that it would be opposed to those alternatives.

The NNMC staff was encouraged by the detailed and thorough analysis and commended MTA for their significant cooperation with local communities and organizations. They provided some specific comments and noted that Jones Bridge Road is highly congested in the AM and PM and could benefit by not having additional

transit traffic along this artery. Finally, they stated that they were certain that whichever alternative is ultimately chosen will encourage and provide efficient mass transit use, provide a sustainable transit solution for future growth, contribute to the attainment of regional air quality goals, and take into consideration existing and future employment concentrations.

Response: *Comment noted.*

F. Opposition to the Wayne Avenue Surface Alignment, Support for a Tunnel Under Wayne Avenue, and Opposition to a Station at Dale Drive

Summary of Comments: Approximately 120 comments opposed a Wayne Avenue surface alignment. Reasons for the opposition include concerns with loss of street parking; adverse traffic impacts; impacts to residential properties; vehicular and pedestrian safety; noise effects; and, slow transit operations on the surface.

Some comments supporting a tunnel on Wayne Avenue also cited support for a tunnel through downtown Silver Spring. Commenters felt that tunneling under Wayne Avenue would be cost effective, could be federally funded, and that an underground/tunneled section would cause less impact to the community on Wayne Avenue. Some comments raised questions about the accuracy of the traffic analyses; these comments are addressed in Section L, Transportation and Safety Concerns.

Another related issue was the proposed station on Wayne Avenue at Dale Drive. Commenters cited opposition to a station at this location, with questions about the estimated ridership and a concern that a station would prompt rezoning in the adjacent area.

There was also support for the Wayne Avenue surface alignment and specific support for a station at Dale Drive with a petition with 62 signatures. These comments are included in Section A—Support for the Purple Line as they are elements of the Preferred Alternative.

Response: *As part of the Purple Line's development and in the process of selecting a Preferred Alternative, a number of alignment options were evaluated for the area between the SSTC and Long Branch, where there are several design challenges including the steep grades of the Sligo Creek stream valley and the absence of a major east-west commercial roadway. The MTA evaluated the alignment options in this portion of the Purple Line corridor and identified a surface alignment along Wayne Avenue as the most desirable alignment for the Preferred Alternative (see Purple Line Evaluation of LRT Options between the SSTC and Mansfield Road, September 2009). This alignment would include the addition of left turn lanes at key intersections (see Section 3.2.4 of the FEIS). Classified by Montgomery County as an arterial roadway but primarily residential in character, Wayne Avenue is currently a well-used transit route and the major transportation corridor through the area.*

F.1 Surface Alignment

Summary of Comments: Commenters opposed a surface alignment on Wayne Avenue due to concerns about visual impacts, pedestrian safety particularly for school children, and potential roadway widening.

Response: *Working to address community concerns throughout the alternatives development process, the MTA refined the surface alignment to include key design elements. Because the transitway would share the center lanes with vehicular traffic, on-street parking could continue during off-peak periods in most areas. In addition, because left turn lanes would be added at key intersections, overall traffic operations would improve along the corridor (relative to the No Build Alternative), even with the addition of the Purple Line. Left turn lanes would be added at Cedar Street, Dale Drive, and Manchester Road.*

Further, a surface alignment on Wayne Avenue with the light rail vehicles sharing the center lanes with vehicular traffic would require acquisition of minimal amounts of private property, with most of the impacts being near the intersections due to the addition of turn lanes.

The Preferred Alternative is being designed to be a safe and efficient system (see Sections 3.2.4 and 3.3.3 of the FEIS). Pedestrian and bicycle enhancements would be included throughout the corridor. With the construction of the proposed Purple Line on Wayne Avenue, pedestrian crosswalks and pedestrian signals would be provided to maintain a safe crossing for pedestrians at the existing intersections of Fenton Street, Cedar Street, Dale Drive, Mansfield Road, and Sligo Creek Parkway. An additional traffic signal with associated pedestrian signals and crosswalks is proposed at Wayne Avenue at Plymouth Tunnel. The light rail would operate in shared lanes and would travel at the posted speed limit of 30 mph. The light rail would essentially operate in lanes similar to a bus that would travel along Wayne Avenue. In the vicinity of Dale Drive, the school zone speed limit would be maintained at 25 mph for both light rail and automobile traffic. The addition of dedicated left turn lanes at key intersections and a left turn phase as part of the signal would improve traffic operations and further promote safety along the corridor.

F.2 Extension of the Green Trail

Summary of Comments: Commenters noted the proposed Montgomery County Green Trail along Wayne Avenue. Some expressed concern that a surface alignment would eliminate the trail.

Response: *The sidewalks along the south side of Wayne Avenue within the Purple Line corridor would be reconstructed. Although a separate project funded by Montgomery County, the 0.7-mile extension of the Green Trail, a shared use path in Silver Spring, would be built with the Purple Line, replacing the sidewalk on the north side of the road. When completed, it would extend from the SSTC to the Sligo Creek Trail, providing pedestrians and bicyclists with at least an 8-foot-wide shared use path between these two areas.*

F.3 Noise

Summary of Comments: Commenters stated concern that a surface alignment on Wayne Avenue would raise noise levels in the community.

Response: *Wayne Avenue is a popular route that carries high volumes of vehicular and bus traffic. As such, there is existing traffic-related noise. The addition of light rail to the existing roadway would not increase noise levels by a noticeable amount since the light rail vehicles would be designed to minimize noise with the incorporation of vehicle skirts (see Section 4.11 of the FEIS). Additionally, by using the shared lane design, roadway traffic would not be shifted closer to the majority of residences, avoiding an increase in traffic noise.*

F.4 Tunnel Options

Summary of Comments: Commenters supported a tunnel option under Wayne Avenue.

Response: *In response to concerns expressed by residents along Wayne Avenue and at the request of the Montgomery County Council and the County Executive, MTA conducted a detailed comparative analysis of all options along Wayne Avenue, including an additional underground tunnel alignment extending from the SSTC to a tunnel portal between Mansfield Road and Sligo Creek Parkway (see Purple Line Evaluation of LRT Options between the SSTC and Mansfield Road, September 2009* in *Supporting Documentation of Alternatives Development (2013) for the analysis).*

Several tunnel options along Wayne Avenue were studied and they were found to have substantial impacts at the portal areas, including residential displacements, right-of-way impacts, traffic and access impacts, impacts to parkland and recreational areas, and high costs ($352 million for the tunnel compared with $179 million for the at-grade in shared lanes with added left turn lanes).

Between three and four residences on Wayne Avenue would have been potentially displaced as a result of the widening necessary to accommodate a tunnel portal and maintain two lanes of traffic in each direction. The tunnel would also impact the residences on the south side of Wayne Avenue, which are above the grade of the roadway,

with short steep driveways. The street widening required for a tunnel portal would have required property acquisitions from the front yards and driveways of these houses, as well as retaining walls in the front yards. In addition, left turn access into and out of driveways would have been eliminated for the 3 residences not displaced in the portal area. The tunnel option with the portal between Mansfield Road and Sligo Creek Parkway would also result in additional impacts to the school and park properties.

In addition, due to the increased costs associated with underground stations, the tunnel option did not include the stations at the Silver Spring Library and Dale Drive. As a result, no stations occur between the SSTC and Mansfield Place, an approximate 1 ½ mile stretch which otherwise would have served the residents of Silver Spring.

The affordability of the Purple Line project is a critical consideration when evaluating proposed alternatives. The MTA concluded that the high costs associated with a tunnel alignment along Wayne Avenue, along with the impacts to transit accessibility and residents in the portal areas, would be cost prohibitive (see Section 2.2.3 of the FEIS). When assessing the costs associated with tunnel options, the MTA considered both the Federal cost-effectiveness ratios prescribed by FTA as well as the overall cost in terms of affordability.

F.5 Dale Drive Station

Summary of Comments: Commenters opposed a station on Wayne Avenue at Dale Drive for a variety of reasons, often concern about rezoning around the station for new development.

Response: *Regarding a station at Dale Drive, the AA/DEIS included a station at this location to serve the surrounding residential community (see Table 2-5 of the AA/DEIS). After the AA/DEIS was issued, Montgomery County requested that the station be noted as "Under Study" in order to further assess the community's concerns regarding the need for the station and its impacts, but also recommended that the Purple Line be designed to accommodate the station in the future by providing space for the station platform and other amenities. The LPA, as announced by the Governor in 2009, included a commitment to study postponing the construction of the Dale Drive station. The FEIS states that the Preferred Alternative includes a station at the intersection of Wayne Avenue and Dale Drive (see Section 2.3.2 in FEIS).*

The Dale Drive station has been further refined throughout Preliminary Engineering; these refinements are reflected in the Preferred Alternative. Refinements include the addition of a left turn lane from westbound Wayne Avenue to southbound Dale Drive, improved access to the Silver Spring International Middle School to address safety concerns, and an offset of the travel lane to the platform edge. During this phase of the study, the ridership model and estimates were also updated. This update included a greater refinement of the zones surrounding the stations and the subdivision of zones, where appropriate, to more accurately project ridership. This update resulted in a reduction of anticipated ridership at this station, lower than presented in the AA/DEIS, because the refinements showed more trips would originate at the Silver Spring Library station.

FTA and MTA recognize that the area around Wayne Avenue and Dale Drive is a well-established, dense residential area. Montgomery County has no plans to re-zone this area due to the implementation of the Purple Line, and the County Council has confirmed this in a unanimous resolution signed February 26, 2008.

G. Suggestions to Consider other Modes of Transportation and/or Technologies

Summary of Comments: Approximately 30 comments included suggestions to consider other modes or technologies including heavy rail, tram/trolley, monorail, maglev, "rubber-tired" trains, and diesel and wireless technologies. Many of the people supporting heavy rail expressed their desire that the Purple Line be fully integrated with the WMATA Metrorail system.

Response: *Many of these modes were considered early in the scoping and planning process. Others were considered during the AA/DEIS phase and some are being tracked as the project moves forward. The MTA will continue to*

monitor the development and operational experience of wireless systems and as the design progresses and the time comes for vehicle selection, one of these systems may emerge as the most appropriate for portions of the Purple Line.

Following is a discussion of the reason each mode/technology was eliminated as an alternative for this project.

G.1 Other Modes

Summary of Comments: Commenters supported the use of heavy rail like the Washington DC Metro.

Response: Heavy Rail—*Heavy Rail transit options were examined as an option for this corridor several times within the project's history as documented in the East-West Transitway Feasibility Study (1986), Capital Beltway/Purple Line Study: Initial Findings and Recommendations (2002) and Bi-County Transitway Metrorail Loop Proposal: Alignment Evaluation (2005). These studies eliminated Heavy Rail as an alternative due to the high costs and limited return on public investment, as described below.*

WMATA's Metro system is a heavy rail system. It is powered by a high voltage "third rail" on the ground within the trainway. Because of the presence of the third rail and the potential danger of it, Metrorail must be in exclusive rights-of-way with no vehicular or pedestrian crossings of the tracks. Therefore, the entire system is fenced off to prevent anyone from accessing the track. Often the Metrorail tracks are elevated or located in tunnels. As outlined above, during the initial project development and scoping phase of the Purple Line, prior to the publication of the AA/DEIS, heavy rail was studied. It was deemed inappropriate to meet the goals and objectives established for the Purple Line. It would not optimize public investment, as costs would far exceed those of light rail, while very few additional benefits would be offered. It would also have high levels of community impact due to the need for an exclusive right-of-way. Light rail was determined to best serve the proposed project corridor's identified purpose and need and is much more flexible in design and can fit into the surrounding communities.

While it was determined that the Purple Line would be a light rail system, the connections to Metro remain an important aspect of the project. Station locations have been selected to provide convenient connections between the Purple Line and Metro. At Bethesda, the Purple Line station is planned directly above the Metro platform. The Purple Line would be directly connected to Metro through the new Bethesda Metro South Entrance project (being designed and funded as a separate project by Montgomery County) which includes elevators from Elm Street down to the Metro station. The elevators would include a stop at the Purple Line level for direct connections between the stations. In Silver Spring the Purple Line station would be located above the Metro platform, between the new SSTC and the existing railroad tracks. The Purple Line station access would be incorporated into the transit center with connections via elevators, stairs, and escalators to Metro and MARC commuter trains. At both College Park and New Carrollton, the MTA has located the Purple Line station platforms as close to the Metro entrances as possible.

Summary of Comments: Commenters proposed the use of a tram or trolley system.

Tram/Trolley—*The tram and trolley systems proposed in the comments were compared to the streetcars of the late nineteenth/early twentieth century. They are typically single car trains that are smaller and carry fewer passengers than typical light rail vehicles. The Preferred Alternative includes two-car trains, each car being larger than the typical tram or trolley car. A trolley/tram system would have limited passenger capacity. Without the addition of many more vehicles, the system would be unable to accommodate projected future ridership.*

Summary of Comments: Commenters proposed the use of Monorail technology for the Purple Line.

Monorail—*Monorail was dropped from further consideration as it would substantially add to the cost of the project and was determined to be an ineffective public investment that would not meet the desired operating capacity while operating within the constraints of the corridor. Monorail systems are based on a single rail, which acts as its sole support and guideway. Monorails are typically, but not exclusively, elevated and almost all modern monorails are powered by a "third rail" or electrified channels attached to or enclosed in their guidance beams.*

Therefore, they are always separated from other traffic and pedestrians similar to heavy rail. Monorail was considered during the Capital Beltway Purple Line Study and FTA/MTA concluded that it would not be a reasonable alternative based on capital costs, environmental/community impacts, and the other factors outlined above.

Summary of Comments: Commenters proposed the use of Maglev technology for the Purple Line.

Maglev—*Maglev (derived from magnetic levitation) is a system of transportation that uses magnetic levitation to suspend, guide and propel vehicles with magnets rather than using methods such as wheels, axles and bearings. Some but not all maglev systems are considered monorails (see above). Similar to heavy rail and monorail systems, maglev is always separated from other traffic and pedestrians and is typically elevated on structure. Maglev was dropped from further consideration as it would substantially add to the cost of the project due to its cost and the need for an exclusive right-of-way, would not achieve the full benefits of Maglev due to the constraints of the corridor and station spacing, and would not optimize public investment.*

Maglev trains move more smoothly and somewhat more quietly than wheeled mass transit systems. However, the noise is more comparable to highway noise and tends to be more noticeable. One of the key benefits cited for modern maglev systems is the higher speeds that can be achieved compared to other rail systems. However, the close spacing of the Purple Line stations limits the potential speeds in many portions of the corridor. Maglevs are generally unaffected by weather although they have not operated in a full range of weather conditions. Maglev is more expensive to construct but may require less maintenance as there is less wear between the wheels and the tracks than on conventional rail systems.

Summary of Comments: Commenters proposed the use of rubber-tired trains for the Purple Line.

Rubber-Tired Trains—*The rubber-tired trains proposed are a mix of rail and roadway technologies. They use rubber tires instead of steel wheels. They are designed in a transitway with guide bars that the rubber tires follow and sometimes have traditional railway steel wheels and steel tracks to address flat tires and facilitate crossovers. Most often, rubber-tired trains that are in use are powered by a "third rail" and therefore require an exclusive right-of-way. They were proposed for the benefit of reduced noise and visual effects as compared to the light rail alternatives.*

Rubber-tired systems can have smoother rides, faster acceleration/deceleration, less noise, and can climb steeper slopes. However, they can have higher energy consumption, are susceptible to tire blow outs, and can lose some of their traction advantage in inclement weather. In order to achieve a rubber-tired system without the visual effects of an overhead catenary system it would have to be designed with a "third rail" and require an exclusive right-of-way. Similar to the other modes requiring an exclusive right-of-way, rubber-tired trains were determined to substantially add to the cost of the project due to its cost and the need for an exclusive right-of-way, and therefore would not optimize public investment.

Summary of Comments: Commenters proposed the use of Diesel Light Rail Vehicles for the Purple Line.

Diesel Light Rail—*MTA conducted "A Comparison of Diesel Light Rail Vehicles to Electric Light Rail Vehicles, with Reference to the Purple Line" in April 2009 (see Supporting Documentation on Alternatives Development). The study concluded that the currently operating diesel electric vehicles are not appropriate for the Purple Line for a number of reasons. Chief among these is the inability of diesel vehicles to make tight turns, their slower acceleration, lower passenger capacity, and no ability to allow true low floor boarding.*

Summary of Comments: Commenters proposed the use of high speed gondolas for the Purple Line.

High Speed Gondolas*—The high speed gondolas proposed were similar to those found at ski resorts. High speed gondola systems in operation today have maximum speeds of approximately 13.5 mph. This would not provide the level of service required to provide an efficient alternative to current conditions and would reduce the projected ridership.*

G.2 Wire-Free Light Rail

Summary of Comments: Commenters asked MTA to consider "wireless" technologies for at least portions of the alignment in visually or environmentally sensitive areas—that is, transit vehicles that do not require overhead wires.

Response: *MTA is not opposed to the consideration of vehicles which could minimize impacts such as reducing the visual effects and concerns about tree branches overhanging the transitway in areas such as the Georgetown Branch right-of-way. These systems may also eliminate the need for some poles and wires and reduce the number of TPSS that are required. There are vehicles currently under development with other propulsion systems that do not require overhead wires; however their use is limited and there is not sufficient information on their operations or reliability. Depending on the technology, some vehicles are heavier with on-board batteries (sometimes reducing the person-carrying capacity) and can have operating limitations including running speeds, grades, and limited distance that they can run without recharge or overhead wires.*

H. Opposition to Build Alternatives or Options not included in the Preferred Alternative

Summary of Comments: Approximately 20 commenters expressed opposition to build alternatives or options that were analyzed in the AA/DEIS but are no longer under consideration in this FEIS, because they were not included in the Preferred Alternative. These comments included:

- Comments opposing BRT alternatives (the Preferred Alternative includes LRT)
- Comments opposing the Jones Bridge Road alignment (the Preferred Alternative follows the Georgetown Branch right-of-way)
- Comments opposing a tunnel along Wayne Avenue (the Preferred Alternative follows a surface alignment on Wayne Avenue)
- Comments opposing a tunnel in Silver Spring (the Preferred Alternative follows a surface alignment in Silver Spring)
- Comments opposing the Silver Spring Avenue/Thayer Avenue alignment option (the Preferred Alternative follows Wayne Avenue)
- Comments opposing an alignment along Preinkert Drive/Chapel Drive through the UMD (the Preferred Alternative follows Campus Drive through the UMD campus)

Response: *The opposition to each of these alternatives/options is noted. None of these is part of the Preferred Alternative, and none is recommended for further study or development relative to the proposed Purple Line project.*

I. Cost/Funding

Summary of Comments in General: Approximately 100 people commented on project costs, cost-effectiveness, and funding of the project. Commenters were concerned with how the project costs were calculated, the cost to build and maintain the project, and the high cost per rider. Positive comments were also received requesting that the project be designed in a cost-effective manner that will not slow down the implementation of the project, and that the best system that project costs will allow should be built. Comments were also received on corrections that should be made to tables in the *Operating and Maintenance Cost Technical Report*, dated September 2008. Corrections to the tables have been made and are included in the revised Technical Report, dated August 2013.

Response: *Corrections to the tables have been made and are included in the revised Technical Report, dated August 2013.*

I.1 Calculation of Costs

Summary of Comments: Comments stated that the AA/DEIS and accompanying technical reports do not contain the supporting data and analyses that the public need to fully evaluate the accuracy of MTA's calculations and methods MTA used to make these calculations. MTA failed to include replacement cost estimates in its capital cost estimates.

Response: *Chapter 5 of the AA/DEIS describes the costs and funding for the alternatives. The Operating and Maintenance Cost Estimate Technical Report and the Capital Cost Estimating Methodology Technical Report provide further detail of the methodology and the assumptions used for each analysis. Chapter 6 of the AA/DEIS then describes the factors involved in the evaluation of alternatives and the calculation of the cost effectiveness of each alternative, following FTA's New Starts process.*

Since the AA/DEIS, the selection of a LPA and its subsequent refinement allow the MTA to present a better estimate of capital and operation and maintenance (O&M) costs. Currently, the estimated cost to construct the Purple Line is $2.152 billion in year of expenditure dollars, and the annual O&M cost is estimated to be $38 million in 2012 dollars (see Chapter 2 of the FEIS).

The capital cost estimate in the AA/DEIS Table 5-1 is for the initial construction and start-up of the alternatives. The Equivalent Annual Cost used in FTA Cost Effectiveness Indices accounts for ASSET REPLACEMENT COST by incorporating "Years of Useful Life" for each major component category of the alternatives' capital cost estimate into the calculation and applying the discount rate discussed in the comment above. For instance, buses, as would be the primary vehicle purchase in the TSM and BRT alternatives, have a useful life of 12 to 18 years and light rail vehicles, the primary vehicle purchase in the LRT alternative, have a useful life of 25 years. Maintenance and upkeep of the vehicles are covered in the O&M Cost Estimate, shown in Table 5-2 of the AA/DEIS.

FTA reviewed the analysis and findings for the appropriateness of the methodological approach and data used given location and nature of the alternatives. When the information for the Preferred Alternative was submitted for the Request to Enter Preliminary Engineering, FTA accepted the information and the manner in which it was prepared.

As requested by certain parties, the MTA provided additional supporting information in manner required under the Maryland Public Information Act. The information provided by the MTA was sufficient to allow for an informed review of the information contained in the Purple Line AA/DEIS.

Following are specific items that commenters questioned:

Inflation Adjustments*—The AA/DEIS capital cost estimates (Table 5-1) and the Annual O&M Costs (Table 5-2) were shown as being in 2007 dollars. As pointed out in the comments, the capital cost estimates were adjusted for prices as of September 2007 (Third Quarter) and the O&M costs were adjusted for prices as of Second Quarter 2007. It is acknowledged, as pointed out in the comment, that there is a one quarter of a year difference in the price indices adjustment basis for the estimates. The AA/DEIS estimates are planning level estimates and the de minimis difference from this one quarter of a year price indices adjustment would be within the rounding of the numbers presented and has no material effect on the usefulness of the information.*

Inflation Rate*—The application of inflation rates in this case was not to the operation of an industrial construction project, but rather to the operation of a well-established (in operation for more than ten years at the time that the estimates were prepared), pre- existing government function that was well integrated into the regional economy. For this reason, it was deemed at the time that the CPI, the most broad-based measure of inflation in the regional economy during that time period, was the appropriate inflation rate to use. A different methodology that*

applies differential inflation rates to various cost elements is in use today, and the need to inflate old costs has been eliminated by FTA's guidance for which data is available. However, this was the way inflation of earlier year costs was typically approached at the time that these estimates were prepared.

O&M BRT Guideway and Station Costs—*Experience with BRT, as with LRT, systems indicates that the vast majority of the cost of maintaining stations and guideway is related to labor costs. For example, MTA's labor costs non-vehicle maintenance (basically, running way and stations) averaged $7.6 million from 2003-2005 (as shown in Table 3-3). Non-Vehicle Maintenance Materials and Supplies was under $420,000, less than 6 percent of the corresponding labor cost and less than 1 percent of the total O&M cost. BRT guideway and station maintenance non-labor costs (excluding replacement/life cycle costs, which are not included in the estimates) are even lower than those of light rail. However, there is precedent within the Baltimore-Washington area for what the cost of these items was likely to be, and very little data available from other agencies in the National Transit Database (NTD) to guide the development of the non-labor cost elements of station and running way estimates. The NTD has since taken to asking agencies to separate BRT costs from those of other agency operations, but this data was unavailable at the time of the preparation of the AA/DEIS. Given the methodological uncertainty in assigning a number to these non-labor maintenance costs, and the very small amount of cost involved (less than 1 percent of the total O&M cost), the non-labor cost was omitted as it would have little effect on the integrity of the model or of the cost estimates.*

O&M Vehicle Operations Materials and Supplies Costs—*All of the cost factor spreadsheets (Tables 3-3 through 3-5 of the Operating and Maintenance Cost Estimate Technical Report) assign "miscellaneous expenses" under Vehicle operations, materials and supplies to the peak vehicles factor. The issue is that Montgomery County assigned a large amount of expenses ($5.7 million, about 8% of its total annual operating cost for the years analyzed) to this category, whereas the other agency's assigned little or nothing to it. However, the model is applied consistently, and what expenses that were assigned to this category were included under the peak vehicles factor. For example, in Table 3-4, WMATA assigned $981 to this category, and this amount was assigned to the peak vehicles factor.*

O&M Cost Validation Process—*The point of the validation was to prove that the variation within data for the years included in the model did not invalidate the model. The validation process followed the standard practice at the time of the AA/DEIS. FTA guidance now recommends that cost estimates be based only on a single, most recent available, year. Thus, the need for this internal validation has been eliminated.*

Comparison to Other Transit Systems—*Comparison with other operating agencies was not included in the O&M cost estimating approach. Comparison with other agencies can be misleading, in that each agency has individual and regional variations in their labor market and practices, operating and maintenance standards, weather and operating conditions, passenger volumes, station spacing and many other elements of the operation and its operating environment. In this case, by far the obvious choice for development of the LRT cost model was the MTA's Baltimore LRT system, which is operated by the same agency and operates within the same regional economic and labor market. Generally, estimates only use data from a different agency in cases where a new mode is being added to the region. The proposed Purple Line is in a much more populous region, with a much higher cost of living, than most other US regions served by LRT. It is to be located in an area of much higher development and population/employment density than prevails in the areas served by most light rail systems in the United States. Projected ridership on the Purple Line system is higher than many other systems, and for these reasons it is likely that the Purple Line will be more efficient and productive, as measured in O&M cost per passenger, than most other US LRT systems.*

I.2 Cost Effectiveness

Summary of Comments: Commenters were concerned with the high cost of the project, and whether the benefits justify the cost.

Response: *The cost of the project has to be considered in light of its expected benefits, which include serving 74,160 riders daily and saving those using the system a total of over 34,800 hours daily. It provides a new, more reliable transit choice with improved transit travel times and access to other existing transit services and Metrorail across the corridor. It will also connect communities and provide access to housing and employment throughout the corridor and beyond. It results in a very cost-effective project when evaluating the cost per user benefit.*

The MTA and the State of Maryland believe that the benefits of this long-term transportation investment will justify the cost. Project funding is expected to be approximately 50 percent state and local and 50 percent federal. While the Purple Line would compete for funding with projects from all across the country, the Purple Line is competitive in projected ridership, cost-effectiveness, user benefits, and many other areas as compared to other projects receiving federal funds. The state of Maryland is identifying funding options for this priority project.

The design of the Preferred Alternative is the result of the environmental analysis, input from agencies, and the continued involvement of the community. Throughout the development of the Preferred Alternative, the MTA made refinements to reduce overall project costs and to maintain a cost-effective project while providing a high quality system.

I.3 Project Funding

Summary of Comments: Commenters were concerned that the State of Maryland does not currently have the money to fund its share of Purple Line costs; the availability of using the Transportation Trust Fund (TTF) funds is highly speculative since the TTF is facing substantial revenue shortfalls; the MTA has not demonstrated that is has a reliable plan for providing the funds necessary to finance the nonfederal portion of the project's capital needs, as well as the entirety of the funds needed to maintain and operate the system.

Response: *Currently, MTA and the State of Maryland anticipate being required to provide a fifty percent match of the estimated $2.2 billion in year of expenditure (YOE) dollars required for construction. In March 2013, the Maryland General Assembly approved the Transportation Infrastructure Investment Act of 2013. The Act will provide an average of $800 million annually to address a backlog of transportation maintenance and expansion projects, and is projected to support more than 8,800 jobs each year. In addition to supporting highway and transit projects throughout the State, the Act will provide critical funding for the Purple Line which will allow the engineering and property acquisition phases to proceed.*

An Application to Enter Preliminary Engineering (PE) was submitted the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) for the Purple Line LPA that was identified following the completion of the Purple Line AA/DEIS comment period. On October 7, 2011, FTA approved the Purple Line Preferred Alternative for Entry into Preliminary Engineering based on its rating of the application against its criteria. FTA stated in the Congressional 10-Day Notification attached to its letter of October 7, 2011 to Mr. Ralign T. Wells, Administrator, MTA, from Brigid Hynes-Cherin, Acting Administrator, FTA Region III: "The FTA has received sufficient project justification and local financial commitment information from the MTA to determine that the project meets the eligibility criteria and all other New Starts requirements to advance into PE." FTA project justification criteria include FTA's cost-effectiveness index measure. The MTA's Purple Line financial plan was the basis for FTA determination of the financial commitment.

I.4 Concerned About Underestimation of Costs

Summary of Comments: Commenters suggested that the new south entrance to the Bethesda Metro should not be excluded from the cost of the project, even though it is financed and undertaken by others. The commenters suggested that the same applies to the additional cost of construction and maintenance of the trail, even though maintenance will be Montgomery County's responsibility.

Response: *Chapter 5 of the AA/DEIS describes the costs and funding for the alternatives. The Operating and Maintenance Cost Estimate Technical Report and the Capital Cost Estimating Methodology Technical Report provide further detail. Chapter 6 of the AA/DEIS then describes the factors involved in the evaluation of alternatives and the calculation of the cost effectiveness of each alternative, following FTA's New Starts process.*

The Bethesda Metro South entrance is an independent project. It was planned and financed by Montgomery County as a separate initiative, which began in 1989 with a recognized need for improved Metrorail Red Line access for downtown Bethesda. Construction of the new Bethesda Metro southern entrance will be closely coordinated with the Purple Line construction. The entrance, without the Purple Line, is expected to draw an additional 700 trips by 2030 and will improve the access for the existing 9,000 trips using this station, many of which presently use the less-convenient north entrance. The existing Red Line Bethesda Station was built anticipating a future entrance to the south with "knock out" walls placed at the location of the new entrance. If the Purple Line LRT does not advance, the Bethesda Metro Station south entrance still will be constructed.

The Purple Line would take advantage of this planned and funded improvement. New projects that incorporate existing or planned improvements undertaken by others are not required to reflect the cost of those other projects in the new project cost estimate.

Regarding the cost of the trail, Montgomery County purchased the right-of-way of the Georgetown Branch in 1988 and has maintained the trail since that time, including significant capital investments, such as the rehabilitation of the Rock Creek Trestle. The trail would be a County-owned and maintained facility. The proposed improvements to the trail will be funded by Montgomery County. The trail would continue to be maintained by Montgomery County while MTA would maintain the transitway right-of-way and associated design elements. The impacts of the trail have been assessed in this FEIS; however funding of the trail would come from Montgomery County. Initial funding is included in their current Capital Improvement Plan. To better estimate total costs, the County-portion of the cost of the project has been included in Chapter 2 of this FEIS.

J. Ridership

Summary of Comments: Approximately 20 people commented that the ridership estimates are flawed or usage is being overestimated or underestimated. Concerns include not using market research or local employment projections (New Carrollton TOD, BRAC, etc.) to estimate demand (leading to underestimated ridership projections), using assumptions that are too aggressive (leading to overestimated ridership projections), as well as general concerns regarding methodology. One commenter noted that the Purple Line would only generate approximately one percent increase in total regional transit ridership over the No Build Alternative. One commenter noted that by comparing MTA's Purple Line LRT ridership estimates (59,000 to 68,000 riders per day) to the actual ridership average for comparable systems (40,000 to 45,000 riders per day) suggests that the AA/DEIS ridership figures may be 40% too high. The commenter also noted several errors and disagreements with the application of FTA formulas.

Response: *The methodologies for travel demand analysis are summarized in Section 3.1 of this FEIS and are described in detail in the Purple Line Travel Forecasts Results Report, March, 2013. As requested by certain parties, the MTA provided additional supporting information in manner required under the Maryland Public Information Act. The information provided by the MTA was sufficient to allow for an informed review of the information contained in the Purple Line AA/DEIS.*

The ridership on a given transit service is a function of many factors: the overall travel market is a function of the residential population, the employment, the regional and corridor travel patterns, and the type and location of commercial, retail, institutional and recreational destinations—among other factors. The usage of the specific service is influenced by the attractiveness and quality of the service relative to other travel options (autos and other

transit services), including the travel time, number of transfers, fares, convenience of access (how much time does it take to access stations and get to the destination), and other attributes of perceived benefits and costs.

