



Area Advisory Committee Three
Meeting #8
Monday, June 8, 2015
Ingleside at King Farm
701 King Farm Boulevard
Rockville, MD 20850

Members

Marcia Bond	Timothy McDonald
Kevin Johnson	Arlene Robinson
Alan Kaplan	Fred Samadani
Marilyn Leist	Gail Sherman
Martin Mankowski	Mel Willis

Apologies

Gerald Calderone	C. Scott Maravilla
------------------	--------------------

Staff

Project Manager – Rick Kiegel	City of Rockville – Craig Simoneau, Katie Mencarini
Facilitator – Traceé Strum-Gilliam	Montgomery County DOT – Joana Conklin
Station Architect – Kyle Kramer	WMATA - Robin McElhenny-Smith, Derek Crider
Traffic Engineer – Kevin Permisohn	M-NCPPC - Nkosi Yearwood
Segment Engineer – Allison Berkheimer	Project Staff – Kyle Nembhard
Engineering Team - Michelle Lockhart	Public Involvement Task Lead – Crystal Saunders
Logistics Staff – Lineta Duren	

General Public

Steve Kornheim

Welcome and Introductions

Traceé Strum-Gilliam (Facilitator) welcomed the AAC Three members to the final meeting and explained that the group would not be disbanded at the end of this stage of the project but that the group would likely re-convene at a later stage of the project. i.e. construction

She began the meeting by asking all attendees to introduce themselves and mention one thing that they enjoyed and or learned during the process, including the project staff.

Members of AAC Three expressed the following as it related to what they learned or liked about the process over the past year:

- Working with professionals

- Passion and commitment from all parties
- Expert input on various aspects of the project
- Project graphics
- The team listened attentively and respectfully regardless of the response
- Accommodating space
- Tracee's facilitation
- Getting to know the group, learning about the concerns of members and the actual community/neighborhood
- Facts and figures of King Farm
- Meeting new people
- Hearing various points of views and being in the middle of those discussions
- Stormwater management
- Learning how to form similar advisory committees for the Montgomery County Rapid Transit System (RTS) projects
- Effectiveness of the group in shaping the project
- Communicating more effectively with the public
- Participating in the process
- Interaction with various members and the different viewpoints
- Hearing everyone's comments and being able to incorporate some of these comments into the outcome of the project

One member requested that some time be set aside during the meeting for any final questions to be asked of the project team.

Project Status

Project Schedule

Rick Kiegel (MTA Project Manager) updated the team on the project schedule and noted that the final dates have not changed.

Environmental Document/Public Hearing

The MTA was delayed in receiving comments from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) on the Environmental Assessment (EA) document and needs time to review and address their comments. With this delay, the team will delay the Public Hearing until the Fall 2015 timeframe. At that time, the plan is for the EA to have the 30% design plans that we have discussed in these meetings. Rick estimated that the team should still be able to stay close to the schedule and reach its construction target of 2018 and opening day by 2020 pending funding availability.

Updated Costs/Funding/Funding Source

A question was raised about project funding. Rick noted that the project is still fully funded through final design and right-of-way acquisition allowing the project to stay on the current schedule through 2018. He noted that as of right now, there is no funding allocated for

construction and the source of funding still needs to be identified in order to meet the construction schedule. Rick stated that if the team seeks to get federal funding for the project, it will have to go through the FTA process with the goal of obtaining a full funding grant agreement (FFGA). The FFGA process dictates when the funding becomes available for construction.

One person asked, what incentive does FTA have to fund the project? Rick explained that projects across the country compete with each other and are evaluated by FTA based on a number of different criteria.

One member requested that Rick's summary be submitted in written form and Traceé indicated that this discussion will be captured in the meeting summary.

Construction Delivery Method

Rick explained that there are various methods for construction delivery, Design Build, Design Build Operate Maintain (DBOM), and Public-Private Partnership (P3) (citing the Purple Line P3 as an example). He explained that P3's work like a mortgage with the private entities financing the project expecting in return payments for operating the system provided that the service is being delivered as agreed as they are taking on the risk while they operate it. Rick also explained the various consequences that if the concessionaire fails to operate and deliver the service as agreed upon, they could be fined or not receive a payment. So benefits of a P3 are not only financed based but operationally based as the concessionaire has a large stake in making sure the facility is kept clean, and operates as scheduled.

Rick then explained the traditional Design, Bid, Build method is when the project is advanced all the way through final design then put out for bid. Various contractors submit bids for the project, then MTA selects the lowest bid and that contractor builds the project.

Rick also discussed how the Design Build, method works. 30% design plans are put out for bid to teams comprised of designers and contractors. Winning teams are usually selected through a combination score of technical proposal and price. The winning team finishes the design from 30% and builds the project. He noted that this method is slightly faster than design, bid, build so that some work can get started while the design is being finalized for other aspects of the project.

Rick noted that there are other methods that essentially work as a combination of the three previously described. He finally mentioned that the team has not decided how the project will be delivered but the project schedule is based on traditional Design, Bid, Build.

Value Engineering

Purpose and Findings

Allison Scott Berkheimer (Segment Engineer) summarized the purpose of the Value Engineering study stating that engineers who were not involved in the CCT design provided an independent review of the project and looked for ways to make the CCT more cost effective. Allison noted the Project Team presented the nuances of the project then a week-long value

engineering workshop was held. The Value Engineering team issued a report to MTA and the Project Team took a month to determine which recommendations to study further and/or carry forward.

Rick emphasized how the Value Engineering team was completely independent of the CCT team in order to look at the project with an unbiased perspective. He noted how they questioned everything in the plans.

A question about the conclusion of the Value Engineering study was raised however Allison explained that the information was not available yet because it was reviewed by discipline and needed to be compiled. Allison and Kyle will discuss some of the items that have been adopted through that process.

One member asked if the Value Engineering team was given a list of comments from the AAC meetings and its members. Rick noted that no formal list was provided but the Value Engineering team was made aware of the concerns of AACs during the project team's presentation.

Transitway Width

Allison shared a graphic illustrating the typical cross-section of King Farm Boulevard and noted that throughout the project, the transitway was narrowed from 28 feet to 26 feet. For King Farm Boulevard, each lane was narrowed from 14 feet to 13 feet making the tree/planting area a foot wider on each side leading to more green space. Rick added that the new design has positive benefits due to less impervious area.

Station Lengths

Kyle Kramer (Stations Architect) referenced the last graphic in the handout showing the East Gaither Station. He noted that the Value Engineering Study recommended reducing the length of all the stations to 125 feet. He also noted that the initial construction length of the East Gaither Station was reduced to 65 feet but additional space will be left to accommodate future expansion.

Traceé highlighted how this change directly addresses one of the concerns that the group raised about the size of the East Gaither Station based on its low projected ridership. In previous meetings, members observed that the original proposed station length was too long and requested that the team consider reducing the size of the station. When asked about the West Gaither Station's length, Kyle explained that West Gaither station will still hold to a length of 125 feet based on the higher projected ridership at this station location.

Rick also noted that where the drawing shows the reduced platform length at the East Gaither Station, the CCT plans to retain green space between the walkway and transit lanes where the drawing shows additional impervious surface.

One member asked whether or not the requested ridership figures for East Gaither Station had been shared and the project team indicated that it had not been made available yet.

Kyle also discussed the Shady Grove Metro Station's proposed layout. He explained how the team has been working with the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) on the design. Kyle noted that the yellow area depicted in the map is not proposed to be colored/painted during construction but is only shown for illustrative purposes on the map. Kyle also explained the function and reason for the CCT alighting bays and how they function in addition to the CCT