The methodologies for travel demand analysis are established in the transportation planning industry and are reviewed and approved by FTA. FTA reviewed the MWCOG model at the beginning of the analysis. Per their guidance, an on-board transit riders' survey of the bus and rail services was conducted to aid in updating the model. FTA reviewed the updated model, and the initial and final results were used in AA/DEIS. Subsequent to the AA/DEIS, FTA reviewed the results and approved the forecasts for the Preferred Alternative to be used for the Application to Enter Preliminary Engineering. The Preferred Alternative was approved for Entry into Preliminary Engineering by FTA.

J.1 Increase in Regional Transit Trips

Summary of Comments: Commenters pointed out the growth in regional transit trips in 2040 due to the Preferred Alternative is small and provided this as evidence that the project would not be very effective and would only provide a small benefit.

Response: *It is true that the growth in regional transit trips in 2040 due to the Preferred Alternative is small, 28,627 or 1.7%. However, the region covered in the MWCOG model contains 22 jurisdictions and about 6,800 square miles and includes Washington, DC and parts of three states: Maryland, Virginia, and West Virginia; therefore it is not surprising that changes due to the Purple Line would only be relatively small. The daily trips in the Purple Line corridor are projected to be 69,300 for work and non-work trips in 2040 rising to an estimated 74,160 with the addition of UMD student, special event and special generator trips (See FEIS Table 3-4). While all of these are not new transit trips, the service provided by the Purple Line will be faster and more direct.*

J.2 Methodology

Summary of Comments: Following are specific items that commenters questioned in the travel forecasting methodology or results.

Response: Trip Ends*—The comment points out an issue with the presentation of "trips" and "trip ends". The label of Table 1-2 of the AA/DEIS should have read "Daily Transit Trip Ends, by District, 2000. Similarly, on page 1-8, the text in the first column, third paragraph, should read "transit trip ends" instead of just "transit trips."*

The statement on page 1-8, the text in the first column, third paragraph "By the year 2030, daily transit trips are forecast to grow by 52 percent or from 953,000 to 2,711,000" should read "By the year 2030, daily transit trip ends are forecast to grow by 52 percent or-by 933,000 to 2,711,000". The 52 percent calculation is correct.

Notwithstanding these typographical errors, the point of the discussion—that transit usage in the region and the corridor will grow between the year 2000 and the year 2030—is not affected.

Fare and Transfer Policies*—Tables 2-6 through 2-8 in the AA/DEIS summarize the fare and transfer policies used in the ridership model. Metrobus does not charge a transfer fare, TheBus charges between $0.25 and $0.50 for transfer between bus and rail, and Ride On charges no transfer for local bus transfers and $0.35 for rail to bus transfers. Consequently, the current transfer policies used in the Purple Line corridor represent a range of costs from free to $0.50. The AA/DEIS further states that transfers between Metrobus and Metrorail and the proposed LRT will initially be free, and fare policies will be re-examined as the project advances. Transfers to Metrobus would be free, and transfers to other local services would be equal to existing bus-to-bus transfer policies. The assumptions and methodologies are shown in detail in the Travel Demand Forecasting Technical Report, 2008.*

Assumed Walking Radii*—Chapter 6 of the AA/DEIS references the radii within which people will walk to the station; typically ¼ to ½ mile; the ridership analysis used the ½ mile radius.*

Comparison to Existing Transit Lines*—Making a comparison of one transit line to another strictly on the basis of length of the systems (especially one with half the number of stations) is not a valid or reasonable comparison. As the comment acknowledged, comparing current ridership levels to the Purple Line alternative forecasts some 20 years in the future is not a reasonable comparison. The assertion that the AA/DEIS ridership figures may be about 40% too high by comparison to other LRT systems is not reasonable.*

User Benefit*—Table 6-3 of the AA/DEIS shows transportation system user benefits (TSUB) and the resultant Annualized Cost per Hour of User Benefit for each alternative, including the TSM alternative. A TSUB can be calculated relative to any two alternatives tested in the regional travel forecasting model; thus, a TSUB can be calculated for the TSM alternative relative to the User Hour Future No Build. While the most common application of the TSUB and the Annualized Cost per Hour of User Benefit is for the New Start process, these measures can also be used as part of an evaluation of a set of alternatives in an AA/DEIS. For the Purple Line AA/DEIS, the TSM alternative was one of the alternatives under consideration and therefore, in order to provide information on benefits and costs on a comparable basis, these measures were calculated relative to the No Build Alternative.*

K. Environmental and Social Concerns

Summary of Comments in General: Approximately 150 comments addressed specific sections of the AA/DEIS and the Purple Line's potential impacts to the environment. Many general comments agreed with the findings contained in the AA/DEIS, with people noting that some environmental loss is expected but should be limited and replaced where possible (e.g., planting new trees and sod). Other comments expressed a feeling that FTA and MTA have not done a complete and objective evaluation of the environmental impacts, specifically of putting the Purple Line along the Georgetown Branch right-of-way. Responses to the specific issues associated with the alignment along the Georgetown Brach right-of-way, consideration of BRT along Jones Branch Road, the alignment along Wayne Avenue, and the alignment through the UMD are addressed separately in Sections C, E, F, and N. Comments dealing with specific resources or environmental effects are addressed below by topic area, generally following the outline of Chapter 4: Environmental Resources, Impacts and Mitigation, Chapter 6: Section 4(f) Evaluation and Chapter 7: Indirect and Cumulative Effects Analysis of the FEIS.

K.1 General Environmental Comments

Summary of Comments: Commenters supported the Purple Line only if it is designed in a community- and environmentally-friendly manner and mitigates negative impacts to the greatest extent possible. All jurisdictional agencies must also be consulted. Several commenters also noted corrections that should be made.

Response: *The Purple Line Project is being planned and designed in accordance with all local, state, and federal laws and regulations. These regulations, including the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), set out specific criteria for environmental and social impacts and how they are to be avoided and/or mitigated against. Respective jurisdictional agencies have been and will continue to be consulted throughout the development of the project. The AA/DEIS discusses the potential environmental effects that could be expected to occur with the construction and operation of each alternative. The AA/DEIS summarizes these impacts, while providing further detail within the associated technical reports. Errors that have been pointed out in the AA/DEIS have been corrected in the FEIS.*

K.2 AA/DEIS Adequacy

Summary of Comments: AA/DEIS Adequacy—Commenters suggested that a more thorough analysis of economic and social impacts is needed—that the DEIS analysis fails to meet the rigorous standards of NEPA, did not clearly identify the need, did not objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives, did not involve the affected public before decisions were made, and did not study construction impact sufficiently. Additionally, one commenter suggested that the Walter Reed relocation would require that a Supplemental DEIS be prepared to study its effects.

Response: *FTA has determined, and the EPA agreed, that the AA/DEIS is adequate and that it satisfied NEPA requirements. The AA/DEIS discusses the potential environmental effects that could be expected to occur with the construction and operation of each alternative. The AA/DEIS summarizes these impacts, while providing further detail within the associated technical reports.*

Since more than three years had passed since the circulation of the AA/DEIS in 2008, FTA prepared a DEIS Reevaluation, as required under FTA's regulations (23 CFR 771.129). The reevaluation was prepared in August 2012 to assess the significance of any new information or changed circumstances. It presented new information and changes in the affected environment, along with refinements made to the Preferred Alternative up to that point in time. The Reevaluation concluded that no changes in the affected environment or in the project required the preparation of a supplement to the DEIS.

Following are specific items that commenters questioned:

Identification of Need: *Following commenter suggestions, the need has been more clearly defined in Chapter 1 of the FEIS, and has been evaluated more fully in Chapter 9 of the FEIS. Although other evaluation criteria were suggested, the evaluation criteria discussed in the FEIS were developed based upon the needs identified in Chapter 1.*

Evaluation of Reasonable Alternatives: *Between 2004 and 2008 FTA and MTA examined a number of alternatives and design concepts. The screening process evaluated the alternatives based on a number of factors, including ability to meet the project's Purpose and Need, engineering feasibility, natural and social environmental impacts, preliminary cost estimates, and input from the public and agencies.-Alternatives that did not meet these criteria were not considered reasonable as described in FTA regulations implementing NEPA (23 CFR 771.123). Many alternatives met the reasonableness standard. In order to reduce this to a reasonable number of alternatives for study in the AA/DEIS, the screening process focused on weighing the relative merits or disadvantages of the various alignments or options under consideration within the definition of low, medium and high investment. For example, where two low investment surface options for a particular mode were under consideration, if one had appreciably greater impacts either to project goals, the environment, or the local community, it was eliminated from further consideration. This approach followed the Council on Environmental Quality's (CEQ) guidance for determining the range of alternatives in an EIS.*

Public Involvement: *FTA and MTA initiated the NEPA process for the Purple Line on September 3, 2003 with the publication of a Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare an EIS. Upon publication of the NOI, FTA and MTA initiated the scoping process by inviting interested individuals, organizations, and agencies to provide their ideas, comments and concerns regarding possible modes, alignments, and station locations in the Purple Line corridor. Public and agency scoping meetings and early public participation activities (a newsletter and a project website) yielded discussion and assessment of concepts from previous studies, as well as new concepts. See Scoping Report, May 2004 for a description of the scoping process, the alternatives presented, and comments received. Beginning at scoping and continuing to this day, the MTA, in coordination with FTA, has conducted an extensive public outreach program throughout the project that has resulted in the development and refinement of the alternatives. This includes numerous large scale public open houses and hearings as well as smaller community group meetings. For a description of the public involvement process see Chapter 8 of the FEIS. Beyond these regulatory requirements, FTA and MTA, in conjunction with their local partners, have been working closely with communities and neighborhoods throughout the history of the project. Public involvement is an important aspect of the project and will continue throughout the completion of the design and construction process. Refer to Chapter 8 of the FEIS for more details on the past and on-going Public Participation activities.*

Analysis of Construction-Related Impacts: *Chapter 4 of the FEIS describes the impacts to each resource that are expected to occur during construction. As described in Section 4.5 of the FEIS and Chapter 8, MTA is committed to supporting local businesses in the Purple Line corridor during construction. MTA is concerned about potential*

impacts to the viability of these businesses during construction and has researched best practices in supporting small businesses through roadway or transitway construction. In speaking to other transit agencies, MTA has heard repeatedly it is most important to establish relationships and trust with the local businesses. Communication will be a critical factor in how well a small business handles the disruption resulting from the Purple Line construction. MTA is working with state and county agencies to identify and bring together existing resources that can support and strengthen small businesses.

Walter Reed Relocation: *as discussed above in Section E, Support for Jones Bridge Road, MTA studied the implications of BRAC and the Walter Reed relocation in the Bethesda area. The findings indicated that ridership would not be greatly increased due to the dispersion of employee home locations and the limited number of employees that are within the identified Purple Line service area. The maximum number of visitors expected to potentially use the Purple Line would be 149 daily. A summary of these analyses was included in the AA/DEIS and the supporting memoranda can be found in the FEIS Volume 2: Technical Reports—Alternatives Technical Report, they do not represent significant changes and do not warrant a Supplemental DEIS.*

K.3 Land Use, Public Policy, and Zoning

Summary of Comments: The National Capital Planning Commission suggested that the AA/DEIS needs to evaluate how the Build Alternatives support the principles and policies of the *Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital: Federal Elements.* The comments also suggest that the large federal campuses near the alignment be discussed.

Response: *Section 4.2 of the FEIS has been revised as follows: "The National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC) is responsible for planning activities involving federal land and federal facilities and operations in the Washington DC region; federal workplaces in the study area include the Walter Reed Army Medical Center-Forest Glenn Annex, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration building, and the Internal Revenue Service campus. NCPC influences existing and planned land use through the* Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital: Federal Elements (2004)*." Additionally, the analysis acknowledges the federal guidelines that access to public transit must be a priority when locating new federal facilities or leases.*

K.4 Neighborhoods and Community Facilities

Summary of Comments: Numerous comments expressed the feeling that the Purple Line would have a negative impact on their neighborhood or community, while others feel that there would be a positive impact. Some of the reasons cited for negative impacts included safety concerns, property impacts, loss of parking, impacts to community cohesion, impacts to schools, and visual impacts. Some commenters believed incorrectly that the trail in the Georgetown Branch right-of-way would be permanently removed.

Response: *MTA has worked with community members throughout the development of the Preferred Alternative to address community concerns, as described in Section 4.3 of this FEIS. MTA would continue to consider adjustments to the design and the construction plan to avoid or minimize impacts to neighborhoods and community facilities. Property impacts and visual impacts are discussed separately below. Following is a discussion of the remaining issues noted by commenters.*

Capital Crescent Trail

Summary of Comments: Some commenters believed incorrectly that the trail in the Georgetown Branch right-of-way would be permanently removed.

Response: *The only time the trail would not be fully usable would be during construction. Once construction is complete, the Georgetown Branch Interim Trail will be incorporated into the larger Capital Crescent Trail network, creating a direct connection from Bethesda to the Metropolitan Branch Trail and SSTC in downtown Silver Spring. MTA will plan, design, and construct the Capital Crescent Trail between Bethesda and Silver Spring concurrently*

with the Purple Line. The Capital Crescent Trail would replace the existing Georgetown Branch Interim Trail, which currently extends from Bethesda to Stewart Avenue within the Georgetown Branch right-of-way. At the junction with the CSXT Metropolitan Branch (after the Georgetown Branch right-of-way ends), the trail is planned to continue on the north side of the CSXT corridor to the SSTC in Silver Spring. The completion of the trail along the CSXT corridor is contingent on agreement with CSXT on the use of their property on the north side of the CSXT tracks for the trail. The Capital Crescent Trail would be funded, owned, and operated by Montgomery County.

Community Cohesion

Summary of Comments: Commenters believed that the light rail would create a barrier in the communities through which is passes.

Response: *Light rail is very compatible with pedestrian environments and would not have an adverse impact on neighborhood quality or community cohesion. The Preferred Alternative would not result in a major change in community cohesion or neighborhood quality as it would operate in or adjacent to existing roadways along most of its alignment. Transit in general, and the Preferred Alternative in particular, would support community cohesion by adding stations and improving walkability in station areas. The reconstruction of roadways with bicycle lanes; the addition of new sidewalks, such as along the east side of Kenilworth Avenue; and the construction of the Capital Crescent Trail would all promote community cohesion.*

Safety

Summary of Comments: Commenters expressed concern about the safety of light rail in communities, particularly for pedestrians.

Response: *The Preferred Alternative is being designed to be a safe and efficient system. Special attention has been given to situations where traffic shares, is adjacent to, or crosses the transitway. Safety measures will include signing, signal phasing and coordination, the addition of turn lanes, and the inclusion of curbs, barriers, and gates, as appropriate. Pedestrian and bicycle enhancements are also included throughout the corridor, and pedestrian crossings will be well marked and delineated. New trail and sidewalk connections are included, as well as bicycle lanes along certain roadways. In addition, speeds will be limited in areas of high pedestrian activity such as on the UMD campus. Stations have been designed with safety in mind and have been located in areas with activity and nearby development. Station access will be well marked, safe, and convenient, and stations will be monitored by closed circuit television.*

Community Facilities

Summary of Comments: Commenters expressed concern about impacts to community facilities**.**

Response: *One community facility, the Silver Spring Post Office in the Spring Center shopping center at 8653 16th Street, would be displaced due to the Purple Line Project. The Preferred Alternative includes measures to minimize the impacts on the remaining community facilities. For community facilities with unavoidable partial acquisitions of property or changes in access, there are no impacts to the overall facility within the property. In addition, MTA continues to work to address changes in access or parking.*

Loss of Parking

Summary of Comments: Commenters expressed concern about the loss of parking.

Response: *As discussed in Chapter 3 of the FEIS, the Preferred Alternative would remove, 12 spaces from a parking garage, 220 on-street parking spaces, 897 spaces from non-residential parking lots, and 110 spaces from residential parking lots. Residential property owners will be compensated for the acquisition of parking spaces, but mitigation is not proposed. Mitigation of on-street parking impacts is not proposed except on Bonifant Street. The MTA has met with business owners along Bonifant Street to discuss the issue of lost parking. The MTA will work with the*

county to identify specific mitigation strategies such as changing the meters in the county-owned Bonifant parking lot to prohibit eight hours of parking to discourage commuter parking and adding additional spaces along the roadway or on adjacent lots.

K.5 Property Acquisitions and Displacements

Summary of Comments: Commenters expressed concern about right-of-way impacts on private property, especially associated with the surface alignment along Wayne Avenue; the potential for residential and business displacements; the taking of private property by eminent domain; and being clear about which communities would have displacements.

Response: *The Preferred Alternative was developed to minimize impacts to private property; however, some displacements will be necessary, as shown by neighborhood in Table 4-8 of Section 4.4 of the FEIS. MTA has coordinated, and would continue to coordinate, with affected property owners and tenants to develop means to avoid or minimize property acquisitions and displacements. As discussed in Section 4.4 of this FEIS, MTA would provide relocation assistance and compensation for displaced residents and businesses as required by the Uniform Act, Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Circular 5010.1D, Grants Management Requirements, and the Real Property Annotated Code of Maryland. One shopping center asked about specifically in a comment, the Spring Center, is included in the list of potential displacements. FTA and MTA anticipate that redevelopment will occur on the remainder of the property.*

Although shared lanes on Wayne Avenue were specifically aimed at reducing right-of-way impacts along Wayne Avenue to residential properties, in response to concerns expressed by residents along Wayne Avenue and at the request of Montgomery County Council and the County Executive, MTA conducted detailed comparative analysis of all options on Wayne Avenue, including several underground tunnel alignments. As a result of these evaluations, MTA has concluded that the high costs associated with a tunnel alignment along Wayne Avenue, along with the impacts to transit accessibility and residents in the portal areas, would exceed the range of cost-effectiveness required for continued consideration of a below-ground alignment as part of the Purple Line Preferred Alternative design in this area. A surface alignment would take minimal amounts of private property and would allow for parking on Wayne Avenue during off-peak hours, while the tunnel option would have substantial impacts at the portal areas and would require much greater associated expenses. Three or four residences on Wayne Avenue would have been displaced as a result of the widening necessary to accommodate the tunnel portal and maintain two lanes of traffic in both directions.

An extensive outreach effort was launched with numerous meetings with the community and business owners to inform people of the potential changes, get input, and present and get feedback on options to reduce impacts. Following are examples of where refinements have been to the project to minimize displacements:

- *To avoid several business/institutional displacements along Kenilworth Avenue, the transitway was moved to the median and the number of future lanes was reduced. The number of potential displacements was reduced from 9 to 3 including avoidance of a church, a bowling alley, two restaurants, a tire shop, and a bakery. (Note: Not all of these were included in the AA/DEIS as the potential future roadway widening was not known at the time.) The DEIS Reevaluation includes a broader discussion of the impetus for the change and a description of the outreach effort.*
- *Through targeted outreach activities, MTA met with residential property owners on Riverdale Road were provided opportunities to offer input on design concepts for the transitway. Their participation led to the decision to displace the properties, rather than partially acquire their front yards and change access to their properties. The MTA conducted an extensive public outreach effort with the affected residents and homeowners, which revealed that the majority of residents would prefer to be displaced rather than remain on*

a busy street that would be further widened, resulting in the loss of both substantial parts of their already small front yards, and full access and egress to their homes.

- *To reduce the business displacements along University Boulevard, MTA proposed the conversion of existing roadway lanes for transit use, which will avoid the need to widen the road. As the Preferred Alternative is now designed, two existing roadway lanes will be converted to transit lanes, thereby reducing the through lanes to two in each direction. This change has been made with the concurrence of the State Highway Administration.*
- *Refinements made to the Lyttonsville Yard further reduced the potential business displacements along Brooksville Road.*

K.6 Economic Effects

Summary of Comments: Commenters questioned the impact of the project on property values and rents; expressed concern that during construction there needs to be protection for businesses along the corridor; feel the Purple Line will have a negative impact to businesses in general; and questioned who the project was to transport. The latter commenters suggested that if the new service is assumed to carry blue collar workers, then it may not be needed as there are no blue collar businesses in Bethesda. Large numbers of commenters offered support for the light rail because it would create jobs and boost the economy; it would provide access to jobs; and it would decrease travel times.

Response: *The MTA has established a business outreach program that will continue to work with communities and agencies completion of design work and construction to further reduce impacts and develop more detailed mitigation and enhancements. This will include programs through ongoing coordination with local jurisdictional agencies to provide assistance to businesses during construction; these programs may include signage, promotions, advertising and other measures.*

MTA is engaging small business leaders in the Purple Line corridor in identifying opportunities and resources for technical assistance to businesses through entities such as the Maryland Small Business Development Center.

The Purple Line will provide new employment opportunities in the project corridor; mostly short term (construction) but some long term (operations and maintenance) as well. MTA and the Maryland Department of Labor, Licensing and Regulation (DLLR) have identified the most common jobs that would be needed for the construction and operation of the Purple Line. They have identified the skills and qualifications that workers would need for those jobs, and have compared that to the existing labor pool in the region. Where a shortage of particular workers exists, local job training and certification programs would be created. The MTA and DLLR are in the process of identifying partners, i.e. labor unions, local workforce agencies, contractors, schools, and community-based organizations, in Montgomery and Prince George's Counties with whom coordinated training efforts and pathways to employment can be developed.

Future development likely would create more jobs for local residents, improve mobility and accessibility for commuters, and reduce average transit travel times. Although potential indirect effects could include increased business expenses (e.g. rents) from increased commercial property values, these effects would likely be offset through increased customer markets for local businesses.

Prince George's County has recently completed an initial planning study of five transit station areas to determine a future vision for these communities and to ultimately develop planning strategies that seek to build both diverse and prosperous neighborhoods. A number of public assistance programs, including home and business improvement subsidies and public infrastructure funding, are in place in Prince George's County to address priority needs related to affordable housing, economic revitalization, and public services. Montgomery County also has developed Purple Line design recommendations and transit-oriented development plans for stations along the corridor. The Montgomery County Moderately Priced Housing Law, in effect since 1974, has facilitated the private development of over 13,000 affordable housing units between 1976 and 2010.

As discussed below in the response to the Comment on Environmental Justice, the MTA has discussed concerns regarding the preservation of affordable and low-income housing with both Montgomery and Prince George's Counties and will continue working with the counties and advocacy groups to support engagement of local elected officials regarding affordable housing and increased commercial rents resulting from increased property values as the project moves forward.

K.7 Parks, Open Space, and Recreational Resources

Summary of Comments: Commenters noted that had our public officials known then what we know now about the environmental and health benefits of preserving green space, they might have supported purchasing the right of way solely for parkland; that there will be potential health impacts resulting from the perceived loss of the trail due to a decrease in physical activity and increased obesity; that the AA/DEIS is missing information and should reflect the changes to the trail; that the document does not consider the need for greenspace or recreational trail in the future; and that the project will change access to the existing Georgetown Branch Interim Trail. Other commenters noted that the Purple Line will improve access to numerous recreational activities and facilities and existing trails, and it will allow for the construction of the permanent Capital Crescent Trail. Some agency comments indicated the need to expand the analysis to include all of the stream valley parks in the study area, an analysis required under the Capper-Cramton Act, as well as to include the Baltimore-Washington Parkway as a park resource.

Response: *The analysis was expanded in response to the comments indicating the need for additional analysis of stream valley parks not previously included. Additionally, discussions related to the Capper Cramton Act have been added to Section 4.6 of the FEIS.*

The Preferred Alternative would provide the opportunity to improve the overall health of the users of the Purple Line corridor. The Preferred Alternative would provide the opportunity to improve the overall health of the users of the Purple Line corridor. This would take place through the improvements and extensions of the trail system with the construction of the Capital Crescent Trail from Bethesda to Silver Spring, its connection to the Rock Creek Trail, Metropolitan Branch Trail and the Green Trail and the extension of the Green Trail to the Sligo Creek Trail, as well as the general upgrade of pedestrian and bicycle safety that will be implemented in conjunction with the Purple Line, as described in Section 4.3 and 4.6 of this FEIS.

Along the Georgetown Branch right-of-way where many residents on both sides now have direct access to the trail from their backyards, the Preferred Alternative will result in some changes in access to the trail. These trail users would need to use the 23 formal access points being constructed as part of the Capital Crescent Trail. These new access points would include paving, sidewalks, and ramps/stairs where necessary. While this is a change, it is not a barrier precluding access to the trail within the community.

K.8 Historic and Archeological Resources

Summary of Comments: Commenters noted concern about impacts to historic resources including the Columbia Country Club, the Trolley Bridge, various UMD buildings, and the Capital Crescent Trail, as well as impacts to archaeologically sensitive sites on the NIH campus. Commenters also disagree with the Section 106 analysis regarding the Columbia Country Club saying that they feel that the Preferred Alternative would significantly damage portions of the 15th, 17th, and 18th holes. One commenter argues that MTA has not fully complied with its obligations to consult with CCC and Montgomery County during the AA/DEIS process. The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation stated that they had no comments on the AA/DEIS at this stage of the environment review; the Maryland Historical Trust (MHT) suggested that the MTA and FTA complete the Section 106 review in consultation with the MHT. The USDOI suggested that additional information should be collected to determine whether the five archeological sites identified in the DEIS are eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP).

***Response**: Historic resources have been identified and studied in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended, and its implementing regulations at 36 CFR Part 800. As described in Sections 4.7 and 4.8 of this FEIS, as well as the Section 106 Assessment of Effects for Historic Properties /Light Rail Alignment Areas Associated with the Purple Line Project, Montgomery and Prince George's Counties, Maryland, the Preferred Alternative would have an "adverse effect" to three historic properties because it would remove the resource (Talbot Avenue Bridge and portion of Falklands Apartments) or eliminate a contributing element (Metropolitan Branch). The MTA's on-going consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer (MHT) as required by Section 106, has included determinations of property eligibility for the NRHP and the effects of the Preferred Alternative on those eligible properties, including assessments of the means to avoid or minimize effects on protected properties. FTA, MTA, and MHT are developing a Programmatic Agreement, a legal document that outlines the commitments to be met to advance the Purple Line project.*

***Columbia Country Club**—The Columbia Country Club historic resource boundaries include the current legal boundary as well as minor encroachments of holes 15, 17, and 18 on the former Georgetown Branch of the B&O Railroad as these encroachments were made during the period of significance, which is the period from its founding in 1911 through 1962, the year of its 50-year age consideration. The area impacted by the construction of the Purple Line would occur primarily within the boundaries of the Georgetown Branch trail right of way. However, in consultation with Columbia Country Club, the Purple Line alignment was shifted to the north-northwest to minimize alterations to the landscaping on the south side that is associated with holes 15 and 17. The Preferred Alternative would have "no adverse effect" to the Columbia Country Club since the project would not diminish the characteristics that render the resource historic.*

***University of Maryland**—The Preferred Alternative would also have "no adverse effect" to the UMD since the project would not diminish the characteristics that render the resource historic.*

***Other Resources**—The Trolley Bridge and the Capital Crescent Trail are not considered to be historic resources. The identified Preferred Alternative avoids the grounds of the NIH campus; therefore, the Preferred Alternative would not impact this resource. As suggested by the USDOI, additional studies were performed to determine if any sites within the Area of Potential Effect (APE) (identified either in the AA/DEIS or during subsequent studies) would be eligible for listing on the NRHP. These studies revealed that one potentially NHRP eligible archaeological site is located within the APE; however the project has been designed to avoid impact to this resource, as described in Section 4.8 of the FEIS.*

***Consulting Obligations**—According to 36 CFR 800.1(c): "The agency official must complete the section 106 process "prior to the approval of the expenditure of any Federal funds on the undertaking or prior to the issuance of any license." This does not prohibit the agency official from conducting or authorizing nondestructive project planning activities before completing compliance with section 106, provided that such actions do not restrict the subsequent consideration of alternatives to avoid, minimize or mitigate the undertaking's adverse effects on historic properties." The Section 106 process was initiated during preparation of the AA/DEIS.*

Subsequent to the AA/DEIS, on March 9, 2012, FTA formally invited the Columbia Country Club and the Montgomery County Historic Preservation Commission to be Consulting Parties. The Columbia Country Club accepted; however, the Montgomery County Historic Preservation Commission did not.

K.9 Visual and Aesthetic Issues

Summary of Comments: Commenters noted that the Purple Line will be visually or aesthetically unpleasing in areas of the corridor and that the Purple Line needs to be incorporated in an aesthetically pleasing manner along the entire corridor, and they requested better and/or non-intrusive lighting and simple streamlined stations. Some comments suggested the vehicle technology include wireless or underground transmission of electricity to avoid visual impacts associated with catenary. The NCPC, as well as several commenters, asked that each

alternative be analyzed more thoroughly for potential visual and aesthetic impacts, and asks that photo simulations be provided to illustrate impacts in stream valley parks.

Response: *As discussed in Section 4.9 of the FEIS, in designing the Preferred Alternative, the MTA has made continual efforts to respect the visual quality and integrity of the neighborhoods in which the project would be built, using context sensitive design techniques. As discussed in Section G—Suggestions to Consider Other Modes of Transportation or Technologies, wireless technology has not been excluded from consideration.*

Through its extensive public involvement and stakeholder coordination program, the MTA has worked with communities and stakeholders to understand community concerns and visions. Project elements, such as the station shelters, were developed in response to community input. The MTA has been mindful of the need to consider carefully the location of power substations and, where appropriate, would provide landscaping or other screening to address the visual impacts of these structures. Specific examples of context sensitive design approaches include:

- *The National Park Service was presented with a range of options for the Baltimore-Washington Parkway bridges. With Park Service participation, the MTA was able to develop a design and a construction plan that is acceptable to the Park Service and would maintain the visual experience of the Parkway visitors.*
- *The MTA has met regularly with the Town of Chevy Chase Mitigation Advisory Group to discuss the design of the Purple Line and the Capital Crescent Trail. This collaboration has involved identifying opportunities to minimize visual and other effects associated with the project.*
- *The MTA has worked closely with UMD to identify and minimize visual impacts to sensitive resources; topics have included the design and location of the Preferred Alternative on campus and the relocation of the M and the removal of the traffic circle where it is located currently. The University recently endorsed the cooperatively-developed plans. The MTA will continue to coordinate with the University and the MHT through completion of design work and project implementation.*
- *The MTA has coordinated extensively with the Columbia Country Club (CCC) to maintain the existing views from the clubhouse and southern fairways and greens. The Country Club has provided input on landscape treatments and grading on the slopes of the railroad berm to reduce visual effects for both the playing areas and landscape views from the clubhouse area. MTA is committed to continuing coordination with the CCC to develop visual treatments of walls, fences, and landscaping to further minimize the visual and aesthetic effects.*
- *Montgomery County and MTA will continue to coordinate and consult on the design of the future Capital Crescent Trail to provide an aesthetically pleasing facility while meeting safety and ADA requirements.*
- *Coordination with elected officials and staff from Montgomery County, and the local community has been on-going regarding the design of the bridges over Connecticut Avenue.*
- *Coordination with M-NCPPC and the National Capital Planning Commission has occurred regarding the design and construction of the Rock Creek Bridges.*
- *MTA worked extensively on the location and design of the Lyttonsville and Glenridge storage and maintenance facilities to minimize visual impacts to surrounding areas.*

In addition, the Art-In-Transit program would be used to enhance many of the elements of the project, especially structural elements such as retaining walls, bridges, and ground planes.

K.10 Air Quality and Energy

Summary of Comments: Many commenters who stated that the Purple Line will improve air quality by removing cars from the road. Many of these comments noted that BRT would generate emissions whereas LRT does not. Some commenters expressed concern that removing the trail and trees will have a negative effect on air

quality in the area; while others stated that the tree removal associated with the Purple Line will have a negative or little effect on global climate change. Some commenters noted that LRT is not as energy efficient and/or environmentally-friendly as stated, while others noted that transit will reduce dependency on fossil fuels and reduce energy consumption and global warming.

Response: *Air quality analyses for the Purple Line were performed following EPA guidance. Embodied emission calculations for raw materials, including the extraction, manufacturing, and transport of project-related products are not required by the EPA. In other words, project-level studies do not include the production of electricity or fuel in the analysis.*

The Metropolitan Washington Air Quality Committee (MWAQC) coordinates air quality in the metropolitan Washington region by issuing a State Implementation Plan (SIP) outlining strategies to comply with the Clean Air Act. The current plans in place for the region are the ozone and fine particulate matter SIPs, and the carbon monoxide maintenance plan. In each of these plans, MWAQC prepares an inventory of all current emissions, future projections of emissions, and reasonably available control measures for reducing emissions to acceptable levels in the region. The emission sources include mobile (cars, buses, trucks); non-road mobile (lawn and garden equipment); stationary (utilities such as power generation); and area (consumer solvents).

MWAQC selects and enforces control measures on whichever source is the most beneficial to regulate. Depending on the future energy market and regulations on power plant emissions, the electricity generated to power the Purple Line could be produced by a variety of methods, some of which produce fewer emissions over the current energy mix. Also, implementation of advanced emission reduction technologies at power plants would decrease air pollutant emissions of particulate matter, sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxides, and mercury.

At the project level, the Preferred Alternative is projected to remove over 16,790 vehicles from the road daily in 2040, which would contribute to the improvement of the region's air quality. Although the Purple Line is not expected to dramatically alter the existing energy conditions within the project corridor, it would offer a more efficient transit alternative to energy consumptive petroleum powered transportation.

Carbon dioxide ($C0_2$) and total energy consumption are the two most common measures of a project's impact on greenhouse gas emissions, which are often associated with climate change. As discussed in FEIS Chapter 4.10, greenhouse gas emissions generated for the Preferred Alternative in 2040 are estimated to be no greater than for the No Build Alternative. Furthermore, with the Preferred Alternative, mesoscale C02 levels and total energy consumption are expected to increase with the Preferred Alternative by 0.7 percent in the year 2020. Mesoscale CO_2 levels and total energy consumption are expected to decrease with the Preferred Alternative by 0.2 percent in the year 2040...

Where unavoidable forest impacts occur along the Georgetown Branch right-of-way as well as the rest of the alignment, the MTA would offset those impacts by planting trees in cleared areas (reforestation) and in areas not previously forested (afforestation). Based on the mitigation requirements set forth by MDNR, the MTA has preliminarily identified reforestation sites and forest mitigation banks with available credits that could be used to satisfy mitigation requirements.

K.11 Noise

Summary of Comments: Many commenters stated that the Purple Line will have a negative effect on noise levels near the alignment; a majority of these comments were received from people living near or along the Georgetown Branch right-of-way, Wayne Avenue, and Ellin Road. Comments reflected some concern over the noise generated by warning horns, but the majority focused on "wheel squeal." Some commenters requested that mitigation measures be applied to reduce noise levels while others stated that noise mitigation measures, such as sound walls, are ineffective. Other comments raised concerns over the impacts and mitigation of construction noise on residents and noise impacts, generally, on threatened and endangered species that reside in and around the Georgetown Branch of the CCT. Other comments were supportive of the quiet operation of the LRT as compared to BRT, citing examples in other parts of the country and in Europe of LRT systems that operate quietly and non-intrusively in urban areas and park-like settings. Commenters also suggested that MTA's technical analysis does not include the technical data and analyses that are necessary for the public to meaningfully comment on MTA's conclusions.

Response: *As described in the AA/DEIS and Section 4.11 of the FEIS, the MTA performed an impact analysis for noise following FTA noise guidance and assessed impact using FTA criteria. The guidance prescribes a method for predicting project sound levels based upon the frequency of trains, the distance from a train, and the speed of the train. The Noise and Vibration Technical Report describes the analysis inputs and assumptions used to predict the project-related sound levels, and the formulas used are detailed in the Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment (FTA-VA-90-1003-06 May 2006[3]) Given the development in the vicinity of the alignment, impacts to threatened or endangered species are not anticipated..*

Extensive noise impact analysis and monitoring have been performed and will continue to be analyzed as the project moves forward. Potential noise impacts from LRT line and yard operations and horn noise near stations and at-grade crossings were considered as part of the noise analyses performed. The Preferred Alternative includes several noise-mitigating measures as part of its design. These include "skirts" on LRT vehicles to cover the wheels, reducing sound levels by approximately 8 dBA, and short retaining walls/noise panels along the residential portions of the Georgetown Branch right-of-way, reducing sound levels by approximately 4 dBA. These measures go beyond what would be required for mitigation and, as designed, there would be no noise impacts along the Georgetown Branch right-of-way. East of the Georgetown Branch right-of-way, six residences and two apartment buildings (containing approximately six units each) would be moderately impacted due to warning horns associated with grade crossings or stations. Constructing sound barriers would block driveway access and pedestrian walkways, and not be reasonable to mitigate horn noise. .

Additional potential noise sources include the PA systems used to announce the arrival of the LRT vehicles, wheel squeal, and the hum associated with the TPSS. The PA system will have volume adjustment controls designed to maintain announcement volume at the specified noise level, as appropriate. With proper use, short-term noise from the PA system announcements is not expected to be a noise annoyance to sensitive receptors adjacent to stations. Regular maintenance of the wheels and brake pads would minimize the noise generated by wheel squeal. The TPSS will be designed in accordance with the MTA design criteria intended to minimize the noise from transformer hum.

MTA is committed to abiding by local noise ordinances, whenever feasible and reasonable. Possible noise minimization measures during construction include the following:

- *Conducting the majority of construction activities during the daytime as feasible*
- *Routing construction equipment and other vehicles carrying spoil, concrete, or other materials, where feasible, over designated truck routes that would minimize disturbance to residents*

[3] http://www.fta.dot.gov/documents/FTA_Noise_and_Vibration_Manual.pdf

- *Locating stationary equipment away from residential areas to the extent feasible within the site/staging area*
- *Employing control technologies to limit excessive noise when working near residences*
- *Adequately notifying the public of construction operations and schedules*

Refer to Section 4.11 of this FEIS and the Noise Technical Report for more detailed information on potential noise impacts and any proposed mitigation measures and Section 4.13 of this FEIS for information on wildlife.

K.12 Vibration

Summary of Comments: Commenters expressed concern about vibration near the alignment, in general, and specifically near the UMD Campus and residential uses (both single-family detached residences and high-rise condominium uses). Comments from some homeowners and building supervisors near the proposed alignment expressed concern over the potential structural impacts to their homes resulting from vibration generated by construction activities. Commenters also suggested that concerns regarding vibration along the Campus Drive alignment through UMD are overstated or can be reasonably mitigated. Commenters also suggested that MTA's technical analysis does not include the technical data and analyses that are necessary for the public to meaningfully comment on MTA's conclusions.

***Response**: For the AA/DEIS, the Purple Line Project's impact on vibration related issues was studied according to the general assessment procedures outlined in the Federal Transit Administration's Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual (May 2006). The analysis was refined for the FEIS, resulting in impacts to four residences and one apartment complex, containing approximately six units. Regarding vibration near the UMD Campus, as agreed upon between UMD and MTA, MTA would analyze extremely vibration sensitive buildings located within the UMD campus through a detailed vibration study to be undertaken during completion of design.*

The formulas used to calculate the specific vibration levels associated with the project characteristics are detailed in Table 10-1 of the manual. Tables 2-15 through 2-20 in the Noise and Vibration Technical Report provide the inputs and parameters used for the calculations.

The apartment complex would exceed FTA impact threshold due to high existing vibration levels caused by daily CSXT freight train pass-bys. For areas identified with the potential for vibration impacts during LRT operations, MTA will identify mitigation measures that are feasible.

As agreed to with the UMD, where the Preferred Alternative transitway centerline would be within 100 feet of existing or potential UMD research laboratories, the transitway would be designed to meet the more restrictive of the ambient vibration levels or the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) criterion of 42 VdB.

Refer to Chapter 4.12 of the FEIS and the Vibration Technical Report for more detailed information on potential vibration impacts and any proposed mitigation measures.

K.13 Habitat and Wildlife

Summary of Comments: Commenters expressed concern with the loss of forest, trees, and vegetation and their potential impact on habitat, wildlife, and the ecosystem. Some comments related potential economic development associated with the Purple Line that may result in additional habitat loss. They expressed desire for avoidance, minimization, and mitigation of these impacts. Additionally, commenters noted that invasive vegetation species already impact native vegetation.

***Response:** Where forest impacts occur, the MTA would offset those impacts by reforestation, which is planting trees in cleared areas, and afforestation, which is planting trees in areas not previously forested. Based on MDNR mitigation requirements, the MTA has preliminarily identified reforestation sites and forest mitigation banks with*

available credits that could be used to satisfy the requirements. The final forest planting obligation for the project would be negotiated between MTA and MDNR prior to construction.

As discussed in Section 4.13 of the FEIS, the MTA has and continues to strive to avoid long-term water quality and quantity impacts to aquatic biota by minimizing the amount of new impervious surface associated with the transitway, yard, and maintenance facility. Where practicable, the MTA has aligned the transitway and located associated facilities in areas of existing pavement and impervious surfaces, such as the Lyttonsville Yard site.

Project-related riparian impacts to a tributary to Paint Branch along Paint Branch Parkway, impacts to migratory fish species using the Paint Branch tributary, and stormwater discharge to Paint Branch were cited as concerns by the NMFS during the agency field review of the project on May 8th and 9th, 2012. In response to these concerns, the MTA shifted this portion of the transitway south to minimize impacts to the riparian zone. In addition, the project has been designed so that stormwater associated with the transitway would not be discharged directly into the tributary of Paint Branch.

As part of project-wide avoidance and minimization efforts, the footprint of the Glenridge Maintenance Facility was shifted east to minimize impacts to the buffer of a Brier Ditch tributary.

MTA will continue to coordinate with the NMFS and other regulatory agencies to identify measures to avoid or minimize:

- *Creation of in-stream barriers that block migratory fish from upstream spawning grounds*
- *Alterations of stream configuration, characteristics and hydrology*
- *Incremental changes to in-stream water quality from unavoidable deforestation of the riparian zone*

MTA will design proposed culverts and bridges to MDE standards to avoid or minimize secondary and cumulative impacts to migratory fish and to avoid alteration of habitat.

Impacts to habitat resulting from future new development associated with but not included as part of the Purple Line are addressed in Chapter 7 of the FEIS, and detail is provided in the Indirect and Cumulative Effects Analysis Technical Report.

K.14 Water Resources

Summary of Comments: Commenters noted concern about water quality, runoff, and erosion with some comments identifying the loss of trees associated with right-of-way development as a source of water pollution through erosion. Commenters were also concerned with the impact to Coquelin Run and the Rock Creek watershed. Other comments noted that transportation options that offered commuters an alternative to using personal automobiles would be positive for water resources and the health of Chesapeake Bay.

***Response**: As discussed in Section 4.14 of the FEIS, while the MTA has strived to avoid or minimize the water quality impacts, the project would increase impervious surfaces in the study area, which could increase the amount of surface runoff and potentially increase the level of contaminants such as heavy metals, salt, organic molecules, and nutrients in the surface runoff (Trombulak 1999).*

MTA is considering using green track, as described in Chapter 2.0, along the Georgetown Branch right-of-way and the CSXT right-of-way. Green track allows for some water absorption within the medium, thereby reducing the movement of contaminants to surface water bodies, reduces stormwater runoff, and increases local air humidity.

Most of the transitway east of Silver Spring would be located within currently paved areas along existing roadways, although some roadway expansions would be required to accommodate the transitway. Redevelopment of the Lyttonsville Yard site would almost completely overlie existing impervious areas, but the Glenridge Maintenance Facility and some stations and power substations would add new impervious surfaces.

The water quality within the Rock Creek watershed is discussed in detail in Volume 2: Technical Appendices—Water Resources Technical Report; however, it has been determined that no direct or long-term impacts to the Coquelin Run stream valley and its interior, such as tree clearing, are anticipated to occur by implementing the Preferred Alternative.

K.15 Environmental Justice

Summary of Comments: Commenters expressed concern regarding possible displacements and/or rent increases in low-income and minority communities around Takoma/Langley. A desire was expressed to minimize impacts to low income, fixed income, and immigrant populations. One commenter noted that the methodology for EJ does not make clear how disproportionate impacts were evaluated.

Response: *The Environmental Justice analysis in Section 4.19 of the FEIS describse the methodology for determining disproportionate impact: "The analysis of potentially disproportionate high and adverse effects is based upon the information developed for the FEIS. Based on the results of technical studies conducted for this project, the physical locations of adverse impacts were identified and a map analysis was conducted to determine whether patterns or concentrations of adverse effects occurred in areas with EJ populations." As discussed in that section, the Preferred Alternative is not expected to have a disproportionately high adverse effect on minority or low-income populations. On the positive side, the Preferred Alternative will provide the benefit of improved transit service to all study area populations. The proposed fare structure will be similar to bus fares and is described in Chapter 2.*

As further discussed in Section 4.19 of the FEIS, "Land use and zoning decisions made by the counties and cities in the corridor also would affect the stock and affordability of local housing. A potential indirect effect to EJ populations would be a reduction in affordable housing as a result of redevelopment of existing housing and increased commercial rents and property values. The MTA supports appropriate development around stations. However, a goal of the project is to serve transit-dependent communities, many of which are low income. The MTA has discussed concerns regarding the preservation of affordable and low-income housing with both Montgomery and Prince George's Counties. MTA will continue working with the counties and advocacy groups to support engagement of local elected officials regarding land use changes such as gentrification. Following is a summary of the progress each county has made regarding affordable housing in the Purple Line study area:

- *Prince George's County has recently completed the Purple Line TOD Study (M-NCPPC 2013, Draft), an initial planning study of five transit station areas to determine a future vision for these communities and to ultimately develop planning strategies which seek to build both diverse and prosperous neighborhoods. A number of public assistance programs, including home and business improvement subsidies and public infrastructure funding, are in place in Prince George's County to address priority needs related to affordable housing, economic revitalization, and public services.*
- *Montgomery County also has developed transit-oriented development plans for stations along the corridor. The Montgomery County Moderately Priced Housing Law, in effect since 1974, has facilitated the private development of over 13,000 affordable housing units between 1976 and 2010. In addition, Montgomery County released the 2012 Housing Policy Draft, A Housing Policy for Montgomery County, Maryland, to ensure that the objectives set out in the 2011 Housing Element to the Montgomery County General Plan are met by establishing action plans to meet the objectives."*

Extensive engagement with minority and low-income residents and businesses throughout the development of the project has been and continues to be valuable to MTA in understanding and responding to the concerns of the communities along the Purple Line corridor.

As described in Chapter 8 and Section 4.19, the MTA has implemented a robust outreach program, with an emphasis on meaningful exchange with minority and low-income populations, from project development initiation,

through the AA/DEIS phase, and continuing into development of this FEIS and completion of design work. In addition, throughout the early planning and design development stages of the Purple Line project, outreach was conducted with specific advocacy groups, such as Casa de Maryland and Impact Silver Spring, that support programs and policies on education, social justice, economic opportunity, and other community issues that affect low income, minority, and immigrant citizens and businesses within the study area. The outreach efforts were expanded during the current phase of the project with project staff canvassing the corridor visiting each business and meeting with owners/representatives. These efforts will continue through completion of design work and construction.

K.16 Section 4(f) Resources

Summary of Comments: The US Department of the Interior identified 4(f) park resources that needed to be included in the 4(f) analysis, including the Baltimore-Washington Parkway. Some commenters suggested that the DEIS should have considered the Georgetown Branch Interim Trail a Section 4(f) resource, this would have required a heightened analysis that would have highlighted the impact due to the loss of trees. Some commenters also suggested that the Columbia Country Club should have been considered in the DEIS.

Response: *At the time the AA/DEIS was published, a Preliminary Section 4(f) Evaluation Technical Report was prepared to identify resources eligible for consideration under Section 4(f) of the US DOT Act of 1966. This preliminary evaluation was updated and revised and is included as the Draft Section 4(f) Evaluation in Chapter 6 of this FEIS. These changes included the addition of resources identified by the US Department of the Interior, including the Baltimore-Washington Parkway.*

Georgetown Branch Interim Trail*—The Georgetown Branch right-of-way and the Georgetown Branch Interim Trail are not Section 4(f) resources. As stated in 23 CFR 774.11(h) (Section 4(f)'s Applicability) "When a property formally reserved for a future transportation facility temporarily functions for park, recreation, or wildlife and waterfowl refuge purposes in the interim, the interim activity, regardless of duration, will not subject the property to Section 4(f)."*[4]

Although the right-of-way is not a Section 4(f) resource, the impacts to forests and specimen trees has been studied. As described above, an FSD was conducted within all forested areas in the study area.

Columbia Country Club*—At the time the AA/DEIS was published, the eligibility assessment for the Columbia Country Club concluded that the Club's current property ownership boundaries were the same as the Club's historic property boundary; MHT had concurred in this conclusion (see the AA/DEIS's Architectural History Technical Report). At that time, the entire area within the Georgetown Branch right-of-way was considered to be outside the Club's historic property boundaries. The build alternatives in the AA/DEIS remained within the Georgetown Branch right-of-way (or were located along Jones Bridge Road), and therefore all build alternatives in the AA/DEIS entirely avoided encroaching on the historic property boundary of the Club. Since none of the alternatives analyzed in the AA/DEIS would take any of the Columbia Country Club property, the AA/DEIS concluded that there would be no "use" of the resource, as defined by Section 4(f) of the US DOT Act. The Columbia Country Club was, therefore, not included in the Preliminary Section 4(f) Evaluation Technical Report.*

As part of the FEIS efforts, MTA in consultation with MHT, further assessed the cultural significance of the Columbia Country Club and provided more detail than what was originally provided during the determination of eligibility (DOE) in September 2002. Based on the refinement of the determination of eligibility as part of the FEIS efforts, the period of significance was established (1911—1962) and contributing elements during the period of significance were defined, which MHT concurred in November 2012. This information was used in the Draft Section 4(f) Evaluation that is included with the FEIS.

[4] Cornell University Law School, Legal Information Institute http://www.law.cornell.edu/cfr/text/23/774.11, accessed 1/16/13.

K.17 Indirect and Cumulative Effects

Summary of Comments: Comment that the AA/DEIS ignores indirect and cumulative effects, and if the Purple Line is built it will bring unwanted development to the area. Some people stated that overdevelopment would lead to an exodus from the area, resulting in a negative impact on the quality of life. Comments also specifically questioned the Chevy Chase Lake development and its impact on Coquelin Run. A final comment noted that the ICE analysis could be improved by indicating specific foreseeable projects planned in the ICE study boundary.

Response: *A detailed Indirect and Cumulative Effects analysis was prepared for the Preferred Alternative. The analysis is provided in Chapter 7 of the FEIS. The list of foreseeable past, present, and future projects has been added, as suggested. As suggested, the Intercounty Connector has been added as a past project, as it was previously approved; however the improvements to the Capital Beltway have not been included, since that project was put on hold.*

Where Purple Line stations are located at existing Metrorail stations, past, present, and foreseeable planned development and redevelopment projects are primarily spurred by Metrorail service. In these station areas, including the Silver Spring Library, the identified planned developments are not induced by the Purple Line project. In station areas where no changes are foreseen in existing land use and zoning, such as Dale Drive, Manchester Place, and Campus Center, or where future redevelopment, such as East Campus, has been planned independent of the Purple Line, stations would not be expected to induce changes in development patterns.

In the other station areas of Chevy Chase Lake, Lyttonsville, Woodside/16th Street, Long Branch, Piney Branch Road, Takoma/Langley Transit Center, Riggs Road, Adelphi/West Campus, M Square, Riverdale Park, Beacon Heights, and Annapolis Road/Glenridge, the Purple Line would have the potential to induce development. In many cases, state and local land use planning and zoning actions undertaken in parallel with the development of the Purple Line anticipate the benefits of the Purple Line by facilitating mixed use redevelopment around the stations, often at higher densities.

While not the sole or primary driver of change, the presence of the Purple Line is likely to contribute to social and economic influences that may transform communities over time. For example, a 2006 report by the Center for TOD, Preserving and Promoting Diverse Transit Oriented Neighborhoods, looked at communities within a one-half mile radius of transit stations across the country and the social and economic characteristics of those communities.

Studies, using sales data, of the effect of transit on property value typically have indicated increased values for residential real estate closest to stations, with a reduced influence beyond a one-half mile radius[5]*. This premium depends on several factors, including the design of the station, the level of ridership, local real estate market conditions, neighborhood characteristics, and adjacent land uses. These economic effects can be a both a benefit and a burden. While implementation of the Purple Line may help communities effect positive economic growth, the diversity and the economic needs of the entire community must be considered. Throughout the development of the Preferred Alternative, MTA has been engaged with neighborhoods and businesses along the corridor to understand their concerns.*

MTA will work with Montgomery and Prince George's counties to create opportunities for project-related local economic benefits including workforce development programs.

MTA is engaging small business leaders in the Purple Line corridor in identifying opportunities and resources for technical assistance to businesses through entities such as the Maryland Small Business Development Center.

---

[5] Public Transportation Boosts Property Values" in *Transportation: A Toolkit for Realtors* 2nd Edition, National Association of Realtors, 2012 http://www.realtor.org/sites/default/files/transportation-toolkit-2012-05-29.pdf

The Purple Line would have an incremental effect on resources of interest in the context of all other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions in the cumulative effects study area. The Preferred Alternative is not anticipated to generate substantial cumulative resource effects in the cumulative effects study area. Minimal direct and indirect adverse environmental resource impacts have been identified as being generated by the Purple Line project. Throughout the planning phase of the project, MTA worked closely with agencies, institutions, and private landowners and developers to design a transit line that fits well within the existing and future environment.

***Chevy Chase Lake**—The development at Chevy Chase Lake has been discussed as early as 1990 in the Comprehensive Amendment to the Bethesda/Chevy Chase Master Plan, Approved and Adopted 1990. As such, this development has been included in the Indirect and Cumulative Effects analysis as a project likely to be implemented between 2012 and 2018. The development is also identified as a transportation-oriented development (TOD) in the land use analysis in Chapter 4 of the FEIS.*

The updated plan, the Chevy Chase Lake Sector Plan (M-NCPPC 2013, Draft) acknowledges that the Purple Line would be an integral part of the project by recommending a two-step amendment to the area's zoning. The first would precede the Purple Line and would rezone commercial properties in the Town Center along Connecticut Avenue between Chevy Chase Lake Drive and Manor Road to allow mixed residential and commercial uses.

The second, to be timed with Purple Line funding, would allow over one million square feet of new mixed-use development in remaining Town Center properties. This expanded level of development would allow more housing options, and community amenities such as parks and trails. It can be said that the Purple Line would induce the projects of the second step in the zoning amendments that would redevelop an urbanized area.

It is anticipated that any negative impact to water quality from the increased development would be avoided through the requirements of state and federal water quality regulations and the stated intent of the community to restore Coquelin Run.

L. Transportation and Safety Concerns

Summary of Comments: Approximately 50 comments related to concerns about transportation including public transportation (transit), highways/roadways, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, parking and safety/security. Some people were concerned that local bus service would be affected. Some felt that the Purple Line would not alleviate traffic congestion or lower travel times in the corridor; others noted concerns with the traffic effects at specific intersections or on specific roadways. There were comments relating to pedestrian access and circulation and requests for additional bicycle and pedestrian connections. There was a concern that the Purple Line would cause parking problems or result in the need for additional parking. Finally, there were concerns with safety and security along the Purple Line. Following is a discussion of each of these issues.

***Response:** Chapter 3 in this FEIS presents a more detailed discussion of the anticipated transportation effects of the Purple Line. Specific issues raised in the comments are addressed below.*

L.1 Public Transportation

Summary of Comments: Commenters stated concern about connectivity with other transit modes in the corridor. Commenters expressed concerns and asked questions about whether local bus services would be eliminated when the Purple Line service was initiated.

***Response:** FTA and MTA considered connections to other modes when planning the Purple Line. The four stations with connections to WMATA's metro system at Bethesda, Silver Spring, College Park and New Carrollton are projected to have the highest ridership followed by the Takoma/Langley Park station which is adjacent to the site of the proposed Takoma Langley Transit Center, the busiest bus stop location in the corridor. The Purple Line is not intended to replace or eliminate local bus service. It should eliminate the need for specific express bus routes such as*

WMATA's J4 which parallels much of the alignment and duplicative service such as the UMD Shuttle from campus to the College Park Metro station. In addition, local transit providers may make minor adjustments to bus stops to facilitate connections with the Purple Line stations.

L.2 Highways/Roadways

Summary of Comments: Some commenters stated the need to address congestion. Others were concerned about the impact of the Purple Line on local roads. Several comments were received relating to the effects at specific intersections, roadway crossings, or roadways:

- Several people cited concerns with crossing Connecticut Avenue at grade and the effects the Purple Line would have on existing congestion levels.
- Commenters were concerned about the intersection of Wayne Avenue and Fenton Street and feared that the Purple Line entering as a "fifth leg" of the intersection would worsen the traffic congestion at this location.
- Commenters were concerned about traffic operations on Wayne Avenue if the Purple Line were in mixed-traffic lanes.

Response: *While the Preferred Alternative will not cause a substantial reduction in area-wide roadway congestion, it would provide improved transit travel times and provide a new travel choice in this highly congested corridor. The Purple Line would provide improved travel times for transit riders because its use of dedicated or exclusive lanes will allow it to avoid back-ups and delays at many of the congested intersections in the corridor.*

Roadway and intersection improvements will be made throughout the corridor as part of the Preferred Alternative (see Chapter 3 of the FEIS) which would result in local improvement in congestion and levels of service. These include re-aligning intersections, and additional or longer turn lanes. The roadway changes will result in localized improvements to vehicular traffic operations. One example of this is the addition of left turn lanes along Wayne Avenue at Cedar Street, Dale Drive, and Manchester Road. The addition of dedicated left turn lanes at these key intersections and a left turn phase as part of the signal would improve traffic operations and further promote safety along the corridor. Another example is the re-alignment of Mustang Drive to connect to Riverdale Road directly across from 62nd Place. Eliminating the current "split" signal will improve traffic operations and facilitate safer pedestrian crossings. Finally, the addition of a dedicated left turn lane on westbound Riverdale Road at 67th Avenue will provide full-time, protected access to the Beacon Heights community. All of these improvements will result in improved local access and travel times.

Connecticut Avenue Crossing*—The Preferred Alternative includes a bridge carrying the Purple Line over Connecticut Avenue avoiding this potential conflict. In addition, the Capital Crescent Trail will cross Connecticut Avenue on a bridge adjacent to the transit bridge, eliminating the at-grade trail crossing of the busy roadway.*

Wayne Avenue and Fenton Street Intersection*—It is true that the Purple Line would require a new phase at this traffic signal when moving between Wayne Avenue and the library. The level of service is projected to be the same as under the no-build condition in the AM peak period, however in the PM peak period the level of service is projected to decline with the implementation of the Purple Line.*

Wayne Avenue Traffic Analysis*—Earlier traffic studies conducted along Wayne Avenue as part of the AA/DEIS have been updated and expanded in order to project future traffic operations, identify travel speeds and intersection delay, and to confirm appropriate intersection geometry and traffic control. MTA collected new traffic counts; conducted travel time runs; developed and calibrated traffic simulation models to reflect both existing and design year conditions; and worked closely with Montgomery County to establish all traffic study parameters.*

The resultant rail and roadway alignment provides slightly wider travel lanes to accommodate light rail vehicles in shared use lanes, along with new left turn lanes at Cedar Lane and Dale Drive, dedicated transit lanes approaching the Silver Spring Library and the Plymouth Tunnel, and an additional westbound lane through the Sligo Creek

Parkway intersection. The light rail will operate at or below the posted 30 mph speed limit and be subject to the same traffic signal control as all other traffic. Except for separate light rail signal phases at the intersections of Fenton Street, Dale Drive and the Plymouth Tunnel, traffic patterns are not expected to vary from existing conditions.

Although the Washington Metropolitan Regional Model projected a negative growth rate on Wayne Avenue, the Design Year traffic estimates assumed a 1% annual growth. In addition, the analysis included traffic expected to be generated by approved development in the immediate area. The study also included a projected mode shift from private autos to light rail of approximately three percent. Even with these higher traffic volume projections, plus the addition of light rail vehicles along the corridor, the analysis of the preferred alternative showed acceptable levels of service and delay.

L.3 Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities

Summary of Comments: Commenters stated the need to improve bicycle and pedestrian facilities. One specific pedestrian enhancement that was recommended was to convert Bonifant Street to a pedestrian mall adjacent to the transitway and eliminate vehicular traffic and parking.

Response: *As described in Chapter 2 the Preferred Alternative includes the construction of the Capital Crescent Trail from Bethesda to Silver Spring with an increase in the number of formal access points to the trail. In addition to the trail, the Preferred Alternative includes numerous other bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Montgomery County's proposed Green Trail is included from Fenton Street to Sligo Creek Parkway and Trail. In-road bicycle lanes are being added to Piney Branch Road, University Boulevard, Kenilworth Avenue, and eastbound Veterans Parkway. In addition, a continuous bike path is being designed adjacent to the transitway through the UMD main campus. Where reconstructed, sidewalks are being upgraded to Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards and new sidewalks are being added along Kenilworth Avenue, and wider sidewalks and crosswalks, pedestrian plazas and refuges will be constructed along University Boulevard where needed and feasible. The entire alignment is being designed to have safe, well-marked pedestrian crossings of the tracks. Stations are being designed with clearly marked, well lit, and accessible access and will have benches and bicycle racks as space permits. Montgomery and Prince George's Counties are also looking for opportunities for bike-share facilities at the stations. Secure scooter parking is not planned at this time.*

In response to the recommendation to convert Bonifant Street to a pedestrian mall, it should be noted that the Preferred Alternative retains parking between Georgia Avenue and Fenton Street on one side of the roadway and has one-way traffic on Bonifant Street. Montgomery County, the community, and local businesses have indicated that this block of Bonifant Street is an important link in the roadway network and that the businesses depend on adjacent parking.

As described in Section 3.3 of the FEIS, during construction there would be temporary sidewalk and trail route detours; alternate routing with appropriate signing would be designated. A Transportation Management Plan will address detours and temporary connections to maintain continuity of bicycle and pedestrian facilities during construction.

L.4 Parking

Summary of Comments: People expressed concerns that the Purple Line could cause parking problems and/or promote the need for additional parking. A specific parking recommendation included eliminating parking on Wayne Avenue.

Response: *Purple Line patrons are expected to access the system primarily by foot/bicycle and by transfer from other transit including Metrorail and bus. No new parking facilities would be constructed as part of the Purple Line. Publicly and privately-owned public parking garages exist near the Bethesda, Silver Spring, College Park and*

New Carrollton stations which are the stations with the highest projected ridership. In addition, some people who currently drive to a Metrorail station to park could instead walk to the Purple Line, and use that to connect to the Metrorail, reducing the need for parking.

The MTA understands concerns with impacts to parking along the corridor and continues to work with specific communities and business areas to address these concerns. While it is anticipated that most ridership will be "walk-up" or by transfer, if parking problems result from a specific station location the MTA will work with the community and County to identify the appropriate measure to address the issue. Potential measures can include time restrictions, which would allow local parking for businesses but eliminate all-day commuter parking.

The Preferred Alternative retains parking on Wayne Avenue during off-peak periods for the homes along that portion of the roadway.

The SSTC, College Park Metro Station, and New Carrollton Metro Station have kiss-and-ride facilities available that would be convenient for dropping off and picking up Purple Line patrons.

L.5 Safety and Security

Summary of Comments: Commenters stated concerns about the safety of light rail operations in roadways for traffic, pedestrians and bicyclists. Specific comments included:

- A comment outlined crime rates at WMATA Metro stations and suggested that extending the system beyond College Park would connect higher crime areas to low crime areas on the western end of the corridor.
- Residents of the Edgevale community expressed concern with losing access to the Capital Crescent Trail as this access serves a safe route to Bethesda-Chevy Chase High School (avoiding East West Highway) and provides a secondary access to the neighborhood (by foot) in emergencies if roadway access were cut-off.
- Comments wanted to ensure that school safety was a consideration in the analysis and evaluation of the alternatives. While some comments were general and others only mentioned one particular school, the main schools along the corridor are highlighted below.
- The Town of Chevy Chase requested that the MTA maintain access to the Capital Crescent Trail at Lynn Drive from the south side of the right-of-way.
- Commenters stated concern about the safety of shared use of the CSXT corridor.

Response: *The Preferred Alternative is being designed to be a safe and efficient system. Special attention has been given to situations where traffic shares, is adjacent to, or crosses the transitway. Measures will include signing, signal phasing and coordination, the addition of turn lanes, and the inclusion of curbs, barriers, and gates, as appropriate. Pedestrian and bicycle enhancements are also included throughout the corridor, and pedestrian crossings will be well marked and delineated. New trail and sidewalk connections are included, as well as bicycle lanes along certain roadways. In addition, speeds will be limited in areas of high pedestrian activity such as on the UMD campus. Finally, MTA will design the station platforms using their design principles to increase visibility and surveillance opportunities. Station access will be well marked, safe, and convenient, and stations will be monitored by closed circuit television. Stations located in areas of high visibility and activity also deter crime.*

Specific comments relating to safety and crime are responded to below:

Only Build from Bethesda to College Park*—Changing the project's eastern terminus to College Park would not meet the overall purpose and need of the project and also is not necessary as a public safety measure; the system and stations are being designed with security measures and monitoring..*

Edgevale Community*—As part of the Preferred Alternative, a new path is included from East West Highway under the transitway and trail to Kentbury Drive across from Sleaford Road. This would provide improved access to the school as the current access across the trail is up and down steep slopes over tree roots, planks, and railroad ties. Residents of Edgevale could access this new path through private yards (as some do today) or from East West Highway. The entrance to the path along East West Highway is less than 300 feet along the sidewalk from the intersection with Edgevale Street. Residents wanting to walk into or out of the neighborhood via the trail could access this path via stairs adjacent to the path from Sleaford Road or via a ramp to the path just to the east along Kentbury Drive.*

School Safety*—School safety is of paramount concern as is safety along the corridor. Special consideration was given to areas with expected high pedestrian levels, especially areas with high student activity.*

- ***Bethesda-Chevy Chase High School****—The trail is currently used by many students to access the high school. Some students travel along the trail while others cut across the trail. As described above, the path included between Kentbury Drive across from Sleaford Road and East West Highway would serve as access to the school for neighborhoods south of the trail and east of East West Highway. There are also ramp and stair connections to East West Highway from the trail. Finally, a grade separated trail connection from Lynn Drive under the transitway would provide access from the Town of Chevy Chase to the trail and connections at East West Highway.*
- ***Rosemary Hills Elementary School****—The transitway is located behind Rosemary Hills Elementary School and will be separated by a retaining wall and/or fence. Wider sidewalks are included along Talbot Avenue and on the Talbot Avenue bridge over CSXT.*
- ***Silver Spring International Middle School (SSIMS)****—FTA and MTA have worked with the Montgomery County Department of Education on the reconfiguration of the access and parking for the SSIMS. The design will improve the safety of the entrance along Wayne Avenue, improve the student drop-off zone, minimize conflicts between students and traffic, and channel students to sidewalks and crosswalks. In the vicinity of Dale Drive the school zone would be maintained at 25 mph for the light rail and automobile traffic. The light rail would essentially operate in middle lanes of the roadway, similar to a bus that would travel along Wayne Avenue. Access to the station would be via a well-marked crossing at the intersection with Dale Drive.*
- ***University of Maryland****—FTA and MTA continue to work with the UMD on the design of the Purple Line through campus. Trains would not exceed 15 mph through the center of campus with the highest levels of pedestrian activity. The Purple Line and UMD would also share security measures at campus stations.*
- ***Glenridge Elementary School****—The Glenridge Maintenance Facility would be located behind Glenridge Elementary School. The Maintenance Facility would be located below the grade of the school fields and would be totally fenced off from the surrounding areas. In addition, the design of the Maintenance Facility allows land currently being used for the park maintenance facility to be converted to additional recreational space for the school.*

In cases where construction would be on or adjacent to school property, FTA and MTA will continue to coordinate with the public schools to minimize disruptions to school activities.

Lynn Drive*—After an extensive safety analysis, the MTA has determined that the risks associated with an at-grade crossing of the alignment are too great. The MTA has developed several grade-separated options which it is reviewing with the Town of Chevy Chase and Montgomery County.*

Shared Use of the CSXT Corridor*—The MTA, the CSXT, and WMATA are all cognizant of the risks associated with the operation of their trains in adjacent rights-of-way. CSXT has a light rail policy in place to maintain safe distances and protections. CSXT requires either a 50-foot separation between the centerline of the nearest CSXT track to the centerline of the nearest light rail trail, or if a crash wall is used, a 25-foot separation between the*

centerline of the nearest CSXT track and the crash wall, with an additional 7.5-foot separation between the crash wall and the nearest light rail track.

The MTA will provide these minimum separations and crash walls where the Preferred Alternative parallels the CSXT tracks. The MTA will meet all safety requirements specified by CSXT, including appropriate vertical separation where a structure is constructed over the CSXT tracks. Chapter 2 of the FEIS includes a figure that illustrates the typical section of the light rail adjacent to the CSXT tracks, with a crash wall between the two sets of tracks. Chapter 2 also includes a similar figure that incorporates an extension of the Capital Crescent Trail into the CSXT right-of-way. As previously noted, completing the trail along the CSXT corridor is contingent on agreement with CSXT on using their property on the north side of the CSXT tracks for the trail.

The proposed location of the trail on the north side of the CSXT Metropolitan Branch corridor is dependent on an agreement between CSXT and Montgomery County. Appropriate safety requirements for the trail would be identified in this agreement.

M. Specific Design Comments

Summary of Comments: Approximately 70 comments dealt with more detailed design issues such as a shift in the alignment, the location of a station or access to a particular business or planned project. These comments are addressed below and fall into the general categories of station location and design, storage yard and maintenance facility, trail design and access, local access, track layout and design, vehicle design/method of payment, re-use of existing structures, streetscape elements, maintenance, and design coordination.

Response: *As the project moves through Preliminary Engineering, FTA and MTA will continue to work with property owners and communities on specific design issues. Some of the issues noted below have been resolved while others will be addressed as part of completing design work on the project.*

M.1 Station Location and Design

Summary of Comments: Several comments were received on the location and design of the stations.

Response: *Station locations were determined based on ridership, geometric constraints (stations need to be located on straight sections of track), and accessibility while trying to reduce impacts to surrounding homes, businesses, and environmental resources. Stations are being designed to provide a pleasant patron experience. They would be well lit and attractive; distinguishable from Metro; made of durable, low maintenance materials; and include communications including next train information, ticket vending machines, and safety and security coverage. Although some commenters requested that retail be added to the station areas, this would occur separately from the Purple Line project.*

Lyttonsville Station

Summary of Comments: Some comments requested that the station be located closer to Stewart Avenue and others suggested it be closer to Grubb Road (or to add another station at Grubb Road).

Response: *Since the publication of the AA/DEIS, the MTA has worked with the Lyttonsville community in locating the proposed Lyttonsville station. The station planning efforts have resulted in the station being located just east of Lyttonsville Place as shown in the Preferred Alternative. Many factors went into this decision including design constraints, access, and visibility of the station. There are curves along the alignment on either side of the Lyttonsville station area from Rock Creek Park on the west and to the CSXT corridor on the east. Some shift of the station was possible; however after studying the area, the location included in the Preferred Alternative, just east of Lyttonsville Place was deemed the most appropriate location.*

The track alignment near Grubb Road is on a curve making it difficult to place a station in this location. An additional station at Grubb Road would be too close to the Lyttonsville station and relocating the Lyttonsville station to Grubb Road would move it farther from the high density employment at the Forest Glen Annex and neighborhoods to the east. The Lyttonsville station would be accessible to people in the Grubb Road area through the local street system as well as the future permanent Capital Crescent Trail. There is a proposed trail connection at Grubb Road and a walk to the station from this point would be just over ¼ mile.

At the request of the community, MTA also looked at shifting the station closer to Stewart Avenue. Due to the curve in the alignment at this location, it would not be possible to shift the station all the way to Stewart Avenue. A slight shift would move closer to Stewart Avenue and the Forest Glen Annex; however the limited right-of-way would result in additional impacts. More importantly, this would place the station "out of view" of Brookville Road, Stewart Avenue, and Lyttonsville Place which was deemed less desirable from an urban design, safety, and security standpoint. The proposed station location at Lyttonsville Place has a strong visual connection to the roadway above. Patrons from the Forest Glen Annex or neighborhoods to the east could access the station via Brookville Road to Lyttonsville Place or via the future Capital Crescent Trail from Stewart Avenue to the station. The walk from Stewart Avenue to the proposed station is less than 1000 feet. In addition, the design of the station is being developed to have a strong visual identity at the street level so people can locate the station and MTA and the County recognize the need to upgrade sidewalks along Brookville Road.

Kenilworth Avenue/Riverdale Park Station

Summary of Comments: Comments noted that the Riverdale Park station could be an important catalyst for growth and redevelopment in the surrounding area.

Response: *The Preferred Alternative includes an elevated station in this area tied to the bridge over the intersection of Kenilworth Avenue and East West Highway. M-NCPPC—Prince George's County has included this station in their TOD study for the area and envisions redevelopment around this transit station and public space. The station is being designed to complement the plan with special attention to the design of the station and public plaza below.*

Connecticut Avenue Station

Summary of Comments: Several comments referenced a proposed station at Connecticut Avenue, mostly in reference to traffic impacts and development.

Response: *The Preferred Alternative includes a station at Connecticut Avenue. The AA/DEIS included some alternatives that crossed Connecticut Avenue at-grade which would have affected traffic but the Preferred Alternative crosses over Connecticut Avenue on a bridge eliminating any conflict between the light rail trains and traffic on Connecticut Avenue. One comment expressed opposition to the bridge stating that it would deface the area and be a visual intrusion. FTA and MTA understand that the bridge is a new visual element over Connecticut Avenue and have worked with Montgomery County on the design of the structure. The Connecticut Avenue station is projected to have good ridership, serves and area with planned development, and without that station there would be no stops between Bethesda and Lyttonsville, a distance of approximately 2 ¾ miles.*

M Square/River Road Station

Summary of Comments: Comments on the AA/DEIS stated a preference that the M Square Station along River Road be located at Rivertech Court in order to better serve residents of Riverdale.

Response: *Since the AA/DEIS, MTA met with representatives of the UMD (the owners/developers of M Square), the Town of Riverdale, property owners, and the community to discuss options for the station location. Based on these discussions, consensus was developed to move the station from Rivertech Court to Haig Drive/University Research Court. This shift of approximately 700 feet was determined to best balance the needs of M Square and the community. It was farther from the College Park Metro station serving a different part of the development and was*

still accessible to the community either via River Road from Rivertech Court or from a newly proposed path from Tuckerman Street in the community directly to the station area and park.

M.2 Storage Yard and Maintenance Facility

Summary of Comments: There were several comments about the storage and maintenance facilities.

Response: *Since the AA/DEIS, MTA has worked with the communities, Montgomery and Prince George's Counties, and Prince George's County Parks to reduce the size of the facilities, minimize potential impacts to the surrounding communities, and reduce redundancies between the two locations. As a result the Lyttonsville site will be primarily the storage yard and operations center and the Glenridge site will be primarily the maintenance facility. In addition, the location of the Lyttonsville yard was shifted and the configuration of the Glenridge facility was changed to respond to community concerns and to reduce impacts to surrounding communities. A summary of the efforts that went into this decision and a description of the two facilities can be found in Chapter 2, in Sections 2.2.2 and 2.3.2. Each has been designed to fit into the surrounding area.*

M.3 Trail Design and Access

Summary of Comments: Numerous comments related to the design of the Capital Crescent Trail including its width, access points, and connections. Most comments were based on the popularity of the trail and its importance in a broader, well connected trail network. Some suggested that the trail extend the entire length of the Purple Line. Some suggested that the trail be constructed on the south side of the Purple Line alignment, particularly between Bethesda and Connecticut Avenue. Many people supported the trail continuing through the "tunnel" in Bethesda

Response: *The trail is part of the Preferred Alternative included in the FEIS and is described in more detail in Chapter 2. It would be constructed at the same time as the Purple Line but is a separate project that will be funded and maintained by Montgomery County providing a continuous off-road trail between Bethesda and Silver Spring. Montgomery County has included funding for the trail in its current Capital Improvements Program (CIP).*

In response to the suggestion that the trail extend the entire length of the Purple Line, the issue is one of available right-of-way. Montgomery County purchased the Georgetown Branch right-of-way for use as a transitway and trail. As stated above, the Capital Crescent Trail is a Montgomery County project that would be constructed at the same time as the Purple Line. The MTA is not able to purchase right-of-way to construct a trail and there is no comparable right-of-way east to New Carrollton. However from Silver Spring, the Capital Crescent Trail would tie into a broader trail network including the Metropolitan Branch Trail and Green Trail. In Prince George's County,M-NCPPC studied future bicycle and pedestrian access throughout the corridor and is looking to implement additional improvements throughout the area. While not a continuous trail, the Purple Line Preferred Alternative includes bicycle and pedestrian improvements throughout the corridor. They are described in more detail in Section L—Transportation and Safety.

The suggestion that the trail be constructed on the south side of the alignment. This was studied in the planning phase of the project and the north side alignment was determined to be preferable. The concrete pillars associated with the East West Highway bridge over the trail constrain the design. Siting the trail on the north side of the alignment allows for the maximization of green space between the trail and the transitway. Additionally the amount of retaining wall needed is reduced with the trail on the north side.

The trail through the "tunnel" in Bethesda was part of the LPA and included in many of the alternatives studied in the AA/DEIS. Following the publication of the AA/DEIS, the Preliminary Engineering phase of the project included more detailed engineering analyses that revealed the high cost and risk associated with carrying the trail through the tunnel. Montgomery County concurred that the cost and risk associated with this concept was too great for the trail experience that would be provided and a decision was made to follow a street running alignment from Elm

Street Park to the current Capital Crescent Trail towards Georgetown. MTA is working with Montgomery County to determine future opportunities to continue the trail under Wisconsin Avenue when and if the existing buildings redevelop. In response to County requests and concerns of community members the Preferred Alternative includes a 5-7 foot sidewalk through the tunnel. This sidewalk would provide access to the Purple Line Station, Bethesda South Metro Entrance, Elm Street and Woodmont Plaza and would avoid the need to cross Wisconsin Avenue at-grade.

M.4 Local Access

Summary of Comments: The following are comments related to local access issues that were not covered in other sections of the response to comments.

- Access to Langley Park Plaza with the removal of a traffic signal on Unviersity Boulevard.
- One comment suggested making Dartmouth Avenue between Wayne Avenue and Dale Drive a cul-de-sac to prevent cut-through traffic

Response:

Langley Park Plaza Shopping Center*—The alternatives in the AA/DEIS would have eliminated an existing traffic signal along University Boulevard that provided access to the Langley Park Shopping Center, restricting the entrance to right-in/right-out access. Since that time, MTA has worked with the property owner to retain the signalized entrance and it is included in the Preferred Alternative.*

Dartmouth Avenue*—The Preferred Alternative includes the addition of left turn lanes at Wayne Avenue and Dale Drive which is projected to improve the operations of that intersection. The dedicated left-turn phase at Dale Drive should make northbound trips more efficient and reduce the desire for motorists to cut through the neighborhood. Southbound vehicles could turn right at Wayne Avenue as they do today without interaction with the Purple Line. If the neighborhood desires changes to this local roadway the residents would have to contact the Montgomery County Department of Transportation and have a broader study and discussion with all of the residents. The Preferred Alternative maintains the intersection of Dartmouth Avenue at Wayne Avenue.*

M.5 Track Layout and Design

Summary of Comments: Several people commented on the track layout and design. This included comments on the number of tracks and the type of track bed.

- There was one suggestion to use girder rail on the project.
- There was a suggestion to add a third track for the entire length to limit the effects of maintenance or track closures.
- Commenters suggested single tracking portions of the Purple Line to reduce impacts.
- Prince George's County initially requested that the LRT run in dedicated lanes in this area.

Response:

Track Type*—Tracks along the corridor will vary by area and primarily include embedded, ballasted, direct fixation, and possibly green track. These are described in more detail in Chapter 2. Both ballasted and green track sections are pervious to varying extents, minimizing stormwater and runoff effects. In some locations the track is dictated by the design (i.e., when sharing with traffic tracks need to be embedded) while in other locations different types of track can be considered. The type of track is being assessed based on design, maintenance, and other considerations.*

Girder rail will not be used as it is no longer produced in the US and there are project requirements for domestically produced materials. It is no longer an industry standard and is hard to replace.

***Addition of a Third Track**—The costs and impacts associated with a third track for the entire length of the project make this infeasible. Cross-overs (places where the train can move from one track to another) are being placed at regular intervals to minimize delays during a track closure.*

***Single-Track**—MTA studied single-tracking sections of the line. The analysis and findings were documented in the report "Opportunity for the Use of a Single Track along the Georgetown Branch Right-of-Way," updated July 8, 2010. The study found that introducing a single-track segment between Bethesda and Connecticut Avenue would significantly compromise travel time savings, service frequency, passenger carrying capacity, and the maintenance and operating reliability of the entire Purple Line, thereby reducing the effectiveness, efficiency, and the return on a more than billion dollar investment. These issues are compounded for the Purple Line because of the restriction on having a tail track or pocket track at the Bethesda terminal station and train lengths limited to a two-car train. Because of the tightly constrained width of right-of-way the amount of tree clearing would be no different for a single track proposal. The reduction in the amount of tree clearing hoped for from building a trail and single-track segment would not be achieved because of the amount of space needed to construct the permanent trail, associated buffers, and the transitway. A single-track segment between Bethesda and Connecticut Avenue would have adverse impacts to the entire Purple Line system in Montgomery County and Prince George's County. These impacts would be:*

- *Longer travel times to the riding public—due to the need to wait for trains in the opposing direction; a delay along any part of the entire line would be compounded by this single-track section.*
- *Less frequent service—trains would not be able to operate at six-minute headways, resulting in a less convenient, less attractive service.*
- *Lower passenger capacity due to less frequent service and inability to add trains, which will limit future ridership growth.*
- *Difficulty in operating the trains on a reliable schedule. The use of single track segments requires that the trains operate on a very strict schedule. The fact that much of the Purple Line would be operating on existing roadways and would be exposed to interactions with other traffic makes maintaining a predictable schedule a challenge. For example, a westbound train coming from Silver Spring that has been slightly delayed by traffic on Wayne Avenue could hold up the departure of an eastbound train in the Bethesda station.*
- *Overall restrictions to operations and maintenance, requiring night-time maintenance work or total service shut down between Bethesda and Silver Spring to perform required maintenance.*

The projected ridership for the Purple Line is quite high, and the state of Maryland had concerns about the fiscal prudence of investing in a project of this scale with capacity constraints in the face of increased ridership.

***Dedicated Lanes on Paint Branch Parkway**—The decision was made to use shared lanes based upon project cost, right-of-way takings, and environmental impacts.*

M.6 Vehicle Design/Method of Fare Payment

Summary of Comments: Commenters asked what kind of vehicle would be used for the Purple Line. One suggestion was to have windows that open in the vehicles; another suggested the use of "split axles."

***Response:** The exact vehicle has not been determined at this time; however a general "family" of vehicles was determined. Vehicle specifications will be developed during completion of design work. As noted in a comment, windows that open can provide fresh air on nice days but most recent vehicles are outfitted with fixed windows that allow more efficient temperature control (hearing and air conditioning) and safety measures. Another comment*

suggested the use of "split axles" to reduce noise from the wheels; however, this technology is typically used with 100% low floor vehicles, not the "regular" 70% low floor vehicles proposed for this project. Finally, the Purple Line is planned to be compatible with the WMATA SmarTrip card.

M.7 Re-use of Existing Structures

Summary of Comments: One comment suggested that the existing trestle bridge carrying the trail over Rock Creek be re-used in the Purple Line.

Response: *The layout of the LRT and trail bridges is not conducive to the reuse of the existing bridge lengths. The project is lowering the existing grade in the area to assist in the widening of hill tops to support both the LRT and the trail. Due to the sensitive nature of Rock Creek, the goal is to span the creek without putting additional pier supports in the stream. The existing prefabricated trusses are not long enough to facilitate this construction. However, MTA and Montgomery County are looking to re-use portions of the bridge for other trail connections in the County.*

M.8 Streetscape Elements

Summary of Comments: Commenters stated support for the inclusion of "streetscaping" in the plans.

Response: *Urban design and streetscape elements will be further incorporated into the plans during completion of design work. Many of these elements are conceptual at this phase. Lighting is being designed appropriate for the area, limiting spill-over into adjacent residential areas. Landscaping will be incorporated into the design at stations and along the corridor. TPSS will be landscaped, fenced, or have other treatments appropriate to their location. Finally, there is an Art in Transit program with a goal "to make the light rail station distinct in its design and artistic impact; encourage civic pride; and reinforce meaningful neighborhood identities." FTA and MTA are working to identify and prioritize opportunities for artistic enhancement along the entire project including stations, structures, walls and fences. An overall concept is being developed to tie together elements and system-wide approaches for art along the Purple Line. There will be community involvement as the program moves forward.*

M.9 Maintenance

Summary of Comments: Commenters stressed the importance of maintenance on the Purple Line, especially from the impacts of weather.

Response: *The Purple Line is being designed to criteria that have been developed for the safety, performance, and sustainability of the system. This will minimize the effects of weather including snow and ice on the tracks. The future maintenance of elements of the system such as shared roadways, snow removal, maintenance of stormwater facilities, etc. will be the subject of agreements with partner agencies such as the Maryland State Highway Administration, Montgomery County, Prince George's County, M-NCPPC, and the UMD.*

M.10 Design and Construction Coordination

Summary of Comments: Commenters stated concern that design and construction need to be coordinated with other agencies and projects. There was also a concern about the safe removal of hazardous materials.

Response: *FTA and MTA will continue to coordinate detailed design and construction issues with partner agencies and the public as the project moves forward. As requested by Maryland Department of the Environment, removal of above ground or underground petroleum storage tanks, as well as general solid waste associated with construction, will be performed and disposed of in the appropriate manner and in accordance with applicable state and federal laws and regulations.*

M.11 Construction Phasing

Summary of Comments: Several people and Prince George's County suggested starting construction on the east end of the project in New Carrollton,

Response: *Chapter 5 of the FEIS identifies construction areas and mentions that construction would likely begin simultaneously in several places. Some elements will require the full five years for construction. A sequence of construction by area has not been developed. A minimal operable segment (MOS) has not been analyzed.*

N. Concerns with Alignment through University of Maryland

Summary of Comments in General: The UMD as well as a few commenters identified issues with the alignment through the UMD and its potential impacts. Several other commenters identified the benefits of having the alignment through the campus.

Response: *Subsequent to submitting these comments, UMD and MTA formed a Purple Line Work Group. The collaborative partnership resulted in the design of the MTA's Preferred Alternative of the Purple Line alignment through the College Park campus and the group continues to coordinate as the design is developed in more detail. In addition, a Term Sheet was developed to address the University's concerns with the Purple Line project and it will serve as the basis for a future agreement between the MTA and the University..*

N.1 Preinkert Drive Alignment

Summary of Comments: Many comments stated that the Preinkert Drive alignment would be more supportive of the University's Master Plan goal of closing Campus Drive to through traffic. Other comments stated that the Preinkert Drive alignment presents safety hazards due to pedestrian and bicycle traffic between LeFrak Hall and the South Campus Dining Hall. Additional concerns cited visual and historic impacts to the Morrill Hall Quadrangle as a result of the Preinkert Drive alignment.

Response*: MTA evaluated the Preinkert/Chapel alignment carefully to try to find an alignment that would meet the project's needs. This initial analysis is included in the "Technical Memorandum Evaluation of the Use of the Preinkert Drive Alignment for the Purple Line," available on the project website. While the alignment, and therefore the station location, is not as central as the Campus Drive alignment, its location is acceptable; however, the physical constraints imposed by the topography and the proximity of the existing buildings result in an operating environment that is not acceptable. The restricted sight lines for the light rail operator create conditions under which the MTA could not agree to operate the system. The risk to pedestrians and bicyclists from the pinch points, limited sightlines, and the impossibility of ensuring that no pedestrians would be in the prohibited area is too great to be accepted by the MTA. UMD and the project study team also evaluated tunnel alignments, but all were dropped from further consideration due to impacts and costs.*

Subsequent to this and other evaluations MTA and UMD agreed on some modifications to the Campus Drive alignment and abandoned further consideration of the Preinkert Drive alternative. Further, UMD adopted its 2011-2030 Facilities Master Plan, which includes the Purple Line on Campus Drive.

N.2 Other Alignments

Summary of Comments: A few comments suggested other alignments on the "outskirts" of campus including alignments that followed Knox Road and/or alignments around Comcast Center.

Response: *MTA reviewed numerous alignments through and around the University of Maryland Campus. Through consultation with the University it was decided that the Preferred Alternative should serve the core of campus and follow Campus Drive. Alignments along Knox Road and around Comcast Center each had*

engineering and physical constraints and impacts associated with connecting back to the overall alignment each of campus.

N.3 Construction and Operating Agreements

Summary of Comments: the MTA should enter into both a construction agreement and an operating agreement with the University before the Regents grant access to the MTA or any others to construct a regional transportation system on University land. Construction must be managed to ensure the University can continue its educational and research activities unhindered.

Response: *Subsequent to the AA/DEIS, UMD and MTA Purple Line Work Group, worked together to design the MTA's Preferred Alternative of the Purple Line alignment through the College Park campus. Early in the Work Group efforts, a Term Sheet was developed for consideration by the UMD Board of Regents. The Term Sheet addresses the University's concerns with the Purple Line project as described in the AA/DEIS and presents alignment modifications/options and mitigation measures mutually acceptable to MTA and UMD. The term sheet has informed ongoing coordination and serves as the basis for the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) currently under development between UMD and MTA. This MOA would supersede the Term Sheet should the project move forward.*

Through the ongoing efforts of the Work Group and detailed design reviews, UMD and MTA will further identify and define the portions of the alignment requiring mitigation for sensitive research. The mitigation will be included in the MOA.

N.4 Electromagnetic Interference

Summary of Comments: There is concern that the LRT vehicles would produce electromagnetic interference (EMI) potentially affecting several major science research buildings (especially those which use modern electron beam instrument operation).

Response: *MTA and UMD together and separately identified the existing conditions on campus as they relate to existing electromagnetic fields and the potential electromagnetic interference (EMI) generated by LRT vehicles of different consist sizes and travel speeds, and they documented the sensitivities of research equipment, such as scanning electron microscopes, used at several University buildings. MTA proposes a combination of design and mitigation remedies that would allow the light rail system to operate through the campus without causing undue problems due to EMI for the sensitive instruments on the University campus. As discussed in the "MTA Purple Line Technical Memorandum Electromagnetic Emissions and Mitigations" (available on the Purple Line website), a combination of automatic controls limiting the speed and acceleration rate of the light rail vehicles as they pass through the campus and a double feeder power supply system would reduce the EMI associated with the operation of the light rail vehicles. If necessary, this strategy will be supplemented with active cancellation or passive shielding that would protect individual research equipment (existing and future) within a certain distance of the LRT alignment. EMI mitigation was also a component of the Term Sheet. Through the ongoing Work Group and design reviews, UMD and MTA will continue to work together to define the areas requiring mitigation and the type of mitigation most appropriate.*

N.5 Vibration

Summary of Comments: There is concern that several research buildings would be affected by vibration associated with the passby of the LRT vehicles, making current research buildings unsuitable for highly sensitive work.

Response: *As agreed upon between UMD and MTA as an outcome of the Work Group, MTA will analyze extremely vibration sensitive buildings located within the UMD campus through a detailed vibration study to be*

undertaken during completion of design work. The study will establish criteria, guidelines, monitoring requirements, exceedence protocols, and timetables for the future operation of Purple Line LRT vehicles within the UMD Campus. MTA will design the guideway adjacent to vibration-sensitive facilities to minimize ground-borne vibration consistent with proven industry practices and maintenance requirements to meet the greater of the ambient vibration levels or the NIST-A within 100 feet of the nearest track centerline at existing and potential research laboratories for a period of 30 years. After that time, UMD and its research partners will design their research activities to accommodate the background conditions resulting from the Purple Line.

Where the Preferred Alternative transitway centerline would be within 100 feet of existing or potential research laboratories, the transitway would be designed to meet the more restrictive of the ambient vibration levels or the NIST criteria of 42 VdB.

N.6 Noise

Summary of Comments: The AA/DEIS does not make clear what FTA Land Use Category was used for the University. While much of the campus is dedicated to Category 3 uses (institutional daytime uses), significant portions could be considered Category 2 uses (residential) and Category 1 uses (sensitive buildings), such as those buildings which are involved with noise sensitive research.

Response: *The Purple Line Noise Technical Report for the FEIS details FTA Land Use Category applied to each site. Eight representative locations were identified within the UMD campus. Six sites were classified as Category 3 for institutional uses, which include schools, libraries and theaters where it is important to avoid interference with such activities as speed, meditation and concentration on reading material; and two were classified as Category 2, representing dormitories and other housing. No Category 1 sites were identified on the campus. Category 1 is defined as buildings or parks where quiet is an essential element of their intended purpose, and it includes National Historic landmarks with significant outdoor usage as well as recording studios and concert halls. A screening distance of 350 feet from each side of the centerline of the track was used to identify sites to be evaluated.*

To help reduce future noise exposure during daily line operations, vehicle skirt panels were included in the design for the LRT vehicles. The skirt panels would reduce the noise caused by the interaction of, and friction between, the wheels pressing down on the rails as the train travels along the transitway, reducing vehicle noise by 8 dBA along the entire length of the project corridor. With this design feature in place, MTA found that no noise impacts would result to the uses on the UMD campus based on FTA criteria. Should UMD identify buildings for which the Category 1 use would apply, the MTA would predict the project's effect on those buildings to determine if they would be impacted by the project, and if so, MTA would design mitigation measures to avoid or minimize the impact.

Additional potential noise sources to the campus receptors include the PA systems used to announce the arrival of the LRT vehicles, wheel squeal, and the hum associated with the TPSS. The PA system would have automatic volume adjustment controls designed to maintain announcement volume at a specified few dBA above ambient noise levels. With proper use, short-term noise from the PA system announcements is not expected to be a noise annoyance to sensitive receptors adjacent to stations. Regular maintenance of the wheels and brake pads would minimize the noise generated by wheel squeal, and the TPSS facilities would be designed in accordance with the MTA design criteria intended to minimize the noise from the transformer hum. It should be noted that the TPSS locations were identified to reduce potential noise or EMI effects on campus activities. The proposed TPSS are located off the main campus away from sensitive research locations; one on the south side of Campus Drive near the Adelphi/West Campus Station and one in East Campus adjacent to Ritchie Coliseum. Similarly, the stations are located adjacent to Adelphi Road near UMUC, in the center of Campus near the Cole Student Activities Building, and in East Campus near the new proposed mixed-use development. These locations are also away from most potential noise sensitive resources.

Additionally, UMD and MTA have agreed that MTA will establish a monitoring program to verify the efficacy of the design and operational criteria in meeting the limits detailed in the various studies and documents prepared by the MTA and UMD. MTA shall be responsible for the costs of the monitoring program, and it will perform the monitoring in conjunction with UMD.

O. Comments on the Alignment along Ellin Road and the New Carrollton Station Area

Summary of Comments: Less than 20 comments were received regarding the alignment along Ellin Road and the New Carrollton Station area. Comments include concerns over the Ellin Road alignment including concerns about pedestrian safety, traffic and parking; potential impacts to homes; and environmental concerns relating to noise and vibration. Most of the comments came from residents of the Hanson Oaks/Old Ardwick-Ardmore Community which has homes backing to Ellin Road and only one access point. Some residents expressed a preference for an alignment along Harkins Road rather than Ellin Road. People asked for efficient transfers between the Purple Line and WMATA at New Carrollton and some noted a desire to design the alignment to accommodate a future extension beyond New Carrollton. Finally, comments noted the need to continue to work closely with the community to minimize impacts.

Response: *FTA and MTA continue to work to address community concerns and to minimize impacts in the New Carrollton area. The Preferred Alternative follows Ellin Road to the New Carrollton Metro station and the design continues to be refined to further minimize potential impacts. As described below, the Preferred Alternative includes design refinements that moved the tracks further from the Hanson Oaks Community and reduced environmental impacts.*

O.1 Pedestrian Safety, Traffic and Parking

Summary of Comments: Commenters stated concern about pedestrian safety in the area, particularly at the intersection of Hanson Oaks and Ellin Road.

Response: *The Preferred Alternative includes the addition of a new traffic signal at Hanson Oaks Drive and Ellin Road. This would help facilitate left turns out of the neighborhood, something people noted is sometimes difficult today and they were concerned would become more difficult with the introduction of the Purple Line. The need for gates at this intersection will be determined based on the design of the intersection. Some in the community have stated a desire for gates to give an extra measure of safety. If gates are installed, they would not impede emergency access to the neighborhood. School buses could still stop at the corner and sidewalks would provide a safe place for students to wait. Improved pedestrian connections are included from neighborhoods to the south along Veterans Parkway improving access to both the Purple Line and Metro. Finally, although the Purple Line patrons are expected to walk or transfer from bus or Metro, the future plans for the area around the Metro station includes additional parking; therefore no parking impacts are anticipated within the neighborhood.*

O.2 Impacts to Homes

Summary of Comments: Commenters expressed concern about the proximity of the light rail to residences in Hanson Oaks.

Response: *The Preferred Alternative has been modified. The Purple Line is now mostly shared within traffic lanes on Ellin Road rather than being located on the side of Ellin Road adjacent to the Hanson Oaks community. This results in the alignment being further from the community.*

O.3 Environmental Concerns

Summary of Comments: Commenters stated concern about noise impacts to the Hanson Oaks community from light rail operations.

Response: *As shown in Sections 4.11 and 4.12 of this FEIS, detailed noise and vibration studies have been conducted. Due to the proximity to a grade crossing, which would require horns to be blown, one apartment building along Ellin, containing approximately six residential units, would be moderately impacted. There are no anticipated vibration impacts in the community.*

As explained below under Community Involvement, the community was able to reach out to the SHA through the Purple Line project. This has resulted in SHA determining that the Hanson Oaks / Old Ardwick-Ardmore community is eligible for highway noise barriers. The noise barriers are not part of the Purple Line project but will mitigate against the adjacent highway noise and provide an overall reduction in anticipated noise levels in the neighborhood. The refinement to the design described above also results in a reduction of potential stream and forest impacts.

0.4 Harkins Road

Summary of Comments: Commenters asked that an alignment on Harkins Road, instead of Ellin Road, be further evaluated.

Response: *At the request of the Hanson Oaks community, the MTA prepared a more detailed analysis of light rail alternatives on Harkins Road and verified and prepared a more detailed explanation of why Ellin Road was selected for the LPA. The study, including an explanation of the factors considered in the decision-making process, is summarized in "Comparison of Harkins Road to Ellin Road for the Purple Line Alignment," December 2009, included in "Supporting Documentation on Alternative Development."*

In this study, MTA considered three different options on Harkins Road: at-grade on Harkins Road, turning southwest at the New Carrollton Metro station; at-grade on Harkins turning northeast at the New Carrollton Metro station; and a tunnel underneath Harkins Road and under the existing Metrorail and Amtrak/MARC tracks. All three of these options could be constructed, but all are problematic, with substantial issues. However, the cost of a tunnel underneath the existing Metrorail and Amtrak/MARC tracks is so high that the tunnel was eliminated from further consideration.

The at-grade options on Harkins Road were not substantially different from each other in cost or impacts. Both had a substantially lower cost than the tunnel and they met the purpose and need of the Purple Line Study. However, the at-grade variations would either preclude Prince George's County's plan to extend the Purple Line further south or not provide a convenient connection to the existing Metrorail/Amtrak/MARC platforms. The Harkins Road options all resulted in impacts, including displacements, to local businesses.

The Ellin Road alternative is faster, meets project goals of connectivity to Metro, MARC and Amtrak better, minimizes impacts to businesses, and facilitates a future extension without incurring excessive project costs. While the transitway would pass by residential areas, this is typical of other areas of the project alignment and has minimal impact to the communities. The property adjacent to the light rail would be landscaped to provide a visual screen. Plans for this would be developed in a cooperative process with local residents. The study concluded that the Ellin Road option did not have unacceptable impacts to the local communities, and would work best from a transit operations perspective.

0.5 Connections to Metro

Summary of Comments: Commenters stressed the importance of a good connection to Metro at New Carrollton.

Response: *The proposed New Carrollton Purple Line station is located immediately adjacent to the entrance to the New Carrollton Metro and MARC station to facilitate efficient transfers. FTA and MTA continue to coordinate with WMATA on the reconstruction of the existing bus loop and kiss and ride lot as well as ongoing plans for future TOD on the site. All of the plans recognize the importance of convenient and efficient transfers.*

O.6 Future Extensions

Summary of Comments: Prince George's County requested that the Purple Line be designed to facilitate a future extension at New Carrollton.

Response: *Tthe eastern end of the Preferred Alternative in New Carrollton has been designed to facilitate a future extension of the Purple Line, if desired.*

O.7 Community Involvement

Summary of Comments: Commenters stated the need for community engagement in the Hanson Oaks area.

Response: *Since the publication of the AA/DEIS, MTA met directly with the Hanson Oaks Community four times including one neighborhood walk with community members. In addition, the MTA held Community Focus Group and Neighborhood Work Group meetings for the New Carrollton area and larger Open Houses throughout the corridor, including two in the New Carrollton area. Finally, MTA met with local elected officials to discuss the concerns of the community. These meetings have resulted in refinements to the Preferred Alternative. FTA and MTA will continue to coordinate with the community as part of the ongoing outreach efforts for the project. Of particular note, at the request of the community, MTA asked the SHA to attend some of the community meetings to address existing noise issues associated with the nearby highways. This opened a dialogue with the SHA and resulted in updated noise studies and analysis which showed that the community met the criteria for noise walls. As a result, SHA continues to work with the community on the future implementation of a noise wall project.*

P. Suggestions for Extensions or Connections to Purple Line

Summary of Comments: Less than 20 comments included suggestions to extend the Purple Line alignment beyond the termini at Bethesda and New Carrollton or to add connectors to the system. Most of these comments were in conjunction with support for the project. Extensions that were suggested include the following:

- Continuing the system around the entire Capital Beltway
- Extending from Bethesda to Virginia, tying into the Orange Line, Tysons Corner, or Dulles Airport
- Extending from Bethesda along the Georgetown Branch to Georgetown and Washington DC
- Extending to Washington DC and Anacostia
- Extending from New Carrollton to FedEx Field, Landover, Largo, Prince George's Community College, Suitland, Andrews Air Force Base, Branch Avenue, National Harbor, Fort Washington, or to Virginia via the Woodrow Wilson Bridge
- Extending from New Carrollton to Anne Arundel County and Annapolis
- Extending from New Carrollton to Waldorf and Charles County
- Extending or connecting to Olney
- Extending or connecting to Bladensburg or Prince George's Hospital Center
- Connecting to Glenmont
- Connecting to the I-95/I-495 Park and Ride

Response: *Each of the suggested extensions and connections would serve different areas and would provide additional access and connectivity within the region. They are outside of the limits of this particular study; however, they may be considered in the future as the local jurisdictions and the State plan for an expanded transit and transportation network. While extending the alignment to the west in the Bethesda area would be challenging,*

the eastern end of the Preferred Alternative in New Carrollton has been designed to facilitate a future extension of the Purple Line. In addition, many of these areas are the subject of other studies for transportation and transit improvements, and each of those studies should consider the Purple Line in its planning.

Q. Suggestions for Other Alternatives

Summary of Comments in General: Approximately 210 comments supported alignments or options not included in the Preferred Alternative and/or suggested alternative routes or configurations. This includes support for the TSM and expanded bus service, reduced fares on the bus and Metro system, support for alignments that followed the Beltway for all or part of their length, tunnel alternatives for all or part of the alignment, grade-separated crossings, exclusive transitway, support for alignments or options not included in the Preferred Alternative, different termini, and other alignments/configurations. This response does not include alternatives discussed in separate responses such as alternatives along Jones Bridge Road or tunnels along Wayne Avenue.

Response in General: *The alternatives development and evaluation process is summarized in Chapter 2 of this FEIS and additional information can be found in the Summary of Alternatives Analysis, 2008 to Present (2012) and the Definition of Alternatives Report (2008).*

Q.1 TSM Alternative and/or Expanded Bus Service

Summary of Comments: A TSM Alternative has been included in the project since its initiation in 2003. As described in Chapter 2 of the AA/DEIS, the TSM Alternative included improvements to transit service that would enhance mobility without the construction of a fixed guideway throughout the corridor. The TSM alternative included improved and expanded bus service with "express" service in the corridor with more frequent service, fewer stops, queue jump lanes, and signal priority.

Response: *The TSM Alternative does not meet the purpose and need of the project. Buses would still be subject to traffic delays and would not provide high level, reliable transit service throughout the corridor. Further suggestions for additional bus routes, service, reduced fares, or amenities such as benches should be addressed to the local and regional transit providers.*

Q.2 Alignments that Followed the Beltway

Summary of Comments: Several comments suggested alignments that followed the Beltway for all or a portion of their route. These included the Metrorail Loop, tunneling under the Beltway, using the median of the Beltway, and following the outside of the Beltway.

Response: *Following is a discussion of each of the suggested alignments and why they were not carried forward.*

Metrorail Loop*—Following scoping, the then Montgomery County Executive proposed a heavy rail alternative that would have connected the Metrorail Red Line from Bethesda to Silver Spring along the Capital Beltway. The Metrorail Loop is described in more detail in Chapter 2 of the AA/DEIS. It generally extended from the Medical Center Metro Station in Bethesda in a tunnel under the Capital Beltway, followed the north side of the Capital Beltway mostly on structure, and then crossed back over the Beltway south along the Metropolitan Branch/CSXT corridor to the SSTC. FTA and MTA conducted additional analyses of this proposal as summarized in Appendix A, Metrorail Loop Proposal Alignment Evaluation of the 2008 Definition of Alternatives Report. As shown in the study, it was concluded that the proposal should not be carried forward for detailed study as it did not meet the purpose and need of the project. It also had negative environmental and cost impacts. As described in Section G, no heavy rail alternatives were carried forward for further study.*

Tunnel under the Beltway*—See discussion of tunnels below. While an existing transportation corridor can be an attractive location to consider for other transportation uses, the curves along the Beltway, especially in Montgomery County, make this an inefficient route for tunnel construction. In addition, most origins and destinations along the corridor are slightly removed from the Beltway, and stations would be hard to locate and/or access.*

Median or Parallel to and Outside of the Beltway*—Much of the Capital Beltway through the study area has no median with the inner and outer loops separated by a concrete barrier. There are segments with a median but they are not contiguous. In order to locate the Purple Line down the middle of the Beltway, the Beltway would have to be widened which would result in significant environmental impacts and displacements. Similarly, an alignment adjacent to and outside of the Beltway would also result in significant environmental impacts and displacements. Finally, as stated above, most origins and destinations along the corridor are slightly removed from the Beltway, and stations would be hard to locate and/or access.*

Q.3 Tunnel Alternatives

Summary of Comments: Many people proposing tunnels did so in conjunction with suggesting that the Purple Line be a part of the WMATA Metro system. Metro is a heavy rail system requiring exclusive right-of-way due to the electrified "third rail" that powers the trains.

Response: *As discussed in Section G, heavy rail technology was considered and dropped from further study due to the high cost and limited return on public investment. Other comments suggested tunnels as a mean of avoiding impacts along the trail, crossings of major roads, and/or community impacts. Tunnels were suggested under the Beltway, under the Capital Crescent Trail, through Bethesda and Chevy Chase, under East West Highway, to NIH, and in downtown and east Silver Spring. Even with modern tunneling methods, tunnels are very expensive as compared to an at-grade system. Tunnel alternatives would result in very costly below-grade stations; requirements for costly fire, and safety measures; and impacts in portal areas and associated with ventilation towers. The tunnels do not provide sufficient added user benefits to justify their level of expenditure of public funds. Therefore, tunnels were dropped from further consideration except where required due to physical site limitations.*

Q.4 Grade-Separated Crossings

Summary of Comments: Some comments suggested bridges to grade-separate portions of the alignment or particular intersections.

- A suggestion was made to grade-separate the transitway and the roadways at Piney Branch Road and University Boulevard.
- There was a suggestion to stay on aerial structure from the SSTC over Bonifant Street, possibly with a station at the existing parking garage, staying on structure over Georgia Avenue to a second level station at the library, crossing over the intersection of Wayne Avenue and Fenton Street, and coming back to grade on Wayne Avenue.

Response: *Following is a discussion of each of the suggested crossings and why they were not carried forward.*

Piney Branch Road and University Boulevard*—The suggestion to grade-separate the transitway and the roadways at this intersection was thought to reduce impacts to traffic and business access and facilitate more efficient and safe pedestrian movements. However, in order to take one roadway over the other, driveway access to businesses would be cut off in the interchange area and/or service roads would be required. The loss of access and/or space needed for the service roads would result in some business displacements. An overpass is not consistent with the themes of making the area more pedestrian and bicycle-friendly and is contrary to the goal of reducing the size of the intersection. The M-NCPPC's ongoing sector planning effort is looking to make roadway and pedestrian improvements in the area.*

***Aerial segment in Downtown Silver Spring**—There was a suggestion to stay on aerial structure from the SSTC over Bonifant Street, possibly with a station at the existing parking garage, staying on structure over Georgia Avenue to a second level station at the library and crossing over the intersection of Wayne Avenue and Fenton Street coming back to grade on Wayne Avenue. This option would be very costly. A station at the garage would be located too close to the station at the transit center and would not serve as many people. In addition, this concept is in conflict with the design of the library that is under currently under construction. Finally, this concept would introduce visual impacts into downtown Silver Spring, which was a key concern of stakeholders early in the scoping process.*

Q.5 Exclusive Transitway

Summary of Comments: One comment suggested having an exclusive transitway for the entire length of the corridor.

***Response:** This would provide improved travel times and reliability; however, it would not take advantage of the flexibility of light rail to fit in different environments. An exclusive transitway would need to be either underground (discussed above) or aerial. An aerial structure would be prohibitively expensive and would have extensive impacts, particularly visual, and it would not optimize public investment.*

Q.6 Support for Alignments or Options not Included in the Preferred Alternative

Summary of Comments: Comments also stated support for alignments or options that were not included in the Preferred Alternative. This category does not include other alignments or options discussed elsewhere in specific response areas such as Jones Bridge Road or tunnel options in Silver Spring. There were several comments that specifically supported the High Investment LRT alternative.

***Response:** Following is a discussion of each of the suggested alignments or options and why they were not carried forward.*

***Support Silver Spring/Thayer Alignment**—MTA evaluated all of the alignment options in the Silver Spring area and identified Wayne Avenue as the most desirable alignment for the Preferred Alternative. The Silver Spring/Thayer Alignment included a long, costly tunnel. It also precluded a station at the Silver Spring Library. Finally, the Silver Spring/Thayer alignment resulted in increased impacts at the crossing of Sligo Creek.*

***Support North Side of CSXT Corridor**—MTA evaluated the alignment options along the CSXT Corridor and identified the transitway running along the south side of CSXT from Lyttonsville to Silver Spring as the most desirable alignment for the Preferred Alternative. The north side of CSXT required an expensive tunnel under the CSXT corridor and resulted in additional private property impacts along that length of the corridor.*

***High Investment LRT alternative**-The identification of the Preferred Alternative included a consideration of the judicious use of public funds. The High Investment LRT Alternative was not selected because many of the higher cost elements did not provide sufficient travel time or ridership benefits to justify the cost. However, many elements of the high investment LRT are included in the Preferred Alternative.*

Q.7 Different Termini

Summary of Comments: There was a comment that the system should end at the Grosvenor Metro station instead of Bethesda.

***Response:** Bethesda was identified early on in the project development and scoping efforts as a primary market for transit and a major connection for patrons travelling into Washington, DC via Metro. Ending the service at Grosvenor would facilitate travel to the north, but would make trips into DC longer. It would not serve one of the major employment centers included in the Purpose and Need.*

Q.8 Other Alignments/Configurations

Summary of Comments: Several comments addressed specific alignment suggestions or configurations, such as a single lane busway along the Capital Crescent Trail that would travel "in" during the am peak and "out" during the pm peak, an alignment along Colesville Road (US 29), and an alignment along East West Highway between Bethesda and Silver Spring.

Response: *Alignments along both Colesville Road and East West Highway were considered in the scoping phase of the project, the reasons for not carrying them forward are described in Chapter 2 of the AA/DEIS. Following is a discussion of each of the suggested alignments and configurations.*

Single Lane Busway—*The single lane busway that would travel "in" during the am peak and "out" during the pm peak can work on linear projects that serve a central business district, such as a line that goes from suburban communities into and out of a downtown area, where most people travel downtown in the morning and back out in the evenings. However, the Purple Line corridor crosses between the developed areas within Montgomery and Prince George's Counties and has heavy ridership in each direction in both the morning and evening rush hours.*

Colesville Road (US 29)—*Colesville Road is six lanes wide with a reversible center lane. It is a heavily-used major arterial surrounded mostly by single family homes inside the Beltway except in downtown Silver Spring. The heavy traffic and constrained right-of-way make it difficult to implement dedicated or exclusive lanes for transit. In the 1990s, the Montgomery County Department of Transportation conducted a feasibility study for a busway on US 29. After this study, both the Montgomery County Council and M-NCPPC recommended that US 29 not be considered for either a busway or LRT. One particular suggestion was to follow US 29 to Four Corners and then University Boulevard to Langley Park. This alignment was proposed in part to provide a different route than those proposed between downtown Silver Spring and Langley Park. It would be approximately 1.8 miles longer than the Preferred Alternative, which would result in impacts to travel time, ridership, and operations. In addition, it would not serve the East Silver Spring or Long Branch areas. Montgomery County has targeted Long Branch for improved transit to support economic development and revitalization. For all of the reasons noted above, alignments along US 29 were dropped from further consideration.*

East West Highway—*As outlined in Chapter 2 of the AA/DEIS, this segment of East West Highway was not carried forward for more detailed analysis due to several factors including a very narrow right-of-way that would have extensive property impacts, steep grades making light rail difficult, opposition from the community and elected officials (including a resolution from the City of Takoma Park), and consideration of which areas would or would not be served. A tunnel along this alignment is discussed above with the discussion of other tunnels.*

R. Suggestions to Fund Other Projects

Summary of Comments: Several comments suggested that funds should be used for other projects rather than the Purple Line or provided comments on other projects. Some of these comments were in conjunction with statements of overall opposition to the Purple Line. Some relate to projects that are under study or construction, some were for new or suggested projects, and others were for increased funding or expansion of existing systems. In no particular order, the projects discussed included the following:

- WMATA Green Line extension to BWI Airport
- Corridor Cities Transitway / Transit from Damascus to Rockville
- Bus Service in Laurel
- Bus Stops in Downtown Baltimore
- WMATA Red Line extension to and/or past Frederick

- MARC Commuter Train expansion
- WMATA Red Line expansion
- InterCounty Connector
- Transit expansion in Anne Arundel and Howard Counties
- BRT on Georgia Avenue and Veirs Mill Road
- Charles County Connector

Response: *Comment noted. State transportation projects are identified and funded through the Consolidated Transportation Program (CTP). The CTP is Maryland's six-year capital budget for transportation projects. The Capital Program includes major and minor projects for the Maryland Department of Transportation and the modal agencies and related authorities within the Department, including the Maryland Aviation Administration, the Motor Vehicle Administration, the Maryland Transit Administration, the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, the Maryland State Highway Administration, the Maryland Port Administration, and the Maryland Transportation Authority.*

Working together with Maryland's citizens, local jurisdictions and the local and State delegations, projects that preserve transportation system investments, enhance transportation services and expand transportation opportunities throughout the State are added to the CTP. The CTP is updated on an annual basis and citizens are provided an opportunity for input into its development.

S. Comments Regarding Public Outreach

Summary of Comments: Amongst the comments on the AA/DEIS and the Purple Line, there were several comments regarding public outreach efforts and the presentation of materials. People commented on the quality of the outreach efforts, timing and location of the public hearings, outreach in specific communities, specifically the Wayne Avenue area, the graphical renderings included in the FEIS, the conduct of the Master Plan Advisory Group (MPAG) meetings, and a feeling that MTA had set up a project support/advocacy group.

Response: *FTA and MTA continue to expand the public outreach program associated with the Purple Line in an effort to share information and gain input into the project. The following is in response to specific comments. The broader outreach efforts are summarized in Chapter 8 of this FEIS.*

S.1 Public Hearings

Summary of Comments: One person commented that the timing, prior to Thanksgiving, was inconvenient. There was an additional comment about the location of the hearings not being convenient to Metro, although the person noted that was part of the need for the project.

Response: *The hearings on the AA/DEIS were scheduled in November 2008 following the October release of the AA/DEIS. A longer than usual 90-day comment period was allowed for comments. In addition, there were 4 different hearing dates throughout the corridor which could accommodate geographic issues as well as schedules if someone were busy on one particular date. Over 750 people attended the 4 hearings and over 3000 comments were received during the comment period. This level of engagement and involvement shows that despite the timing, people were able to be involved in the process.*

The requirement for large facilities with multiple rooms made scheduling hearings close to Metro difficult. Some of the locations were more convenient from transit than others. Since that time, MTA has strived to have at Open Houses in more transit-convenient (Metrorail and or bus) locations including in the Silver Spring, College Park, and Takoma-Langley areas.

S.2 Community Outreach

Summary of Comments: Commenters stated the importance of community outreach. Some felt it was not sufficient on the Purple Line; while others praised MTA for the project's outreach.

Response: *The Purple Line project includes an extensive public outreach plan including large hearings and open houses, Community Focus Group and Neighborhood Work Group meetings, meetings with community associations and other stakeholder groups, and meetings with individual property or business owners. In addition, the project has a website, newsletters, fact sheets and a mailing list of over 60,000 individuals. Since the AA/DEIS outreach has expanded with community outreach events, and the use of social media including Facebook and Twitter. To address one specific comment regarding Wayne Avenue, the MTA met with the various community associations and work groups over 15 times specifically on the Wayne Avenue area. See also Section F—Opposition to the Wayne Avenue Surface Alignment, Support for a Tunnel Under Wayne Avenue, and Opposition to a Station at Dale Drive for a discussion of the additional studies and analyses conducted for residents along Wayne Avenue.*

S.3 Graphics and Renderings

Summary of Comments: Commenters both praised and criticized the graphics and renderings used for the Purple Line study. Some comments believed that the renderings were not accurate and that, in particular, trees were shown too large and landscaping was shown as it would be when full grown.

Response: *MTA appreciates the comments provided on the graphics and renderings in the document. FTA and MTA attempt to use graphics to help portray the ultimate design of the facility. Comments about the "reality" of some renderings were taken seriously. Since the time of the AA/DEIS renderings were developed in more detail, new trees were shown smaller rather than how they would appear in the future, and plans and displays were clearly marked that landscaping was shown for illustrative purposes and did not represent the existing or proposed future conditions. Renderings in this FEIS have been reviewed for clarity, accuracy and presentation.*

S.4 Master Plan Advisory Group

Summary of Comments: Comments were received on the Montgomery County Planning Board Master Plan Advisory Group (MPAG).

Response: *In support of the effort to develop their Purple Line Functional Plan, in May 2007 the Montgomery County Planning Board authorized the establishment of a Purple Line MPAG. The MPAG membership was composed of more than 30 representative stakeholders along the alignment within the County. The MPAG met 19 times between October 2007 and October 2008 when the Purple Line AA/DEIS was released. During that time, the group reviewed many of the technical and process issues inherent in large projects of this type and provided input to the staff memorandum and technical review of the AA/DEIS.*

The MPAG also met on seven additional occasions since the release of the AA/DEIS to further examine issues in the context of the Planning Board, County Council, and State recommendations on the Purple Line. In addition, the Planning Board held a work session in December 2008 and a hearing and work session in January 2009 as part of its outreach during deliberations on reaching a recommendation for the LPA for the Purple Line.

MTA was invited to some of the meetings and provided information to the County and MPAG to inform their discussions. MTA did not plan or conduct the meetings and cannot speak to the process, how differing views were received, or the make-up of the group.

S.5 Support/Advocacy Groups

Summary of Comments: A comment suggested that it was inappropriate for FTA or MTA to have formed a group to push support for the project. While the comment referenced "Go Purple Line," MTA believes they were referring to "Purple Line Now."

Response: *According to their website, Purple Line NOW! is a coalition of business, labor, environment, neighborhood, and civic organizations that works with local, state, and federal government officials in pursuit of their mission to build the Purple Line. FTA and MTA did not create this group and have no relationship with this or any other support or opposition group that has been formed in relation to the project.*

T. Information Requests

Summary of Comments: Approximately 160 requests for information or in regard to procedural matters were received, including:

- People requesting the Public Hearing schedule, meeting times and/or locations
- People requesting clarification of information
- People asking to be added to/removed from the project mailing list
- Requests from individuals or groups seeking a meeting with or briefing by MTA regarding the project

Response: *Requests for information relating to the public hearing schedule, times and locations were responded to upon receipt of the request to facilitate maximum attendance and participation. Items were clarified, additional data provided, and all names were added to or deleted from the project mailing list. Finally, requests for meetings were addressed upon receipt of the request and meetings were scheduled, as appropriate.*

U. Comment Reference

Records of the AA/DEIS public comments are documented in Tables A-1 through A-4. Table A-1 lists the commenters and topic of interest, by agency. Table A-2 lists the elected officials and topic of interest. Table A-3 lists the commenters and topics of interest by organization. Table A-4 lists the petitions that were received and their topics of interest. Finally, Table A-5 lists the public commenters alphabetically by last name, followed by their topics of interest. The actual comments can be found on the DVD on the inside sleeve of the printed document, or via the website www.purplelinemd.com. Copies of the DVD can also be requested via the website. Finally,

Table A-1: Agency Commenters and Topics of Interest (federal state regional local)

Agency	Commenter	Topics of Interest
Federal		
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation	Dwin Vaughn, Charlene, AICP	K
Department of the Navy, National Naval Medical Center	Zinder, D.J.	E, J, K, L
National Capital Planning Commission	Koster, Julie	A, K
National Institutes of Health	Wheeland, D.G.	H
United States Department of Interior, Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance	Taylor, Willie R., Director	K
United States Environmental Protection Agency Region III	Arguta, William	K
State		
Maryland Department of Planning, State Clearinghouse	Janey, Linda C. , J.D., Assistant Secretary	A, E, K, M
Maryland State Highway Administration	Slater, Gregory I.	K
University of Maryland	Wylie, Ann, Ralston, Steve & Phillips, Colin	A, N
WMATA, Assistant General Manager, Planning and Joint Development	Bottigheimer, Nat	A,L,M
County		
Montgomery College, Vice President/Provost	Stewart, Brad	A
Montgomery County Chamber of Commerce	Godwin, Georgette	A
Montgomery County Commuter Services	Carlson, James	T
Montgomery County Department of Transportation	Johnson, Gary	T
Montgomery County Department of Planning- Property Mapping Section	Engelberg, Eric	T
Prince Georges Community College	Dukes, Charlene, President	A, Q
Prince George's County DPW&T	Weissberg, Victor	A, K, M
Prince George's County DPW&T, Director	Hijazi, Haitham A.	A, K, M
Prince George's County Planning Department	Piret, Fern V.	A, H, K, L, M, N
Local		
Fairland Master Plan CAC	Rochester, Stuart, Chair	A
Town of Chevy Chase, Council Member	Barnes, Linna	B, D, E, I, R
Town of Chevy Chase (submitted by Sidley Austin LLP)	Wilson, Stacey L.	I, J, T
Villiage of North Chevy Chase	Hirsh, Lawerence	A

Table A-2: Elected Officials and Topics of Interest (state mayor council)

Position	Commenter	Topics of Interest
State		
Delegate, 16th Legislative District	Bronrott, William	A
Delegate, 18th Legislative District	Carr, Al	E
Montgomery County, Council Member	Ervin, Valerie	A, F
Senator, 16th Legislative District	Frosh, Brian	A
Delegate, 21st Legislative District	Frush, Barbara	A
Delegate, 20th Legislative District	Hixson, Sheila	A
Delegate, 20th Legislative District	Hucker, Tom	A
Delegate, 16th Legislative District	Lee, Susan	A
Senator, 18th Legislative District	Madaleno, Richard S., Jr.	B, D, I
Delegate, 20th Legislative District	Mizeur, Heather	A
Senator, 22nd Legislative District	Pinsky, Paul	A
Senator, 20th Legislative District	Raskin, Jamie	A
Senator, 21st Legislative District	Rosapepe, Senator Jim	A
Delegate, 18th Legislative District	Sol Gutierrez, Ana	A
Senator, 18th Legislative District	Tsikerdanos, Scott	B, I
Delegate, 18th Legislative District	Waldstreicher, Jeff	C, E, R
County		
Montgomery County Council, President	Andrews, Phil	A
Prince George's County Council Member	Campos, William	A
Prince George's County Council, Chairman	Dean, Samuel H.	A, Q
Prince George's County Council Member	Dernoga, Tom	A
Montgomery County Executive	Leggett, Isiah	A
Montgomery County Council, Council Member	Leventhal, George	A
Prince George's County Council Member	Olson, Eric	A
Local		
Town of Riverdale Park, Mayor	Archer, Vernon S.	A, L, M, Q
Town of Brentwood, Mayor	Bailey-Schmiedigen, Bettyjean	A
City of College Park, Mayor	Brayman, Stephen	A
City of Greenbelt, Mayor	Davis, Judith F.	A
Town of Berwyn Heights, Council Member	Dennison, Patricia D.	A
City of New Carrollton, Council Member	Dodro, Katrina	A, T

Table A-2: Elected Officials and Topics of Interest (continued)

Position	Commenter	Topics of Interest
Local		
Town of Kensington, Mayor	Fosselman, Peter	A, E
City of Hyattsville, Mayor	Gardiner, William F.	A
City of New Carrollton, Mayor	Hanko, Andrew C.	A, M
City of Greenbelt, Council Member	Herling, Konrad	A, Q
Town of Chevy Chase, Council Member	Lublin, David	C, D, E, I, J
City of Greenbelt, Council Member	Mach, Leta	A
City of College Park, Council Member	Molinatto, Jonathan	A
Edmonston, Mayor	Ortiz, Adam	A, H, M
Town of Kensington, Council Member	Scott, Sharon	C, E, Q
Town of Riverdale Park, Council Member	Sharpe, Katherine	A
Town of Chevy Chase, Mayor	Strom, Kathy	C, D, E, K, M
City of College Park, Council Member	Stullich, Stephanie	A
Town of Landover Hills, Mayor	Walker, Lee P.	A, K, M, T
City of Takoma Park, Mayor	Williams, Bruce	A, L, M
City of College Park, Council Member	Wojahn, Patrick	A

Table A-3: Civic and Community Organizations and Special Interest Groups

Organization	Commenter	Topics of Interest
1000 Friends of Maryland	Stewart, Douglas	A
Action Committee for Transit	Riemer, Hans	A
Action Committee for Transit	Ross, Ben, President	A
Alliance for Smart Transportation	Gonella, Geoff	B, E, I
Bethesda Civic Coaliton	Skalet, Linda	C, E
BeyondDC.com	Malouff, Dan	A
Bicycle and Trails Advisory Group	Shaffer, Fred	A, L
Board of Riviera of Chevy Chase Condominium	Duvall, William, President	K, M, T
Branch Ave Focus Group	Green, Teena, Chairperson	Q
Casa de Maryland	Alvarenga, Nestor	A, K
Casa de Maryland	Johnson, Guy	A
Casa de Maryland	Pinto, Laura	A, K
Chatham Council Civic Association	Becker, Kevin	T
Chesapeake Bay Foundation	Girard, Alan	A
Chesapeake Bay Foundation	Prost, Alison Hooper	A
Chevy Chase Hamlet Homeowner's Association	Woodyard, Shawn, President	C
Chevy Chase Hills Civic Association	Marsh, Mike, President	C
Chevy Chase West Neighborhood Association	Lukas, Theresa	C, E

Table A-3: Civic and Community Organizations and Special Interest Groups (continued)

Organization	Commenter	Topics of Interest
Citizens Against Beltway Expansion	Davies, Joseph	A
Citizens Coordinating Committee for Friendship Heights	Tripp, Ron	C, E, K
City Homes of Bethesda	O'Bryon, David	E, Q
Clean Water Action	Fellows, Andrew	A, Q
Coalition for Smarter Growth	Cort, Cheryl	T
Coalition for Smarter Growth	Schwartz, Stewart, Executive Director	A
Coalition for the Capital Crescent Trail	Gray, Peter	A, C, M
College Park Area Bicycle Coalition	Kelly, Bill, Chair	A
Co-op America	Zakai, Yochanan	A
Columbia Country Club	Gallagher, Kevin P.	B, C, I, J, K, L, T
Columbia Country Club	Pillote, Bob	B, I, K
Coquelin Run Citizens Association	Peek, Eric	C, D
Demarche Alliance	Cleckley, Eulois	A
East Bethesda Citizen's Association	Saltzman, David, Ph.D., Vice President	B, C, E, I, K, L, M, S
East Silver Spring Citizen's Association	Colvin, Bob	F, K
East Silver Spring Citizen's Association	Roper, Karen	F, J, K
Eastern Village Cohousing Community	Jennings, Thomas F.	A, F, K
Edgemoor Citizens Association	Jais-Mick, Maureen	T
Edgevale Civic Association	Curtis, Robert	C, D, E
Edgevale Civic Association	Curtis, Verna	B, C, E, Q
Edgevale Civic Association	Nash-LeBon, Judith	C, D
Forest Grove Citizens Association	Cook, Margot	A
Georgetown University Cycling Team	Sikes, AJ, President	C
Glenbrook Village HOA	Michaels, Debbie, President	A, H, Q
Greater Bethesda Chevy Chase Coalition	Wolf, Mier, Chairman	C, E
Greater Bethesda/ Chevy Chase Chamber of Commerce	Morenoff, Jerry, Ph.D.	A
Greater Silver Spring Chamber of Commerce	Walker, James	A
Greater Washington Board of Trade	Black, Sam	A
Greater Washington Board of Trade	Dinegar, CAE, James C.	A
Greater Washington Board of Trade	Flores, Daniel	A
Hanson Oaks Association	Johnson, Artis J., President	O
Indian Spring Citizen Association	Hausner, Tony	A
Jews United for Justice	Saks, Robert	K
Jews United for Justice	Meyers, Sarah	A, K
Jews United for Justice	Schapiro, Mike	A, K

Table A-3: Civic and Community Organizations and Special Interest Groups (continued)

Organization	Commenter	Topics of Interest
Kennedy High School and Montgomery County Student Government Association	Nadel, Marcy	A
League of Women Voters of Montgomery County	Bond, Marcia	A
League of Women Voters of Montgomery County	Hibino, Diane, President	A
Linden Civic Association	Cooper, Fredric C.	A, E, Q, T
Locust Hill Citizens Association	Hohman, Kristen	A
Lyttonsville Civic Association	Tyson, Patricia A.	
Maryland's International Corridor and Community Development Corporation	Kelly, Laurie, Exec. Director	
Maryland's International Corridor and Community Development Corporation	Kapastin, Marc, Chairman	
Montgomery Bicycle Advocates (MoBike)	Cochrane, Jack, Chair	
Montgomery County Affordable Housing Conference	Bennett, Ralph	
National Association of Railroad Passengers	Capon, Ross B.	
Neighborhood Design Center	Townsend, Jan	
New Creation Christian Church & Ministries, Pastor	Burrell, Dawn	
North Chevy Chase Citizens Association	Zorn, Richard	
North Chevy Chase PTA	Durbin, Eden, President	
North Chevy Chase Transportation Committee	Kaplan, Howard	
North Woodside-Montgomery Hills Civic Association	Brosnan, Woody	
Northmont Citizens Association	Heide, Jean	
Oakview Citizens Association	Walters, John	
Old Ardwick-Ardmore Citizens Association	McNeil, Alice D., President	
Old Blair Auditorium Project, Inc.	Moore, Stuart C., President	
Park Hills Civic Association	Richardson, Chris	
Park Hills Civic Association	Bowser, Alan	
Peachwood Civic Association	Meyers, Richard	
Petition to Save the Trail	Browning, Pam, Organizer	
PG Advocates for Community Base Transit/Maryland Convention Council	Wilson, Bill	
Prince George's Advocates for Community-based Transit, co-chair	Pope-Onwukwe, Karren	
Progressive Cheverly -Environmental	Heikal, Clareen	
Progressive Maryland	Dennis, Rion	
Progressive Maryland	Ettel, Herb	
Progressive Neighbors	Sylvan, Stephan	
Purple Line Now	Sanders, Harry	
Purple Line Now	Smedley, Webb L.	

Table A-3: Civic and Community Organizations and Special Interest Groups (continued)

Organization	Commenter	Topics of Interest
Rethinking the Purple Line	Jais-Mick, Maureen	
RRC Community Association, Inc.	Newman, Marty	
SEIU Local 500	Cuttitta, Merle	
Seven Oaks Evanswood Civic Association	Gabriele, Mark, President	
Seven Oaks Evanswood Civic Association	Jay, Jonathan	
Seven Oaks Evanswood Civic Association	Kavanaugh, Jean	
Sierra Club Montgomery County Group	Hauck, David	
Silver Spring Advocates	Elkind, Jonathan	
Silver Spring Advocates	Singh, Ravi	
Silver Spring Advocates	Mintzer, Irving	
Silver Spring Citizens Advisory Board	Unger, Darian	
Silver Spring Urban District Advisory Committee	Lourie, Jon	
Silver Spring/Thayer Opposed to the Plan	Rosenberg, Robert	
Small Businesses in Langley Park	Sactic, Jorge	
South SIlver Spring Neighborhood Association	Sylvan, Rachel	
South Silver Spring Neighborhood Association	Glass, Evan	
Takoma/ Langley Park Crossroads Development Authority	Teague, Neel, President	
Templeton Knolls Civic Assoc	Wertz, Sharon	
TOP Condominium Association	West, Joy C.	
UMCP Student Government Association	Friedson, Andrew	
University Landing Tenant's Association	Pinto, Laura	
University of Maryland SGA, President	Sachs, Jonathan	
Washington DC Building and Construction Trades Council	Ayers, Vance	
West College Park Citizens Association	Balacaudran, Suchitra	
West Lanham Hills Citizens Association	Rowe, Lee	
Woodside Civic Association	Anderson, Casey	
Woodside Park Civic Association	Ditzler, Barbara, President	
World Resources Institute	Fuhs, Greg	

Table A-4: List of Petitions

Organizer	Signatures	Topics of Interest
Demarche Alliance	162	A
Silver Spring Advocates	113	A
Carole Highlands Neighbors	7	A
Casa de Maryland	136	A
Residents of the East Silver Spring/Wayne Ave. Area	62	A, F
Town of Somerset Purple Line Supporters	39	A
Supporters of the Purple Line in Woodside	33	A
Purple Line NOW (1)	2756	A
Purple Line NOW (2)	24	A
Bicyclists in Support of the Purple Line and Capital Crescent Trail	13	A
Residents of Chase Apartment Building	13	A
Petition to Support Inner Purple Line (Silver Spring Area)	24	A

Table A-5: Public Commenters and Topics of Interest

Commenter	Topic of Interest	Commenter	Topic of Interest
Abell, Karen S.	C	Albertson, Todd	C
Abood, I.	L	Albores, Richard	A
Abu, Godbless	A	Alden, Edward	C
Ackermann, Drew	T	Alderman, Joan	T
Acosta, Alex	C, D	Alevizos, Dr. Ilias	C, E, Q
Acuña, Mike	C	Alexander, Arthur	C, D, Q
Adams, E.	A	Alexander, Jonathan	A
Adams, Stephani	T	Alexander, Tamara	A
Adler, Leonard	A	Allmond, Aleta	Q
Afflerbach, Peter	F, K	Allred, Willis W.	A
Agouridis, Georgio	A	Alpher, Bernard and Penny	C
Aiyar, Shekhar	C	Altevogt, Bruce	A
Akinbami, Lara	A	Altman, Fred	K
Akst, Elaine	C	Altman, James	A
Albaugh, Sharon	Q	Alvarez, Jose Luis	A
Alberg, Penny	A	Amaya, Fidelina	A

Table A-5: Public Commenters and Topics of Interest (continued)

Commenter	Topic of Interest	Commenter	Topic of Interest
Ambler, Anne	A	Aukamp, Liz	A
Amezcua, Javier	A	Aurecchia, Steven	C
Amster, Michael J.	C	Ausema, John	M
Anastasi, Daniel P.	B	Avery, Carolyn L.	A, C, M, Q, R
Anderson, Amy	C, T	Ayers, Rob	C
Anderson, Carol and John	B	Ayodele, Marlen	C
Anderson, Fenwick	A	B., Cristina	A
Anderson, Robert	B	Bacigalupo, Elizabeth	C
Anderson, Sarah B.	C, Q	Bado, Marjorie	A
Andrea, Susan	F	Bahta, Tsedal	A
Andrews, Mary	A	Baide, Lourdes	A
Andrews, Rachel	A	Bailey, Charles	A
Angeles, Melinda	A	Bailey, James and Mary	C, D, E
Aniba, Ramzi	A	Bailey, Leigh	C
Anspacher, David	A	Bailey, Wendy	C
Anthony, John	A	Bain, Christopher	C
Antoine, Richard	T	Bair, Ashley	A
Antonelli, Erica	K	Baker, Dave	A, M
Applestein, Cara	A	Baker, Gavin	A
Aranguren, Gabriel Ernesto	C	Baker, George	B, I
Argani, Sholey	A	Baker, Mike	A
Argueta, Santos	A	Balcombe, Jonathan, Ph.D.	A
Arkin, Richard	A	Bales, Gabriel	A
Armstrong, Emily M.	C	Balfour, Guillermo A., M.D.	C
Armstrong, Scott	B, I, Q	Ballard, Thomas	A
Armstrong, Tom	F	Banegas, Sister Carmen	K
Arness, II, John E.	C	Banks, Dontres	A
Arnold, Agnese Reforzo	C, E, Q	Banks, Terry and Karen	B, C, D, E, J, R
Arnold-Lourie, Christine	F, K	Barber, Melissa, BS, BA	A
Arons, Nancy and Michael	C	Barber, Michael Jared	A, P
Arriaga-Western, Claudia	C	Bardin, Jacob	A
Ash, Jon F.	C	Bardwell, Mark	A
Asher Prince, Leland	C, Q	Barinum, Barbara	C, E
Asher, Edward Hall	A	Barker, Jack	D
Asher, Jana	A	Barker, John	A
Asher, Jules	C, G	Barnes, Mary W.	A, H
Ashford, Roslyn	F	Barnett, Beth	B, C, E, I, J
Asmar Jr., Charles S.	C, E	Barreto, Eric	A
Asmuth, Genie	B	Barry, Fatima	A
Atkinson, Charlotte	A	Barry, Michael	A

Table A-5: Public Commenters and Topics of Interest (continued)

Commenter	Topic of Interest	Commenter	Topic of Interest
Bartfeld, Ruth	C	Bernhardt-Lanier, Jason	A
Barton, Hanna Jane	A	Berninger, Carl J.	C
Bathgate, Pamela	P	Berns, Brian and family	C
Batstone, Ian	A	Bernstein, Catharina	C, E
Baumann, Ginny	A	Bescher, Karen E.	C
Bausch, Elizabeth and Justin	C	Beshers, Martha	C
Baxt, Leonard	C	Beshers, Martha F.	C, E
Bayerl, John	A	Bevacqua, Frank	A
Bayhurst, Paul M.	T	Beveridge, Jennifer	A
Beach, Ben	C, E	Bhatt, Ajay	C
Beard, Bob	Q	Bhattacharya, Andrew	A
Beard, Matthew	A	Bickley, Joe	B, I, P
Beardsley, Donald	C	Bierbower, Eleanor Deane	C
Beauchamp, MaryAnne	T	Bimson, Dr. William	A
Beauregard, John and Cindy	C	Bindeman, Sherry	C
Becher, Elise C.	C	Binder, Wendy	F, K
Beck, Nick	A	Bingham, Sheila	T
Beck, Nancy, Ph.D.	A	Birch, Jeremy	A, M
Becker, Richard	B	Birndorf, Jesse M.	A
Beckerman, Peter	C, Q	Birsun Bramson, Valerie	C
Beckett, Amy	F	Bisengo, Agaba	A
Beckham, Don	E, G, L	Bisers, Dan	A
Bedore, Ruth	A	Bishop, Eli	C
Behler, David	A, L	Bittman, Ann W.	B, C, I
Bell, Lisa	C	Bittman, Robert J.	C
Belling, Doug	A	Bjornlund, Gina and Erix	C
Belliveau, Paul	C	Black, Thomas, PhD	A
Belsky, Alan	A, Q	Blair Fitzgerald, Martha	C
Beltz, Kristin	A	Blair, Crystal	S
Bender, Randy Michele	C	Blais, Catherine	A
Bender, Tim, Melissa, Alex and Brooke	C	Blake, Nathan	A
Benezra, Alexander	A	Blank, Lawrence	C
Bennett, Katherine	C, E	Blank, Peter	A
Benson, Michael	C	Blasey, Paula K.	C
Benzmiller, Andrew	C	Blasey, Thomas M.	C
Berger, Seth	A, M	Blevins, Catherine	C
Bergman, Stephen	F	Blizzard, Keith	C
Berman, Nathaniel	A, K	Bloom, Aaron	A
Bermudez, Tomas	C	Blum, Jason	A
Bernard, Warren	B, I, J	Blum, Rick	T

Table A-5: Public Commenters and Topics of Interest (continued)

Commenter	Topic of Interest	Commenter	Topic of Interest
Blumenstock, Michael	A	Brancato, Richard	I, K, L
Boden, Barry	C, E, Q	Brand, Carole	A
Bogut, R.	C, Q	Brand, Nick	A
Bokern, Susan	C	Brandt, Ed	A
Boland, Leanne	B, C, Q	Branson, Robert	C
Bombard, Hilary	C	Braun, Rachel	A
Bombard, Mike	B, I	Bravo, Robert	C
Bond, Marcia	A	Breckbill, Steven	F
Boniface, Duane	C, J	Breckenridge, John	C
Boniface, Keith, MD, RDMS	C	Breen, Philip	A
Bonmartini Brophy, Gioia	C	Brennan, Mike	C
Bono, David	A	Breslin, Bill	C
Boone, Robbie	C	Breslin, Katie	C
Boone, Theodore S.	A	Breslow, May	C
Bopf, Michael	A	Brezny, Rastislav	A
Borger, Marc	P	Brice, Patrick	I, N
Borneman, Marcy	B	Brigati, Joseph	C
Bort, Christopher J.	C, Q	Briscuso, Ray	C, E
Borwegen, Bill	A	Brochin, Elana	A, K
Bosc, Joyce	K, L, T	Brocker, Barbara	C
Bottoms, Glen D.	A	Brockman, Catherine J.	C
Bottrell, Eileen	A	Brockman, Johanna	A
Boucher, Timothy	C, Q	Broderick, Michael	C
Boulter, Sally	C	Brody, Abraham	A, G
Bour, Gerald	A	Brooks, Craig	C
Bowen, Mary Beth	C	Brophy, John, Jr.	Q
Bower	E	Brown, C.J.	A
Bower, Stephen and Donna	A	Brown, Carin	A
Bowers, Connie J.	A	Brown, Doug	A
Bowles, W. Alexander L.	C	Brown, Dr. Edward A.	C
Boyce, Constance	A	Brown, Edward A., Ph.D.	T
Boyce, Don and Donna	A	Brown, Jenny	C
Boyer, Laura	C	Brown, Kenneth	A, Q
Boyle, Lochlann	A	Brown, Mary	A
Boynton, Jane B.	C	Brown, Mike	C
Bracken, Todd	T	Brown, Paul	A, Q
Brader, James	A	Brown, Roberta K.	C
Bradford, Kevin	A	Brown, Roderick Edmund	A, T
Braithwaite, Jeanine	A	Browning, Pam	C, E, H, Q
Branca, Marisa	C, Q	Brozena, Alexandra	C

Table A-5: Public Commenters and Topics of Interest (continued)

Commenter	Topic of Interest	Commenter	Topic of Interest
Bruce, Brandon	Q	Busse, Wilfried	C, E
Bruce, Gloria	C	Bussey, Lucas	A
Bruce, Marney	A	Byrne, Lisa	A
Bruch, Anabella	A	Cahill-Tully, Susan	C
Bruck, Jonathan	A	Cain, Colyn	C
Brudnick, Ida	S	Calabrese, Michael	C
Bruhn, Arlene	C, T	Callahan, Joseph B.	C
Bruno, Victoria	B, C, F, I	Calomiris, Leon	B, H
Brush, Stephen	A, N	Cameron, Gary	F
Brutz, Heather	A	Campbell, Arch	C, Q
Bryant, Alex	A	Campbell, Kirk	A
Bryant, Carolyn	A	Campbell, Michael	C, D
Bryant, Kathy	A	Campos, Tereza	B, K
Buchanan, Bill	B, I	Cantor, Kenneth P.	F
Buchanek, Elizabeth M.	B, C, E	Cappa, Fred	T
Buchholz, Frank	T	Cardona, Wilfredo	A
Buck, Robin	A	Carle, Glenn L.	C
Buck, Stephen	A	Carlson, Lamar	T
Buergler, Jean	A	Carnahan, Ira and Kitty	C
Bullock, Brian	A	Carpenter, Ursula	C
Bunch, Michon	A	Carpenter-Israel, Stephen and Wendy	Q
Bund, Malcolm	C, Q	Carr, Cathy	A
Bunnag, Chatkan	A, L	Carr, Peggy	A
Buonanno, Andres	A	Carrier, Steve	C
Burda, Patricia	E	Carrington, William J., Ph.D.	A
Burger, Aaron	A, T	Carrington, William & Patricia	C
Burgett, David	C	Carroll, Ginger & John	A
Burka, Eric	C	Carroll, John	A
Burka, Kristin	C	Carroll, Paul	C
Burke, Jim	C	Carruthers, Robin	A
Burke, Malcolm	C, E	Carson, Charles	A
Burke, Melissa	A	Carta, Mary Lou	F
Burkhart, Joe	C	Carty, Thomas	C
Burkhart, Shannon	C	Casagrande, Giovanna, M.D.	C, E, Q
Burnett, Dan	C	Casey, Patrick	C
Burnett, Susan	C, E	Cassaberry, James	A
Burns, Maya	B, D	Castanuela, Ava	F
Burnside, Leah	A	Castellan, James	A
Burtraw, Dallas	A	Cattaneo, Elizabeth	A
Business Owner	K, M	Cavanaugh, Jean	F, K

Table A-5: Public Commenters and Topics of Interest (continued)

Commenter	Topic of Interest	Commenter	Topic of Interest
Cech, Thomas R., President	A	Cimino, Andrea	A
Celebic, Lejla	C	Cimino, Steve	Q
Celeste, Sue	C	Clabault, Meg	A, L
Cepler, Jamie	A, Q, T	Clark, Bob and Sara	C
Ceruzzi, Paul	A	Clark, Jerry	C
Chaison, Ken	C	Clark, Maureen D.	A
Chall, Joelle	C	Clark, Nicholas	A
Chalmers, Rolande Valerie	A	Clark, Thomas	T
Chambers, Tim	A	Clarke, Elaine	A
Chamblee, Andrea	C	Clarke, James	A
Chamorro, Maria Pilar	A, K	Clarke, Maud	A
Chan, ShuPing	A	Claude Cowey, Colette	C, D
Chang, Peter	A	Clauss, Mark A.	C
Chao, Nuno	A	Clay, Kevin	B, I, K
Charrier, Anne	C	Clifford, Catherine	C
Charrow, Veda R., Ph.D.	C	Clifford, John	A
Chase, Wilbur P. and Katherine F.	C	Clifford, Patricia	C
Chen, Sike	A	Clifton, Tara	C
Cheney, Sheldon	A, Q	Clime, Linda M.	C
Cheng, Alice	C	Clingenpeel, Jon	C
Cheng, Dinah	A	Clive, Michelle	A
Childress, Monique	T	Coates, Kevin	G
Chin Family	C	Coates, Kevin	G
Chin-Lee, Alex	A	Cobbett, Mary and Billy	A
Chmilewski, Jay	A	Cody, George D.	C, E
Chockalingam, Sundar	T	Coffey, Pamela Sumner	A
Cholka, Joe	F, J, K, L	Coffin, Gabrielle	A
Cholka, Joe	F, K	Cohen, Edward	A, Q
Choppin, Timothy	A	Cohen, James	A, E
Choquette, Lynn	C	Cohen, Laurie	C
Chorrinsky, David	A	Colcock, Robert H.	O
Choukas-Bradley, Melanie	C	Cole, Alex	C, Q
Chovan, Michelle	A	Cole, Elizabeth A.	A
Chrislip, John	L	Cole, Josh	A
Christensen, Tyler	A	Coleman, Roger	C
Christopher, Louis G.	C, E	Colgary, Laura and James	T
Churan, John	A	Colindres, Alvaro	A
Churchill, John	C	Colino, Stacey	C, D
Cicerchia, Monique	C	Collazos, Juan	A
Cicerchia, Spartaco	C	Collier, Anne	C

Table A-5: Public Commenters and Topics of Interest (continued)

Commenter	Topic of Interest	Commenter	Topic of Interest
Collins, Phil	C	Coyne, Micheal	A
Collyer, Philip	C	Craig, Kristi	C, E
Colter, Haig	A, M	Crandall, James	J
Comer, Ed	A, M	Crane, Martin	A
Compton, Addie	A	Cranor, David	K
Condon, Ellen	A	Crayton, Vivian	C, K, L, T
Conklin, James	A	Creel, Alisha	A
Connell, Genevieve P. and James R.	C	Creer, Laura, Brad, Rebecca, and Lauren	C
Connelly, Saunya	A	Crilley, Jim	C, I, Q, R
Connor, Michael J.	A	Crist, Delanson	C
Conrad, Brad	A	Criswell, Doris	C, Q
Constantian, Alan	A	Crockett, Rochelle	A
Constantine-Davis, Jean	A	Crosson, David	A
Conway, Maureen	A	Cruz, Jose	K
Cook, Bejamin H.	C	Cruzat, Kristi	A
Cook, Erene P.	C	Cullen, Genevieve	C
Cook, Geoffrey	A	Cullen, Maura	B, C, I
Cook, James	A, Q	Cullen, Patrick	B, I
Cooke, Kathy	C	Cuming, Don	A
Cooper, Karen S.	A	Cummings, Terry	A
Coover, Edwim R. and Sue B.	A	Cunningham, Charlotte	C
Coplan, Michael	C, D	Curry, Farris	T
Coplan, Tina and Michael	C, E	Curtis, Jade	C
Cormier, Sarah	C	Curtis, Robert	C
Cornelius, Linda	A	Curtz, Elisabeth	C
Cornwell, Michele	A	D'Achille, Michael	C
Cort, Cheryl	A	Dack, Leonard J.	C
Cosgrove, Ellen	A	Daigon, Glenn	A
Cotterill, Sarah	A	Dailey, Jeff	T
Cottle, James	B	Dailey, Terry	C
Cottrell, Robert	C	Daisley, Linda and Bill	C
Coughlan, Richard	A	Daken, John	A
Coughlin, Laura	C	Daley, Maureen	A
Coulibaly, Tiemoko	T	Damania, Richard	C
Couvillon, Anna	A	Damkevala, Zal	A, M
Covell Sands, Susan	C	Damtoft, Russell	A
Covell, Maria L.	C	Dandois	C
Covell, Matt	C	Daniel, Adam	A
Covell, Timothy M.	C	Danton, Mary Jo	A
Cox, Tom	C	Daubon, Ramon E.	C, E

Table A-5: Public Commenters and Topics of Interest (continued)

Commenter	Topic of Interest	Commenter	Topic of Interest
Davico, Ricardo	A	DePoy, Martin	C
Davidovich, Stuart	A, H, N	Dernoga, Matt	A
Davidson, Doug	E	Desmond, Ned	C
Davidson, Melissa	C	Devincenti, Juan Claudio	C, E
Davies, Cornelius	C, E	Diamante, John	A
Davis, Alan M.	C	Diamond, Rev. Karen W.	C
Davis, George	G	Dianis, Nancy L.	C
Davis, Graham	C	Dibble, Catherine	A, Q
Davis, Kathryn	C	Dick, Vanessa	C
Davis, Neil	D	Dickman, Michael	A
Davis, Patricia, C.S.A.	A	Dieterich, Christine	A
Davis, Paul W.	A	Dietrich, Karen B.	C, E
Davis, Shalyn	B, L, Q	Dietrich, Margaret	C
Davis, Suzanne	C	Diggs, Audrey	A
Davis, Timothy H.	A, M	Diggs, Blair	B, D
Davis, Tony	A, L, Q	Dildine, Dave	A
Dawson, Frank	C	Dimmock, T. Herbert	A
Day, Jeff	A, M	Dingle, Sola	T
de la Cruz, Regine	A, T	Dinsmoor, Anastasia N.	C, E
de Souza, Boris	A	DiSciullo, Laura	A
Dean, Peter	A	DiTullio, Donna	A
Dean, Peter	A	Ditzler, Brian E.	A
Dearmon, Alexander	A	Djawdan, Betty	A
DeCaro, Thomas	F, K	Dlhopolsky, Heather	A
Dede, Justin Anthony	A	Dobeck, Brad	C
Deerin, Sloan	C	Dobrosky, Nanette	A
Dehoff, Jeffrey	C	Dolan, MaryEllen	C
Deitemyer, Grace	A	Dombo, Fred	C
Deitz, Judith	A	Dombroski, Marian	A, Q
DeKona, Tanya	A	Dominguez, Maureen	C
del Campo, Emilio	A, M	Donahue, Meghan	C
Delahunty, Alicia	C	Donatelli, Ted	C
Delany, Devin	C	Donn, Majory M.	A
Delany, Gael M.	C	Donnellan, Michael	B, C
Delany, Shannon	C	Donnelly, Catherine	C
Dellatorre, Laura	A	Donohoe, James	A
Demarcus	A	Donovan, Michael	C
Demiraydin, Murat	A	Door, Lale	A
Denbo, Bev	C	Doorley, Bill	C, D
Denney, Christopher	A, Q	Doren, Sandra	A

Table A-5: Public Commenters and Topics of Interest (continued)

Commenter	Topic of Interest	Commenter	Topic of Interest
Dorsey, C.	T	Eberling, Felicia	A
Dorsey, Douglas and Sylvia	B	Eck, William	A
Dotson, Keenan	A	Eckert, Angela Calle, Jaime Henriquez and Robert	C
Dotson, Sarah	A	Eco, Christopher	C
Douek, Beth	C	Edelstein, Carole	C
Dougherty, Barbara	A	Eden, Timothy S.	C
Downey, Leslie	A, K, L, Q	Edmonds, Amanda	C
Downey, Phil	K, T	Edwards, Amber	A
Doyle, Christo	C	Edwards, Kenya Marie	A
Doyle, Garrett	A	Edwards, Kevin and Angela	C
Dozier, Daniel P.	A	Edwards, Tilden and Mary	A
Drayne, Michael	T	Edwards, William	C
Drazin, Lisa	C, E	Effer, Ann	C
Drescher, Laura	A	Egeth, Hillary B.	A
Drew, Seth	C	Eghtesadi, Parvin	C
Driscoll, David	A	Ehat, Grant	A
Druskin, Janie and Brian	C	Ehrenstein, Gerald	A
Dub, Jay	B	Ehrman, James and Sylvana	F
DuFour, R. Dennis	C	Eichner, Ronald	A
Dufresne, Jacqueline	A	Eiden, Lee	C, D, E
Duke, Christopher	C	Eisele, Ellen	C
Duke, Mary	T	Eisemann, David	A, Q
Dukstein, William	C	Eisen, Sandy	A
Duncan, John	E	Eisenberg, Elliot	A
Dunham, Renee	C	Eisenberg, Lloyd	B
Dunkelberger, Evelyn	C	Eldridge, Raymond	A, Q
Dunkelberger, Peter K.	C	Eldridge, Shemeka K.	A
DuPont, Helen	C	Eligen, Sarah	A
Dupree, Jamie	C, E, G	Elizalde, Margaret	A
Dura, Joe	C, E	Elkind, Jonathan	J, L
Durling, Ellie	C	Ellepola, Christopher	A
Dyballa, Cindy	A	Ellis, Adele	A, K, M
Dziduch, Beverly	A	Ellis, Ebonique	A
Eades, Caroline	A	Ellis, Elaine	F, J, K
Eagan, Marge	C	Ellis, Robert A.	C
Eardley, Brian	C	Ellsworth, Ruth G.	A
Earnest, Daniel J.	C, Q	Elms, Pete	C
Eaton, Seth	A	Elrod, Bryan	A
Ebbeler, Jonathan	A	Elswick, Linda	A
Ebbin, Robert	A	Emmet, Eileen	Q

Table A-5: Public Commenters and Topics of Interest (continued)

Commenter	Topic of Interest	Commenter	Topic of Interest
Emmet, Peggy	B, C, I, Q	Feldman, Paul	C
Englar, Carolyn	A	Feldman, Phil	C
Enz, Cliff	A	Feldman, Steven	A
Epps, Donald	A	Felling, Bill	A
Epps, Helen C., Ph.D.	C	Fellows, Carletta	T
Epstein, Helene P. and Leonard G.	C	Fendrick, Anne-Marie	E, Q
Epstein, James	A	Fendrick, Lila	C
Epstein, Yanka	C	Fenimore, John	A
Erwin, Jared	A	Fennell, Piers	C
Esquerre, Rosa	C	Fernandez, Jared	A
Esterson, James	A	Fernandez-Turton, Samuel	C
Evans, Sharon J.	A	Fernando, Ingrid	C
Ewing, William	A	Ferrell, Gentry	A
Ezichi, Amarachi	T	Field, Randi	A
Ezzelle, Elizabeth	C	Figueres, Muni	C
F., Tom	B	Figueroa, Michael	Q
Fagan, Patrick	A	Filice, Ross	Q
Fahler Hogwood, Mary	C	Finley, Andrew	C, D, Q
Fahler, Amanda	A	Finnegan, Amy	C, Q
Fainberg, Joseph	A	Finnegan, Natasha	B, C
Falk, Andrew	C	Finnegan, Yvonne	C, Q
Faller, Alyson	A, K, Q	Firestone, Ken	A
Faller, Erica	A	Fishbein, Anna	C
Farasy, Thomas	T	Fisher, Lawrence R.	C, E
Farber, Amanda	C	Fisher, Shalomf	A
Farthing, Carol	F	Fishman, Samuel	E
Farwell, Josephine	C	Fishpaw, Heidi	A
Fasalojo, Funke	A	Fitzgerald, John	A
Fatal, Erica	A	FitzGerald, John H.	B, C
Fausold, Howard	A	FitzGerald, Karen	F
Fay, John	A	FitzGerald, Peter J., Jr.	C
Faye, Jon and Nina	B	Flaherty, Judith	A
Fedelino, Annalisa	C	Flam, Eli and Lucy	A
Feehan, David	A	Flammia, Thomas	C
Feinberg, Rita	F	Flanigan, Mike	C
Feinstein, Debbie	C, Q	Flatow, Daniel	A
Feldman, Debra and Howard	C	Fleshner, Robert	C
Feldman, Gregory	C	Floyd, John, II	A
Feldman, Harry	B	Fluggs, Mark	A, M
Feldman, Luke	C	Flynn, Chris	C

Table A-5: Public Commenters and Topics of Interest (continued)

Commenter	Topic of Interest	Commenter	Topic of Interest
Flynn, Francis	C	Frye, Sandei	A
Flynn, Gregory E.	C	Fu, Lily	A
Flynn, Patrick and Jessica	C	Fuge, Jeff	C
Fogel, Ariel	A	Fugier, Nadine	C
Foltin, Richard	A	Fulmer, Deborah Huguely	C
Fomalont, Jessica	A	Fulmer, Todd	C
Fonseca, Vinicio	B	Fulvio, Monica	A
Foong, Yvonne	A, M	Furlano, Jennifer	C
Forbes Cameron, Cynthia	A	Fye, Allan	A
Forbes, Beth	C, K	Gagarin, Gregory	A
Ford, Sharon	K, S	Gagarin, Gregory G.	A
Forrest, E.M.	A	Gage, Kit	A
Fothergill, Kate	C	Gagliardi, Joel	A
Fought, Phillip	A	Gaige, Laura	C
Fowler, Mary	C	Gaines, R.	T
Fowler, Pamela	C, E	Galbraith, Ken	C
Fragomeni, Vincenzo	C	Gale, Morgan	A
Frankl, Aaron	C	Galer, Meghan	C
Frankl, Joe	C, E	Gallagher, Ann	C
Frankl, Joseph	B, C, I, Q	Gallagher, Kevin	B, C, E
Frankl, Leah B.	C	Galleher, Kathy	A, Q
Franklin, Sandra	A	Galli, Shinae	A
Franks, Shannon	A	Galvin, Peter	A
Franz, Bill	C, E	Galvin, Theresa	C, Q
Frazier, Lee	B	Ganiban, Jody	T
Fredieu, Brian, Esq.	A	Gannon, Rick	C
Freeland Raymond, Megan	C	Garbarino, David J.	A
Freeman, David, PsyD	A	Garcia, Kristina	B, C, Q
French, George	B	Garcia-Casellas, Ada	C
Fresquez, Danielle	A	Gardiner, John	C
Friauf, Julie	C, Q	Gardner, Carol R.	A
Friauf, Ken	C, Q	Garg, Arjun	A
Friedman, Aron	C, E	Garrand, Betty	C
Friedman, Diana	A	Garrett, Ann	T
Friedman, Jane M.	C	Garrido, Christian	C
Friedman, Julie	A	Garrido, Karina	T
Friedman, Robert	C	Gartner, Susan L., Ph.D.	C, D
Friend, Julius W.	C	Garvey, Carol	A
Frisch, Mathias	A	Garvey, Patrick and Patty	C, D, Q
Frost, Ashley	A	Gaskill, Brenda	A

Table A-5: Public Commenters and Topics of Interest (continued)

Commenter	Topic of Interest	Commenter	Topic of Interest
Gass, Connie	C	Glasser, Josh	C
Gassler, April	A	Glasser, Matt	C
Gaster, Robin	J, T	Gleichman, Norm	A
Gaudet, Katherine	C	Glenn Court, Helen	C
Gavidia, Elena	C, E	Goel, Vijay	A
Gayaldo, Liz	C	Goh, Mark Y.	A
Geck, Gary	A, Q	Golas, Sandra	A, Q
Geffroy, Marc	C, D, Q	Goldberg, Al	C, E
Gehman, Nancy	A	Goldberg, Bruce	A
Gehshan, Shelly	A	Goldberg, Lisa	T
Geier, Edward	C, D, Q	Goldenberg, Barton	C
Geist, Eric	A	Goldman, Paul	A
Gelfand, Matthew D.	C	Goldman, Scott	A
Gemeny, W. Gordon	J	Goldstein, Michael	A
Gemmell, Marie	A	Goldstein, Nelson	A
Gendelman, Jill	C	Goldstein, Robert, M.D.	C
Gentry, Donna	A	Gonzalez, Alberto	C
Gerson, Jeffrey I.	A	Gonzalez, Piero	A
Gerson, Mr. and Mrs. Donald	A	Goodman, Keith	T
Gertler, Edward	A	Goodman, Robert	A
Gervino, Gerald and Joan	C	Goodwin, Paul	A
Geselowitz, Daniel	B	Goozner, Karen	A
Gettinger, Dan	C	Gorbaty, Jane	H, T
Ghanadan, Gabe	Q, T	Gordon, Aaron Michael	A
Gholkar, Preeya	T	Gordon, Joseph	A
Gibbs, Russell	A	Gordon, Stephen L.	C
Giblin, Walter J., M.D.	C, D	Gormally, James F	A
Gilbert, Jonathan	A	Gottfried, David	A
Gilley, Jeff	A	Gottlieb, Gail	A, Q
Gilley, Kay	A	Goulet, Denise C.	C
Gilmore, Michael	C	Grabowski, Beatrice, Ph.D.	A
Gilroy, Brett	A	Grady, Denise A.	A
Giorgis, John D.	T	Graeter, James H	C
Gitchell, Joe	C, D	Graf, Tami	C
Gitterman, Ed	B, P	Grageda, Martha	A
Givens, David	D, K	Grant, Robert E.	C, E
Glaros, Dannielle	A	Graves, Ashlea P.	A
Glasgow, Darren	T	Gray, Ann	A
Glassell, Ashton	T	Gray, Kerri	C
Glasser, Gabrielle	C	Grayson, W. Cabell "Cab"	C

Table A-5: Public Commenters and Topics of Interest (continued)

Commenter	Topic of Interest	Commenter	Topic of Interest
Green, Bradley	A	Gunter, Adria	T
Green, David P.	A	Gurney, Brent and Laura	C
Green, Doug	A	Guter, Lev	A, K
Green, Linda S.	A	Gwadz, Joyce and Robert	A
Green, Matt	A	Haag, Eric	A
Green, Stephen A., M.D.	C	Haanes-Olsen, Grayce	A
Greenberg, Julie	A	Hagerty, Thomas G.	B, I
Greenberg, Shelly	C	Haggerty, Patrick	C, E
Greene, Jane	T	Haglund, Kurt	C
Greene, LaTosha	A	Hahn, Robert	B
Greene, Margaret H.	A	Haibel, Betsy	A
Greene, Neil R., AIA	A	Hain, Nicola	A
Greenstein, David	C, E	Haines, Sigrid	A
Greenstein, Jenna Nober	C, E	Hains, Mary Ann Wagner	C
Greer, Claudia	C	Hairston, Donald	A
Greer, George	A	Hairston, V.	O
Greer, Tom	C	Halimi, Nathalie	A, M
Gregerman, E. M.	G	Hall, C.M.	A
Gregorio, Santos	A	Hall, Leslie	A
Gregory, Henry	A	Hallett, Judith	A
Griffin, Jon	B	Hallivis, Cheryl Lynn	C
Grimley, Dan	C, Q	Halpern, Jonathan	F
Grine, Gregory	C	Halverson, Derek	A
Groff, Jay	F	Ham, James T.	A
Groff, Lauren	F	Hamdallah, Myriam	C
Grogan, Glenda	C, Q	Hammer, Lauren	A
Grohs, R.L.	B, Q	Hampp, Charles W., Jr.	C
Gross, John	A	Hanan, Susan	C
Gross, Naomi	C	Hanks, Stephen	A, M
Gross, William	C, E	Hanley, John	E
Grotenstein, Neal	C, K	Hanlon, Rich	A
Grotsky, Gary	C	Hanna, William	A, K
Groves, Brenda	T	Hanson, Christopher	A
Grow, Brian and Amanda	C	Harden, Frank and Berit	A
Grunby, Eugene	A, M	Hardesty, Duane	A
Gubbings, John	A	Hardin, Melissa	C
Gubits, Jon	A	Hardt, Timothy R.	A
Gubits, Jonathan	A	Hardy, Bernice and John	B, C
Guinnessy, Paul	B, K, L	Hargus, Sally	C
Gullo, Thomas	A, M	Harper, Blaney	C

Table A-5: Public Commenters and Topics of Interest (continued)

Commenter	Topic of Interest	Commenter	Topic of Interest
Harper, Scott	A	Henriquez, Victor	D, Q
Harper, Timothy	C	Herbert, Patricia	C
Harrington, Aaron	N, Q	Herlihy, Candy Perque	C
Harrington, Nathan	A	Hernandes, Lucia	A, K
Harriot, Dorothy	C	Hershey, Robert	A
Harris, Mike	A	Herson, Linda and Jay	C
Harris, Oliver	A	Hertzberg, Elisabeth	C
Harris, Richard	C	Hibey, Jim	C
Harrison, Ken	T	Hickay, Bill	B, E, I
Harry, Joseph	C	Hickey, William	B, C, I
Hartigan, John D.	G, N	Hicks, Peter C.	B
Hartigin, John	D, E	Hicks, Robert	A
Hartley, Diane	T	Hidalgo, Dario, Ph.D.	D
Hartman Family	C	Hidey, Adam M.	A
Hartman, Nancy	C	Hiebert, Mary	C
Haselswerdt, Jacob	A	High, Michelle	C
Hatch, Pao Lin	A	Hileman, Refael	B, F, I, K, L, Q
Hatton, Emily	C, D	Hill, Andrew	C, E
Hausner, Tony	A	Hill, Andy	C
Hautamaki, Jared	B	Hill, Drew	B, I
Hawkins, Chris	C, Q	Hill, Fred C.	C
Hawkins, Sue	O	Hill, Lori	A
Haworth, Larry	A	Hill, Mark	A
Hayat, Nosheen	A	Hill, Susan	C, E, J, K
Hayes, Burke	C	Hillary, Maxine	T
Hayes, Chris	B, C, E, I	Hilton, Joy	C
Hayes, Jada	C	Himmelfarb, Anne	C
Hayes, Mike	A	Hines, Gerald	A
Haywood, Charles, Sr.	C, G	Hinga, Kenneth R., Ph.D.	A
Healey, Peter F.	C	Hinnant, Anthony	T
Heard, Anna	A	Hintersehr, Steve	B, I
Heard, Nathan	A	Hinton, Cary	J
Hefter, Jackie and Larry	C	Hirschhorn, Eric	C
Heidenberger, Betsy	C	Hirschhorn, Joel S., Ph.D.	B
Heidenberger, Steve	C	Hirtle, Alex	A
Heise, Erin	A	Hishmeh, Jed	C
Helfgott, Maxwell A., MD	B	Hitchens, Richard	A, Q
Hellkamp, Lori	A	Hobson, L.	C
Hennemeyer, Chris	C	Hoddick, Andrew	B
Henriquez, Pedro	A	Hoffman, Elaine	C

Table A-5: Public Commenters and Topics of Interest (continued)

Commenter	Topic of Interest	Commenter	Topic of Interest
Hoffman, J. David	C, D	Humerick, David	A
Hoffman, Mary Anne	C, E, K	Hunt, Fern Y.	A, H, K
Hoffman, Matt	A	Hunter, Lynne	A
Hoffman, Scott	C	Huntington, Anne Marie, Grace, Mary Ann and Kent	C
Holbrook, Wm A., MD	C	Huntington, Mary Ann	C, E
Holbrook, Michael T.	C	Hutchinson, Fred	K, L
Holbrook, Michelle	C	Hutchinson, Wendy	C, L
Holland, Griffin	C, E	Hutton, Glen	C, G
Holland, Kent	B	Hwang, Ta-Mao (Eric)	A, M
Holland, Nancy	A	Hyer, Lewis	C
Holland, Rich	C	Iaquinto, Kevin	C
Hollander, Anne	A	Ibach, Maryilyn	A
Hollenberg, Linda	A	Ibici, Beyhan	A
Holloway, Sean	A	Ikels, David	B
Holman, Amy	F	Ikle-Khalsa, Sat Jiwan	A
Holmay, Kathleen	A	Ingham, Ken & Glenda	A
Holmes, Ethan P.	A	Ingraham, David	A
Holmwood, Amy	C	Ingram, Susan	C
Honigman, Robert	A	Iolster-Izquierdo, Pia	A
Hooke, Patricia	C	Irani, Sands K., MD	C, E
Hooshangi, Jennifer	A	Irving, Andrew	A
Hopkins, Catherine	C	Ishaq, Fota	C
Horner, Marie-Josephe, MSPH	C	Ivey, Jennifer	C
Horton, Mark and Nancy	C	Ivey, Xavier	A
Horwitz, Shelly	A	Iyer, Sriram	A
Hostetler, Susan	C	Jackson, David	M, T
Hostler, Louis	A, T	Jackson, Nick	A
Hotchkiss, Michael F.	C	Jackson, Oscar F.	T
Houston, Robert	T	Jacobin, Dave	C
Howard, Eve	C	Jacobs, Cindy	A
Howard, Loni	A	Jacobs, Myra	C
Howe, Eleanor	T	Jacobs, Sr., Ronnie	A, K
Howell, Norman	A	Jacobson, Austin	A, K
Hoye, Richard	A	Jacobson, Lisa	A
Huang, Priscilla	A	Jacobus, Headley	A
Hubbard, Bob	A	Jaffe, Peter	A
Hudalla, John	B, P	Jaffee, Gail	C
Hughes, Allison	A	Jaffee, Michelle Koidin	C
Hughes, Christopher & Elizabeth	C	Jagoe, Armiger	B, C, K
Huguely, G. Scott	C	Jahnig, Katherine	C

Table A-5: Public Commenters and Topics of Interest (continued)

Commenter	Topic of Interest	Commenter	Topic of Interest
Jais-Mick, Maureen	C, E	Jones, Richard	C
Janssens, Miebeth	A	Jones, Samuel	Q
Jantac, Lubomir	A	Jones, Tom	C
Jarvis, William	C	Jordan, Matthew	A
Jasinski, Matthew	A	Jorstad, Anne	A
Jefferson, Deborah	A	Joseph, Frank	A
Jenci, Krysten	C	Jurkovich, Celesta	C
Jenkins, Nneka	T	Jusufbegovic, Nadir	C
Jenkins, Peter	A	Juzenas, Eric	F
Jennings, Jeanne	A	Kadden, Jeremy	C
Jensen, Patty	C	Kadow, Brian and Ellen	C
Jentz, Kathy	A	Kadunc, Edward	A
Jentz, Kathy	A	Kailo, Gail	A
Jeweler, Leslie	C	Kalmanson, Jennifer	A
Jin, Albert, Ph.D.	F	Kalmanson, Phillip	A, Q
Jobe, H. Daniel, II	C	Kamani, Nehal	C
Jobe, Lisa and Daniel	C	Kameras, David	A
Johansson, Erin and Christopher	A	Kane, Steve	A
John, Diane	C	Kantor, Aileen	C
Johns, Jayne	K	Kaplan, Howard	B, D, E, Q
Johnson, Angela	T	Kaplan, Roger	C
Johnson, Elizabeth	A	Kapsalis, Glenda	A
Johnson, Floretta	T	Karasik, Joan	A
Johnson, Frank	B	Karp, Robert	C
Johnson, Gregory	A	Kassinger, Alice	C
Johnson, Jim	A, K, T	Katz, Linda Sobel	A
Johnson, Julia	C, D	Kaufman, Diane	A, M
Johnson, Katherine B.	C, D	Kaufman, Marc	C
Johnson, Michael F.	C, E, Q	Kaupert, William H., Jr.	F
Johnson, Michaela	A	Kaushal, Sujay	A
Joice, Paul	A	Kavanaugh, Patricia K.	C, D
Jolly, Paul	A, M	Kawaja, Galib	A
Jones, Anne	A	Kay, David	A
Jones, Carol	F	Kaylor, Robert	C, Q
Jones, Elaine	O	Keane, Gabriela	C
Jones, Jacqueline	A	Kearns, Martin	A
Jones, Kristina	A	Keating, Kevin	C
Jones, Lois	C	Keefer, Carol	A
Jones, Mitch	A	Keeley, Kevin	A
Jones, Carol A., Ph.D.	F	Kefer, Jennifer	A

Table A-5: Public Commenters and Topics of Interest (continued)

Commenter	Topic of Interest	Commenter	Topic of Interest
Keitelman, Charis	C	Kippax, Jonathan	Q, T
Kelada, Samir	A	Kirchner, James	C
Keller, Rachel	A	Kirkland family	A
Kelley, M.	A	Kirkland, Rachel	A
Kelly, Byrne	A, I, K, L, M, Q	Kirlin, Timothy J.	C
Kelly, Byrne H.	A, I, K, L, M, Q, S	Kirmse, Robert	C
Kelly, Francesca	C, E, Q	Kissel, Mark	T
Kelly, Ian	C, E	Kiyonaga, Paul Y.	B, I
Kelly, Joyce	A	Kleiderer, John	T
Kelly, Laurie	A	Klein, Beverly	D
Kelly, Lynn and Chris	C	Klein, Lorraine Gill	C
Kelly, Suzanne	C	Klim, Jake	C
Kelson, Lance	A	Klion, Catherine	C
Kenary, Joseph	C	Klippel, Jason	T
Kenary, Mary Lou	B, C, M	Knable, Michael	C
Kenep, Marcia	A	Knight, David	A
Kennedy, Jean	C, E	Knight, DeDario	A
Kennedy, Patricia	C, Q	Knight, Rogina	A
Kennet, Mark	C, Q	Knopf, Norman G.	C
Keplinger, Helen	C	Knowles, LaShawn	A
Keppler, Dianne M.	C, E	Knox, Elizabeth	A
Keppler, John	C, E, K	Knutsen, Linda	C
Kershow, Mike	C	Knutson, Marilyn	C
Keto, Laurin	C	Ko, Susan	A
Kevles, Beth	D, E	Kodish, Douglas	B, P
Khafra, Dia	Q	Koehler, Tom, CFA	B, K
Khamphong, Natthavee	A	Kohler, Arthur and Zoila	F
Khanna, Rohit	B, C, I, K, L	KoKopeli, Peter H.	A, M
Khatchadourian, Kelley	A	Kollin, Cheryl	C, E, Q
Kiernan, Vince	C	Koneff, Alexandra	B, I
Kikvidze, Irma	A, Q	Koneff, Douglas A.	C
Kilcullen, Dennis	C	Koo, Charlie	A
Kim, Jay	A	Koppelman, Charles	A
Kimm, Peter	C, D	Kornhaus, Cindi	C
Kindle, Gretchen	A	Koslow, Diane	C
King, Edward	A	Kostant, Amy.W	C, E
King, Joan	A	Kosterlitz, David S.	A
King, Marylyn	A	Kotschoubey, Nicolas	A
King, Natalie	A	Kountoupes, Cary	A
King, Richard	A	Krainman, Elizabeth	A

Table A-5: Public Commenters and Topics of Interest (continued)

Commenter	Topic of Interest	Commenter	Topic of Interest
Kramer, Elizabeth	C, D	Larson, Paul and Lenore	C, D
Kramer, Susan	C	Lasensky, Scott and Elise	T
Krash, Jessica	A	Lashgari, Monir	C
Krauth, CPA, Suzanne	C, Q	Lashley, Lori	T
Kress, Richard	A	Lasley, Judith	C
Kriesberg, Caleb	B, C, D, E, F, G, Q	Lass, Susan B.	C
Kriss, Evan Jane	A	Latimer, Richard	C
Kriss, Rachel	A	Latino, Frank	G
Krist, Elizabeth Cheng	C	Latty, Richard	C
Kristiansen, Kathrine	F	Lava, Francisco	A
Krug, Kevin	C	Lavan, David	C
Kucia, John	A	Law, Boo	C
Kuhns, David	A	Lawee, Aaron	A, K
Kullback, Rebecca	C	Lawhornbrown, Linda	A
Kunnirickal, Isaac	F	Lawrence, Frances & Robert	C, Q
Kura, Swapna	A	Lawson, Robin and Keith	C
Kurland, Pamela	C	Le Dem, Jean	C, D, Q
Kursban, Mindy	A	Lea, Lyston	A
Kurtz, Nicholas	A	Leachman, Thomas	I, K
Kuzminski Stouffer, Beth	C	Leaf, Roberto	A
Kwan, Quon	A, K	Leahy, Anthony	B, I
La Grenade, Lois	A	Leakan, Matthew	T
Labib, Jaleh	C	Leary, Liz, John, Catherine, and Jack	C
Labovitz, Priscilla	A	Leary, Robert	A, M
Labson, Courtenay	C	Leavitt, Wilder J.	C
Lage, Christopher	F	Lebowitz, Alisa	C
Lamari, Cary	A	Lederman, Laura	C
Lamb, Joshua, MD	C	Lee, Anne	A
Lamb-Mechanick, Deborah	B, E	Lee, Austin	K
Lamond, Chris	B, C, E, I	Lee, Bobby Y.	C
Lancette, Christopher	B	Lee, D.	A
Landa, Linette	C	Lee, J. Sue	C
Landau Steinman, Melissa	C	Leggett, Daniel	C, I, M, Q
Landau, Eric	A	Lehman, H.J.	A, M
Landay, Alan H.	C	Lehmann, Mishian	C
Lane, Kathryn	B	Lehrer, Beverly	A
Lane, Paul G.	C	Leibowitz, Pat and Lewis	C, E
Lannom, Linda	C, E	Leinwand, Stuart	A
Larkin, Jennie	A, M	Leman, Noa	C
Larravide, Gloria	L, Q	LeMieux, Christine	A

Table A-5: Public Commenters and Topics of Interest (continued)

Commenter	Topic of Interest	Commenter	Topic of Interest
Lemos, Iris	C	Lipitz, Michael	A
Lemov, Michael & Penelope	A	Lipper, Charles	C
Leon, Miguel	A	Lippincott, Alexandria	A
Leon, Sharon M., Ph.D.	C	Lite, Carol S.	A, F, K, L
Lerner, Mark, Inna, Misha, and Sammy	A	Liu, Douglas	A
Lerner, Richard	A	Liversidge, Ellen	F, S
Lerner, Shari	C	Lock, Cameron	A
Lesar, Douglas E.	C	Lofft, Alexander	A
Letsinger, Nancy	C	Loggie, Linda	A, M
Leventhal, Allan	F, Q	Logman, Mojgan	C
Leventhal, Carol	F	Longsworth, Nellie L.	C
Levin, Marci	B, C, T	Loonsk, John	C
Levin, Susan	C	Lopata, Nick	C
Levine, Edith	C	Lopez, Carlos	A
Levine, J.	C	Lopez, Daniela	C
Levinger, Matthew	A	Lopez, Louis M.	Q
Lewis French, Stacy	C	Lora, Eduardo	A
Lewis, Gregory A.	F	Lorenzana, Katherin	A
Lewis, T. Reid	C, E, Q	Lorenzen, Laura	A
Lewis-Khanna, Sherry	B, C, I, K, L	Lotze, Thomas	A
Li, Yixin	T	Love, Doug	A, Q
Li, Yun	A	Lowery, Jeffrey A.	C
Liburd, Soyini	M	Lowet, Stephanie	C
Lichtenstein, Jules	C, E	Lubbert, Marion	A
Lichtenstein, Lynn	B, C, D, E, K, Q	Lubin, Lisa	A
Lickwar, David	A	Lucas, Jill	C
Liddel, David	A	Lucash, Seth	C
Liebow, Normanl	A, M	Luco-Devincenti, Paulina	C, E
Lied, R. Andrew	C, F	Luebke, Thomas, AIA	A
Liepold, Mary	A	Lujan, Clemencia H.	C
Lietwiler, Charles J.	A	Luke, Jordan	C
Light, Jimmy A., MD, FACS	C, E, Q	Lutes, Mark and Jean	C
Lillibridge, John	A	Lynn	A
Lim, Janelyne	F	Lynn, Christine	C
Lim, Soketeang	F	Lyon, Philip	A
Limbert, Barbara	C	Macario, Pablo Salinas	A
Lincoln, Jane	B, C	MacCartee, William	C
Lindahl, Richard S.	C	MacGlashan, Don	C, D, Q
Lindenberg, Emily	C	MacGlashan, Margaret	C
Lindenberg, Howard	A	Mackey, Jack	C

Table A-5: Public Commenters and Topics of Interest (continued)

Commenter	Topic of Interest	Commenter	Topic of Interest
MacPherson, Richard L.	A	Marmos, William	C
Madigan, Brian	C	Maroon, Sophia	B, C
Magner, Renee	C	Marques, Andy	A
Magnuson, Lyle	A	Marr, Christine	A, Q
Mahaffey White, Captain, Richard	C, Q	Marrocco, Drew and Carolyn	C
Mahaffie, Jim	C	Marshall, David	A
Mahan, Dee	C	Marshall, James	C
Mahmud, Lugman	A	Marshall, Malcolm and Darcy	C
Maines, Christopher	C, D	Marston, Christopher H.	C
Majano, Marvin	A	Martin, Cassia	A
Maka, Eva V.	A	Martin, Cooper	A
Malatesta, Jennifer	A	Martin, Delaney	C
Malik, Asia	P	Martin, Dessirae	A
Malison, Alex	F	Martin, Ellen	C
Mallikarjunan, Arun	C	Martin, Miranda	A
Malone, Andrew	A, E, H, L, Q	Martin, Ron	A
Malone, Elizabeth	A	Martin, Sydney	C
Malouf, Henry & Julie	C, E	Martin, Ted	A
Mancilla, Bethany J.	C	Martinez, Gabriel	A
Mancino, Galen	A	Marton, Yuval	A
Manganaro, Mike	A	Mascioli, William	A
Mann, Aliya	A	Mason, Bob	C
Mann, Marilyn K.	C	Mason, Geoffrey	A
Manning, Mark	A, F	Massey, Martina Gillis	F
Manrique, Roberto	C, E	Mathis, Nancy	B, I
Mansaray, Sandy	A	Mathura & Family, Karen	C
Mansueti, Sarah	T	Mattes, Stephanie	A
Marchick, David	C	Matthews, Suzanne & Jason	C, E
Marcus, Andrew	A, F	Maudlin-Jeronimo, Lynda	C
Marcus, John	C, E	Mauger, Anthony	I, Q
Marcus, Pamela	C	Maurer, Marie	C
Marella-Carpenter, Amy	C, Q	May, John F.	A
Mark, Clyde	C	May, Juliette	A
Markley, Ryan	A	Maya, Penina	C, E
Markowitz, Joy	A	Mayer, Diane	B, C
Marks, Marcia F.	C	Mayer, Peter C.	B, C
Markson, Alex	F	Mayo-Amilcar, Hanno	A, Q
Marlow, Susie	A	Mazie, Sara	A
Marmo-Fernandes, Martha	C	Mazo, Mark E.	C, K
Marmos, Lucretia	C	McBride, Jonathan E.	C, E

Table A-5: Public Commenters and Topics of Interest (continued)

Commenter	Topic of Interest	Commenter	Topic of Interest
McBride, Mark	A	McLean, Michael & Firuzeh	C, E
McCaleb, Meghan	T	McMahon, John	A
McCarragher, Ward	Q	McMann, James P. & Marjorie E.	A
McCarthy, Caroline	T	McManus, Rich	B, G
McCarthy, Janey and Kevin	C	McNamara, John	C
McCarthy, Kevin	A	McNeil, Alice	O
McCarthy, Lori	C	McNeil, Dale	T
McCarver, Brenda	A	McNelis, James	T
McClain, Philip	Q	McNerney, Christine	A
McCloskey, Bill	A	McNerney, John	C, E
McConnochie, Timothy	A, H	McPherson, David	A
McCormick, Jennifer	A	Mead, William B.	D, E
McCormick-Goodhart, Leander	A, M	Meade, Birgit	A
McCreery, Roger	A	Mechanick, Maury and Irving	B, E
McCrudden, Charlie	A	Meche Kilcullen, Angela	C
McCubbin, Don	C	Meehan, Avice	A
McCullough, Claire A.	A	Meenan, Michael	A
McDaniel-Corrigan, Linette	A	Meitiv, Alexander	A
McDonald, Evelyn	C	Meline, Jed	A
McDonald, Robert	A	Memaran, Mahnaz	A
McDonnell, Michael	C	Mencher, Steve	A
McElrath, Hugh	A	Mendez, Nancy	A
McFeely, Martin	T	Merchant, Laura	C
McGeehan, Jackie	A, Q	Mergner, Gertrud D.	A, Q
McGervey, Joseph	T	Mergner, Wolfgang	A
McGill, Erica L.	C	Merkowitz, Maria	B, I
McGill, Robert F.	C	Merritt, Nick	C
McGinn, Julia	A	Mertz, Thomas	A
McGovern, Michael B.	B, C, E, I	Metalitz, Steve	A
McGowan, Sharon	T	Meyer, Mark D.	C
McGuire, Judith	D, E, K, Q	Micallef, Louise	C
McHale, Jeanette	C	Michopoulos, George	C
McHale, Thomas	C	Midlen, John	K
McIlwain, Harold	L	Midthune, Douglas	C
McKay, Richard and Janie	C	Mietz, Judy	C
McKinney, John E.	A	Mikulak, Lucy	A
McKinney, Kristin	C	Milbourne, Charles, Jr.	T
McKnight, Matthew	A	Millard, Steven	T
McLaughlin, Michel J.	C	Miller, Aruna	T
McLaughlin, Susan, MD	B, C, D, E, I, Q	Miller, Barbara	C

Table A-5: Public Commenters and Topics of Interest (continued)

Commenter	Topic of Interest	Commenter	Topic of Interest
Miller, Barry A.	C	Mondor, Raymond	A, M
Miller, Dan	A	Montgomery, Bill	A
Miller, Devon Lee	C	Montgomery, Todd	T
Miller, Franklin G.	C	Monti, Ernest	D
Miller, Jenn	A	Monti, Mary	C, D
Miller, Judy	C	Moody, Sally A., Ph.D.	A
Miller, Julie M.	A	Moon, David	A
Miller, Larry	C	Mooney, Diane L.	C
Miller, Lee	B, G, I	Moore, Frank	A
Miller, Mark W.	C	Moore, Laura	A
Miller, Megan	A, M	Moore, Steve	C
Miller, Melinda	C, E	Morales, Daniel	A
Miller, Renee	F	Morehead, Harvard	A
Mills, Kevin	A	Morgan, Marcia H.	C
Mills, Susan	C	Moriarity, Chris	A, Q
Ming, Michelle	A	Moriarty, Megan	A, K
Minkoff, Sue	C	Morris, Lindsay	A, K
Minning, Deborah	C	Morrison, Anita	A
Minovich, Christopher, CPA	A	Morrison, Foster	A
Mintz, Emily	A, Q	Morrison, Ian	A
Miraso, M.	A	Morrison, Jim	C
Mirkin, Gabe	C	Morrison, Elizabeth, M.D.	C, E
Misra, Asheesh	C, K	Morrison, Nancy	A
Mistrik, Marion	A	Morrissey, John	C
Mitchell, Colet	B, C	Morse, Sarah	A
Mitchell, Janene	C	Moskowitz, Ben	A
Mitchell, Jessica	A	Moulton, Hannah	A
Mitchell, Lisa	C	Moya, Laura	A
Mitchell, Sarah	C	Mudarres, Yasmina	C, F
Mitchell, Susan	C, E	Mudd, Marion H.	A
Mitchell, Thomas W., Esq.	C, D	Muise, Allan	A, Q
Mitchem, Freda	T	Mulholland, Kurt	C
Mitrakas, Ulysses L.	A	Mullen, Tiger	C
Moen, Craig	C	Mulligan, Christina	A
Mohammed, T.	A	Mumford, Elizabeth	C, D
Moir, Catherine	B	Munoz, Cecilia	A
Mokhtarzada, Idris	A	Muratori, Francesca	C
Mollenauer, Andrew	C, K, Q	Murayi, Theophile	A
Molloy McCaleb, Meghan	C	Murphy, Brian	B, I, T
Moltumyr, Mary	A	Murphy, Brian and Joy	C

Table A-5: Public Commenters and Topics of Interest (continued)

Commenter	Topic of Interest	Commenter	Topic of Interest
Murphy, Charles	C	Nguyen, Chi	A
Murphy, Douglas	B, E	Nickerson, Cindy	C, E, I, Q
Murphy, Frances	A	Nickerson, Louisa	A
Murphy, Patrick	C, Q	Nicolacci, Giovanni	B
Murphy, Stephen and Dominic	C	Nielson, Theresa	A
Murphy, Thomas D.	A	Nieva, Christine	A, K
Murray, Bruce	T	Nieves, Dennis	A
Murtha, Peter	A	Nolasco, William	A
Musher, Amy	T	Norton, Scott	C
Mutzberg, John	C, E, K	Norvell, John and Elizabeth	C
Nagaraj, Barbara	C	Norwood, Bill	A, N
Nagle, William	A, M	Novicio, Mark	A
Nainis, W. Scott	C, E	Novotny-Dura, Janet	C
Nalls, Daniel G.	B	Null, Elisabeth Higgins	F, K, M
Naradzay, Bonnie	C	Nunez, Albert	A
Nash, Michael	B, C	Nybro, Ruth	A
Nasr, Navid	K	Oberg, Kathleen	I, K
Natale, Michael	A	O'Brien, Jim	B, I, L
Nathe, Tobias	C	O'Brien, Kate	C, E
Nau, Lise	A	O'Brien, Lisa	A
Navarro, Nancy	A	O'Brien, Paula	C, E
Neal, Valerie C.	K	Obrine, Lisa	A
Needle, Roslyn Brandon	C	Obrinsky, Mark	A
Neher, Jim	A	O'Bryon Haas, Megan	C
Neil, William	A	O'Connell, Timothy	A
Nekrasova, Ninel	C	O'Connor, Austin	A, H
Nelson	A	O'Donnell, Earle	A
Nelson, Curt	C	O'Donnell, John	B
Nelson, David	M	Ogundimu, Kehinde O.	A
Nelson, Gerald	A	O'Hanlon, Michael	A, C
Nelson, Nicole	T	O'Hare	C, E
Nelson, Susie	C	O'Herron, Thomas F.	A
Nemec, Linda	C	Ohnsorge, Franziska	C, Q
Nemeth, Diane	F	O'Laughlin, Daniel and Agnes	C
Neusner, Noam	B, I	OLeary, David	D
Newman, David	A	Oliver, John M.	C
Newman, Marian	C, E	Oliver, Lloyd and Nancy	C
Newman, Sarah	C, E	Oliwa, Michael	C
Newman, Sharon	A	Olmstead, Jon C.	C
Newton, Kellie	C, I, K, Q	Olsen, Maria and Chris	C

Table A-5: Public Commenters and Topics of Interest (continued)

Commenter	Topic of Interest	Commenter	Topic of Interest
O'Mara, Marsha	C	Pascaley, Assya	C
O'Neil-Manion, Sara, AIA	C, G, Q	Pashby, Chris	A
Onufer, Drew	C, D	Pasta, Michelle	T
Orleans, Bill	A, Q	Patch, Ted	C
Ortiz, Evelyn	A	Patterson, Byron	C, K, N
Oser, Jeff	A	Pavitt, Charles	A
Osorio, A.R., Jr.	A	Payne, John	A
O'Steen, Karen	A	Peal, David	C
Ostlund, Robert	A	Pearse, Michael	C
O'Toole, Bob	G	Pearson, Steven D., MD, MSc, FRCP	C
Ovalles, Judith	A	Peck, Roy	A
Owen, Ryland	A	Peckham, Gardner G.	C
Owens, Anna	A	Peek, Hope	B
Oweos, John	A	Peirce, Lara	T
Owings, Megan	T	Pena, Constance	F, K, Q, S
Ozberk, Erkin	A	Pendergrass, J. Aaron	A
Ozburn, Laurent	A	Pendergrass, John	F, K
Packard, Dean A.	C	Penina, Maya	C
Padilla, Solveig	C	Penner, Eileen	C
Pakroo, Shapari H.	C	Pereira, Sandra	A
Pakulski, Margaret	F	Perez, Rodolfo	A
Pal, Amlesh	T	Perkasa, Hans	A
Palladino, Grace	C, Q	Perkins, Emily	A
Palley, Tom	A	Perkins, Fletcher	H
Palmer, Laurie	F	Perl, Matthew	C
Paludneviciai, Raylene & Zilvinas	A	Perla, Lee	A
Panebianco, Nicholas	C	Perring, Rebecca	A
Papageorge, Alex	B, L	Perry, Cheryl	A, M
Pape, Barbara	C	Persons, Jacqueline	A
Parchment, Mark	A	Peterkofsky, Don	C
Paretzky, Raymond	A	Petersen, Rafe	T
Park, Eugenia	A	Peterson, Jonathan	A
Park, Michael	A	Peterson, Paul	C
Park, Paul Joseph	A	Peterson, Rosemary	A
Parree, Jutta	A	Petrash, Carol	C, Q
Parry, Jennifer	A	Petrash, Jack	C
Parsons, Richard	A	Petrides, Bette	B
Pascal, Mark S.	F	Petrides, Sr., George	C
Pascalev, Alice	B, C	Petrisko, Nancy	C, E
Pascalev, Mario	C	Philbin, Vivienne	C

Table A-5: Public Commenters and Topics of Interest (continued)

Commenter	Topic of Interest	Commenter	Topic of Interest
Phillips, Hannah	C	Previti, Lawrence	G
Phipps, Heather	A	Primack, Karen and Aron	A
Phyillaier, Wayne	A	Proctor, Tim	B, I
Picard, Matthew	C	Pskowski, Martha	A
Picard, Suzanne and Matthew	C	Public, Jane X.	G
Piccardo, Pedro	A	Pugh, Jennifer	T
Picchioni, Dante	A, G	Purdie, Christina	C
Pick, Terri	A	Purdie, Edith	B, C, I, Q
Pickar, Catherine	A, T	Pyles, Dr. Tracey	C
Pickering, David	T	Qazzaz, Keylan	C
Piepmeier, Brad	C	Queen, Marcus	A
Pinckney, Andrea G.	A	Quick, Tim	C
Pinto, Laura A.	A, K	Quigley, Gail	C
Pirnia, Denise	A	Quilici, Kristine	A
Pirone, Mark A	C	Quinn, Marianne	A, F
Pivik, Lynn	C	Quintos, Beatriz	A
Plank, Stuart and Laura	C	Rabinowitz, Mitchell L.	A
Platia, Edward and Rose	C, E	Race, Adam	C, E
Platia, Edward V., MD	C, E, Q	Radichevich, Alexander	A
Platia, Rose	B, I	Raesly, Lee	C
Pluta, Tom	B, D, I	Rafferty, Patick and Michele	B, I
Polisar, Barry Louis	C	Ragen, William	A
Pollard, Richard	A, M	Rainville, Chuck	A
Pomarede, Betty	C	Rajpal, Vikas	D
Pomarede, Jean-Michel	C	Ramirez, Silvestre	T
Pomykala, Daniel	H, Q	Ramos-Izquierdo, Luis	C
Pope, Margaret M.	A	Rand, Florence	A
Pope-Onwukwe, Karren	A	Randall, Julia	C, E, Q
Porambo, Albert	A	Raphael, Donna	A
Portney, Mindy	A	Raphel, Erica	A, K
Posner, Mark	A	Rashford, Venice	A
Pothier, Karl and Betsy	B, Q	Rashid, Wali	T
Potter, Tonja	T	Rasmussen, Jack	A
Powell, Anathea	A	Ratcliff, Judith	A
Power, Sheila	C	Rathbone, B.	C
Powers, Joseph	A	Ratkowski, Pat	A
Prater-Lewis, Jon	A	Rauch, Brigid	T
Prece, Jan	A	Rauh, Dean J.	C
Prescott, Jannea R.	A	Rauh, Jill	A
Preust, Floyd C.	A	Ravnitzky, Michael	A

Table A-5: Public Commenters and Topics of Interest (continued)

Commenter	Topic of Interest	Commenter	Topic of Interest
Ray, Aaron	A	Rhine, James	I
Ray, J. Ram and Shashi	F	Rhodes, Terry and Mary	A
Ray, Ronjini	C	Ricardo, Lillian	C
Rayder, Helene	C	Rice, Andrea	C
Raymond, Sharon	C	Rice, Chrysantha	A
Re, Peggy	A	Rice, Jerry M.	B, C
Read, John	A	Richards, Frank	A
Real de Azua, Christine	C, D, Q	Richards, Sarah	B, C
Reamy, Brian	A	Richardson, Melanie	F
Reddy, Veerender	A	Richardson, Peter	C
Reed, Dan	A	Richardson, Rhea	A
Reed, Kevin F.	C	Richman, Suzanne	C
Reeve, Becky	B, K	Richmond, Brian	A
Reeves, Ari	A	Riddell, Jennifer	B, C
Reeves, Kevin	A	Rider, Jeremy	A, M
Reforzo Arnold, Agnese	C	Ridgway, Micheal C.	C, E
Regan, Patrick, Janet, Christopher, Jennifer, & Caroline	C	Ridgway, Nancy	C, D
Reichelt, Heike	C, E	Riemer, Hans	A
Reichert, Amy	C	Rigolage, Jacques	A
Reid, Ervin	A, Q	Riley, James	A, F, G, M
Reilly Scarff, Margaret	B, I	Rinaldi, Patricia	T
Reilly, Kevin Michael	A	Rinaldi, Patricia	T
Reinhart, George R., Ph.D.	A	Rinehart, Theresa	C
Reinstein Dewey, Betsy	C	Riordan, Chris	A
Reis, Richard, PE	A	Ritchie, Brittany	A
Reis, Rose	A	Rittenberg, Susan	A
Reitzel, Todd	A	Ritter, Daniel	C
Remer, Davida	A	Rivera, Angela	A
Remer, Stew	C	Rivera, Eric	A
Remez, Shereen	C	Rivera, Fernando	A
Remuzzi, Chris	A	Rivera, Maria	A
Repp, Gary	B, C	Rivers, William	A
Requena, Martin	C	Rivkin, Goldie	D
Ressa, Richard	C	Rivkin, Steve and Mary	B
Reuben	A	Roach, Alyce	O
Reuter, Bob	A	Roach, Gary and Alyce	O
Revenis, Anthony	C, G, Q	Robbins, Alan	A
Reyes, Thelma	A	Robbins, Melinda	C
Reynolds, Michael	A	Roberts, Brent	A

Table A-5: Public Commenters and Topics of Interest (continued)

Commenter	Topic of Interest	Commenter	Topic of Interest
Roberts, Carol O.	C, E, I	Rothstein, Paul F., Thelma A. and Vanessa J.	B, C
Robertson, Dan	C	Roud, Andrew	T
Robertson, Tom	O	Rousseau, Claudia, Ph.D.	A
Robinowitz, Max	A	Rowe, Judith	A
Robinson, Barbara M. & Sherman	C	Rowe, Kevin	C
Robinson, Carlton C.	C, E	Rowles, Rick	A
Robinson, Keisha	B	Rowse, Arthur	A
Rocap, Adam	F	Roy, Jim	B, C, I
Rocap, Kristi	F, Q	Ruane, Jane	C
Rocco, Jim	C, K	Ruben, Ida	A
Roche, Maria	C	Rubin, Carol & Ken	C
Rodbell, Linda	C	Rubin, Kenneth	C
Rodgers, Brian	C, E	Rubin, Larry	K
Rodgers, William	C	Rubin, Michael	A, K
Rodrigues, Dennis	A, M	Rubinson, Kenneth	Q
Rodriguez, Reetiberto	A	Rucker, Marcia	A
Rogers, Jonathan	A	Ruddick, Colleen	A
Rojas, Noe	A	Ruff, Patrick and Natalia	A
Rolland, Jill, Ph.D	A	Rule, Allison	B, C, E, I, K
Rollenhagen, David	F	Rule, Jeff	C, E
Rollin, Josh	A	Ruppenthal, Kevin	A
Rollins, Ann	A	Rurka, Katherine	C
Roman, George	I	Rurka, Steve	C, E, Q
Roman, Sally	A	Rurka, Steven	B, I
Romans, Alana	A	Rush, Christina	C
Rood, Joanne L.	B, C, D	Russell, Charles	G
Roop, Robert	C	Russwurm, Dirk	F
Rosales, Roberto	A	Rutherford, Joyce	B
Rose, Lois C.	A	Ryan, James	A
Rose-Blass, Stacey	A	Rydland, Laura	A, P
Rosenberg, Diane	C, Q	Ryerson, Joel	A, Q
Rosenberg, Keith	A	S., Amir	C
Rosenberg, Stephen	A	Saavedra, Alejandro E.	A
Rosenthal, Josh	A, K	Sachs, Howard & Tricia	C, D, E
Rosettie, Chris	C	Sacks, Melvyn	A
Ross, Andrew	A	Sadler, Anthony	A
Ross, Matthew	A	Sage, Steven F., Ph.D., Esq.	C, Q
Ross, Nino	A	Saggese, Marty	C, E
Rothandler, Stephen	C	Saks, Robert	T
Rothstein, Paul	C	Saldana, Kelly	A

Table A-5: Public Commenters and Topics of Interest (continued)

Commenter	Topic of Interest	Commenter	Topic of Interest
Salgadoe, Andrew	A	Schroeder, Joe & Pam	C
Saltzman, David	C	Schruben, Thomas	C
Salzman, David, Ph.D.	K	Schuck, Justin	A
Salzman, Melinda C.	A, Q	Schulden, William	A
Samelson, Lawrence E.	C	Schulz, William	C
Samiy, Kathleen	C, D, F	Schulzinger, Rhoda	A
Sampas, Larry	A	Schwandes, Shaytu	A
Samson, Aleli	C	Schwartz, Benjamin	A, M
Samuel, Gisele	A	Schwartz, Dr. Ira B.	C
Sandalow, Marcie	C	Schwartz, Michael (Chevy Chase)	A
Sanders, Gregory	A	Schwartz, Michael (Gaithersburg)	C
Sandstrom, David	A	Schwarz, Joel	C, E
Sangillo, Judy	A	Schwarzwalder, James	T
Sapozhnikova, Alla	C	Schwenker, Bryan	C
Sarah	A, M	Schwinn Cohn, Elizabeth	C
Sarles, Donald	A	Sears, David W.	A
Sarris, Chuck	A	Seavey, Caleb	A
Sattler, Neil	A	Seay, Christopher	A
Saunders, Jamie	C	Sebastian, John	A
Sauro, David	A	Secunda, Rachel	A
Savage, John	C	Sedransk, Joseph	E
Sayyad, Shihadeh & Vara	C, E, Q	Seeley, Tim	C
Scanlin, William and Therese	C, D	Segatol-Islami, Zia	A
Schaberg, Sara	C	Seidel, Stephen	C, E
Schaefer, MA, Michael L.	C	Seiple, Tim	A
Schall, Amanda	C, K	Serafino, Al	B
Schauffler, William B.	A	Sera-Herdrich, Nancy M.	C, D
Scheel, Marti L.	A, M	Sessions, Stuart	C
Schleis, Daniel	A	Sethi, Satish	A
Schlesinger, Maurice	A	Sevier, Loretta	A
Schmal, Stephen	A	Seward, Bob	A
Schmidt, Nicholas	A	Shaffer, Robert J.	C
Schneeman, Kristin	B, C, E, K	Shah, Amol	A
Schneider, Andrew	A, H	Shah, Jigar	C, D, Q
Schneider, David	A, K	Shalleck, Ann	A
Schneider, Richard	A	Shalom, Amy.W	A
Schneider, Sam	A	Shane, Jeffrey N.	C
Schneider, Scott	A	Shanley, Daniel	A
Schnitzer, Ari	A	Shannon, Stewart	C, E
Schreiber, Daniel	C	Sharif, Abdul	A

Table A-5: Public Commenters and Topics of Interest (continued)

Commenter	Topic of Interest	Commenter	Topic of Interest
Sharif, Abdul	A	Simon, Madlen, AIA	A
Sharma, Nitin	A	Simon, Stuart L.	A
Sharp, Heather	A	Simon, William	C
Shattuck Flugge, Jessica	C	Singer, Josh	C
Shaul, Marnie	C, D	Singh, Manmohan	A
Shaw, Cora	C, E	Singh, Rinki	A
Shea, Shannon	A, M	Sitko, Nicole	A
Sheehan, Frank	Q	Skolnuc, Lola	A
Sheehan, Kathleen	A	Skomoroch, Peter	C
Shekar, Vinod	A	Slater, Christine	A
Shellabarger, Nan	T	Slater, Don	A
Shelton, Scott	A	Slater, Jessica	A
Shepard, Martha	A	Slater, Tina	A, F
Shepherdson, W.	C	Slettebak, Andy	A
Shepord, Ben	A	Slettebak, John	A
Sherk, Don	C	Sligo Computer Services	A
Sherman, George	D, E	Small, William	A
Sherry, Margaret	A	Smedley, Giovanni	A
Shikora, Vladka	A	Smedley, Pietro	A
Shimm, Monique	C	Smedley, Webb	A, H, I, K
Shinkman, Gillian	C	Smirniotopoulo, James	A
Shore, Stacy	A	Smith, Aaron	A, M
Short, Radley	C	Smith, Bettina	A
Shue, Robert	C	Smith, Craig	C
Shuey, Don	C	Smith, Gregory M.	C, E
Shufelt, Susan and Gordon	A	Smith, Jeffrey C	B, C, I
Shull, Frank T. IV	C	Smith, Karen K.	C
Shulman, Larry	L, M	Smith, Kean	T
Sibert, Boyd	C	Smith, Mark	C
Sibert, Sasha	T	Smith, Maynard	A
Silberman, Paul, DDS	C, E, Q	Smith, Peter	A
Silerman, Aaron M.	A	Smith, Sarah and Siegner, Wes	C
Sill, Jonathan	A	Smith, Scott	C, D
Silla, Theresa	A	Smith, Wendie	C
Sillett, Scott	A	Smyth, Gus	C
Silver, Arthur	A	Smythe, Robert	B, K
Silverberg, Beverly	A	Snow, Cindy	A, M
Silverman, Peter	C	Snowden, Karesa	A
Simmons, Lindsay	C	Snyder, Lynn	A
Simon, Alan	C	Sobel, Daniel	F

Table A-5: Public Commenters and Topics of Interest (continued)

Commenter	Topic of Interest	Commenter	Topic of Interest
Sobel, Lee	A	Stahr, William	C
Solana, Ernesto	C	Stamm, Leonard	C
Solazaro-Lopez, Blanca	A	Stanek, Jason	A
Solem, Sanna	B, C, Q	Stanish, Julie	C, D, E
Solomon, Dr. Fred	C, E	Stanley, Thomas	T
Solomon, Gloria B.	C	Stanton, Paul	C, Q, R
Solomon, Howard	A	Stapleton, Ruthy	A
Solomon, Michelle	A	Stark, Chad	B, Q
Solzarno-Lopez, Blanca	K	Starkweather, Aleen	A
Somok, Kevin J.	A	Stathoplos, Linda	A
Sonnefeld, L.Joseph	A	Staub, Leah	A, K
Soprano, Wendy	T	Stauffer, Marc	A
Sorden, Sarah	A	Steeds, David	C, E
Soreng, Nancy	A	Steimel, Jane	C
Sorensen, James	T	Stein, Alan	C
Sorrel, Lorraine	T	Stein, Lester	C
Sosin, Cliff	T	Stein, Mike	A
Sosman, Alicia B.	C	Steinberg, Clarence	K, L, Q
Sotocov, Sister Carmen M.	A, K	Steinhauser, Hubert	C
Sotwin, Brad	A	Stephan, Erica	A
Sourlis, Andrew J.	A	Stephens, Robert	A
Spaniol III, Joseph F.	C	Sterkel, Molly	A
Spann, Laura	C	Stern, William R., MD	C
Sparer, Nadine G.	B	Sterner, Maggy	A
Sparrow, Judith	C	Sternfeld, Michael	A
Speed, Chet	B, I	Sterrett, Joan	B, I
Spencer, Elizabeth	B	Stevens, Andrea	C, Q
Spencer, John	C	Stevens, Anita	A
Spiegel, Aila	A	Stewart, Phil	C, K
Spiegel, Taru	A	Stewart, Susan	A
Spielberg, Anne	F	Stewart, Zachary	C
Spielberg, Debbie	F	Stickle, Marcie	A, Q
Spinrad, Naomi	C, D, E	Stigile, Arthur	A, H, Q
Springer, Theodora	C	Stillwell, James	A
Squier, Mark	C	Stingley, Patrick	B, C, I
Sribarra, Kartik	A	Stinson, David B.	F, K
Srinivas, Allison Barra	A	Stinson, John	A
Srisilapanan, Darunee	A	Stinson, Susan	A
St. Thomas, Jonathan B.	F	Stith, Gary	A
Stahlbush, Robert	A	Stoddard, Robert and Barbra	C

Table A-5: Public Commenters and Topics of Interest (continued)

Commenter	Topic of Interest	Commenter	Topic of Interest
Stolka, Kurt	A, D, R	Tate, Maleda	B
Stone, Lori	A	Taylor, Betsy	F
Stone, Paula	C, D	Taylor, Denise	C
Stopak-Mathis, Tali	C	Taylor, Jerry	Q
Strain, Sally C.	C	Taylor, Martina and Keene	C
Strauss, Sharon	A	Taylor, Stephen	B, C, D
Stregevsky, Paul Franklin	A	Taylor, Theresa	B, C, I
Strein, William	A	Teagle, Eliot G.	A, Q
Strickland, Ken	H	Tehan, Timothy	C
Stromberg, Edwin	A	Tejada, Veronica	A
Stroud, Lindsay	C	Telep, Candace	C
Stuesse, Sherrry	A	Telesco, John	A, M
Su, Chen-Wu	A	Tender, Neil	C, Q
Suddleson, Michele	A	Teng, Barbara	C
Sugarman, Kate	A	Tennyson, E.L., PE	A, H, K
Sugarman, Keith	A, G	Tennyson, Ed	A
Sugarman, MD, Kate	A	Teofilo, Erica	T
Suite II, Bill	A	Tercyak	C
Sullivan, Andy	A	Terrell, April	A
Sullivan, Katherine W.	B, I	Teslik, W. Randolph and Jane	C
Sullivan, Matthew K.	E, I, Q	Thibeau, Karen	C
Sullivan, R.	A	Thomas, Adam	A
Sumner, Anne E.	C	Thomas, Ann L.	A
Sundin, Rebekah	C	Thomas, John	A
Sussman, Frances, Ph.D.	B, F, I, Q	Thomas, Lauren	A
Sutter, Allan	T	Thomas, Theresa	K, S
Svec, Michael	C	Thomen, Harold	A
Swagart Jr., John M.	C	Thompson, Alan and Diane	C
Swanson, Tom	C, D, E, Q	Thompson, Bruce and Kathy	C
Swanson, Tom	B, E	Thompson, Dean	C
Sweeney, Kristine	C	Thompson, Megan	A
Sweeney, Molly E.	C	Thompson, Robert	A
Sweet, Evelyn	C	Thompson, Shawn	A
Sykes, Dina	A, Q	Thorington, Caroline	C
Sznajder, Joanna & Roman	A	Thornton, Brian	A
Taitano, Vicki King	A	Thrift, Jesse	Q
Talbot, Barbara	C	Throckmorton, Judy	C
Talbott, Jay	C	Thuyacontha, K.	A
Talbott, John	C	Tievsh, Robert S.	A
Talone, John R.	F	Tillett, Martin	A

Table A-5: Public Commenters and Topics of Interest (continued)

Commenter	Topic of Interest	Commenter	Topic of Interest
Tingler, Erica	C	Van Heuvelen, Ben	C
Tirocke, Jessica	A	Van Houten, Ted	A
Tirpak, Dennis	C	Van Hovell, Floris and Polly	C
Tobin, George	A	Van Metter, Kristen	A, M
Tobin, Mary	A	Van Mourik, Dave	A
Toomer, Earlette	A	Van Mourik, Jaime	A
Toro, Luz E.	A	Van Roden, Victoria L.	A
Torres, Norma	A	VanDeWeghe, Meg	C
Torro, Pamela	A	VanDuren, Mau	A
Touw, Steve	T	Vanzego, Raymond J.	A, Q
Townsend, Holly	C, E	Varela, Ana	A
Tracy, Karen	A	Vary, Elizabeth	D
Trangsrud, John	A, M	Vary, Elizabeth and George	B, C, I
Trapmann, William	A	Vary, George	B, I, K
Traxler, Herbert	A	Veras, Yanira	A
Treibitz, Janelle	A, K	Verdonk, Ron	A
Trimble, David	C	Veremis, John	A
Troccoli, Kenneth and Karen	C	Verner, Douglas	A
Trujillo, Lalo	A	Vest, Charles T.	B, F
Truong, Tri	C	Vest, Gilberte S.	F
Truppner, Travis	C	Villatoro, Berta	A
Tschirgi, Vali M.	C	Viloria, Andrew	A
Tsigas, Marinos	A	Vincenzo	A
Tso, Judy	B	Virnich, J.T.	A
Tso, Judy	B, C, E, K	Virsilas, Terra	A
Tsui, Flora Hsiu-chen	C, E, Q	Vita, Lisa K. & Frank K.	C, E
Tuchman, Raymond	B, D, I	Vitiello, Benedetto	C, K
Tucker, Jonathan	B, Q	Vollmer, Deborah A.	C, E
Tucker, Laura	A	von Fleckenstein, Fritz	A
Tulip, Peter	A	Vorisek, Lauren	A
Tully, Mercedes	C	Vorisek, Nita	A
Tully, Sunnie	C	Wachino, Vikki	C
Tupper, Craig	A	Wadyka, Jr., Steven J.	C
Tutwiler, M. Ann	A	Wagithuku, Donya	A
Ucko, Aaron	A	Wagle, Kusum	C
Umamaheswaran, N.T.	A, Q	Wagner, Judith	A
Urofsky, Melissa	C, Q	Wah, Michael	A
Uza, Gabriella	C	Wahiba, Bonnie	A
Vaccaro, Tanya	T	Wahl, Alice	A
van der Cammen, Karin	C	Walker, Charmayne	A

Table A-5: Public Commenters and Topics of Interest (continued)

Commenter	Topic of Interest	Commenter	Topic of Interest
Walker, Elinor	A	Weir, Dennis	F
Walker, Jelila	C	Weiss, Catherine	C
Walker, Jeremy	C	Weiss, Chris	C
Walker, Karen	C	Weiss, Claire	C
Walker, Rhonda	B, I	Weiss, David	B, C, H
Wall, Joanne F., Esq.	C	Weiss, Kenneth D.	A
Wallach, Naor	T	Weiss, Brendan M., M.D.	C
Wallerstedt, John	C, E	Weiss, Ruth	B, I
Walling, Kevin	A	Weisz, David A.	C
Walser, Judy	A	Weitzel, Daniel P.	I
Walsh, Deirdre and Howard	C	Wele, Anne	A
Walsh, Marjorie G.	B, I	Wellins, Nancy	A
Walsh, Sheila	A	Wells, Jim	C
Walsh, Thomas	C	Wells, Tryon	C, Q
Walsh, William J.	B, C, I	Welna, Jane	A
Walton, Thomas E.	C	Wessel, Barret	A
Walton, Tim	A	West, Becky	C, Q
Waltz Dallaire, Christine	C	West, David	A, M
Ward, Alan	C, D	West, Jay	C
Ward, Mariette	A	West, Joy C.	B, I, K, L
Ward, Shawn	A	Western, Mark A.	C
Warnock, Annette	B, C, Q	Westover, Charles	A
Warnock, John	B, I, T	Westreich, Sabena R.	A
Waroich, M.J.	A	Wetmore, John Z.	A
Warren, Dorothy Joan	A	Wheeland, Daniel	A
Wassermann, Sophia	A	Wheeland, Paula	A
Waters, Jerry and Janice	C	Whelpley, Joshua	A
Watkins, Luke	A	Whetzel, James	B, I, K, Q
Watson, Sarah	C	Whidden, Brad	A
Wattenberg, Alicia	A	White, Andrew	B, C, D, K, Q
Way, Stanley H.	C	White, Corinne	C
Weathersby, Kathryn	C	White, Juanita	A, Q
Webb, Candace	A	White, Timothy S.	A
Webb, Carol	C	White, Victoria	A
Webb, Christian	A	Whitehead, Charles E.	C
Webb, David	A	Whitehead, Kerry	B, I
Webber, Gary L.	A	Whitfield, Crystal	A
Weeks, Brian	A	Whitman, Deborah	F
Weinstein, Jeff	A	Whitty, John	A
Weinstein, Paul, Jr.	A	Whybrew, Michael	A

Table A-5: Public Commenters and Topics of Interest (continued)

Commenter	Topic of Interest	Commenter	Topic of Interest
Wicklund, Bonnie	A	Wolf, Matthew	C
Wielobob, Allison	A	Wolf, Mier	C, D, E
Wigand, Martin	B, E, I, Q	Wolfson, Marc W.	C
Wild, Ann	C, D	Wong, Doris C.	C
Wilensky, Sara	C, D	Wood, Bruce	A
Wiles, Janice	A	Wood, Hannah	A
Wilk, Cavan	A	Wood, Kent	C
Wilkins, Lindsay	C	Wood, Lizzie	C
Wilkins, Victoria	A	Wood, Sebastian	C
Wilks, Kathleen	C	Wooden, Amy	C, Q
Wilks, Madeline	C	Wooden, Ralph	A
Williams, Bess	A	Woodman, Marjorie	C, E, Q
Williams, Darryle T.	A	Woods, Lisa	C
Williams, Kirsten	C	Woodward, James	C
Williams, Lynda	C, K, L	Woody, Jesse	A
Williams, Peggy Sue	A	Workman, Anita	A
Williams, Rebecca	C	Worthington, Aileen	C
Williams, Ruth J. and Kate	A	Wrigley, Will	A
Williams, Stephanie	T	Wulff, Robert	A, K, M
Williams, Sylvie	A	Wyeth, George	A
Williamson, Matthew	C	Wynn, Sherry	T
Willig, Sharon	C, D, E	Wynne, Suzan	A
Willis, F. Michael	A	Yakovenko, Victor	A
Willis, Floyd and Carolyn	C, D, K	Yang, Hong	A
Willmott, Sam	C	Yasmer, John	A
Wilmot, Laurie	A	Yassin, John, MD	A
Wilson, Ben	B, Q	Yeomans, Ian	C
Wilson, Lisa	F	Yianilos, Niki	C
Wilson, Scott	C	Yockey, Thomas M. and Lynne A.	C
Wilson, William	A	Yonkos, James	A
Winarsky, Lew	A	Yost, Amber	T
Winarsky, Susan	A	Youker, Bob	J
Winer, David	C	Young, Amy	C
Winn	C	Young, Dawne	A, Q
Withrow, Mitzi	A, Q	Young, Esq., Amy	C
Witmer, Chuck	A	Young, Paul A. and Peggy L.	C
Witt, Clara J	C	Yu, William	A
Woerner, Bryan	A	Yue, Kang	F
Wojtacha, Trent	A, T	Zaborski, Marcey A.	C
Wolf, Cathryn	C	Zahn, T.	C

Table A-5: Public Commenters and Topics of Interest (continued)

Commenter	Topic of Interest	Commenter	Topic of Interest
Zanoff, Fred	T	Zipin, Philip B., Esq	A
Zartman, Eleanor	C	Zolotukhina, Elizabeth	C
Zartman, Eugene R., CPA	C, D	Zubkovsky, Leonid	A
Zassenhaus, Harold	C	Zubrzycki, Kathleen	T
Zbar, Frederick S	B, C, I	Zuccaro, Tony	C
Zeiler, Jessica	A	Zuckerman, Eric	C
Zhu, Paul	C	Zuluaga, Juan Eduardo	C
Zimmerman, Mark	A	Zuniga, Cecilia	A
Zipin, Jessica	A	Zweck, John	C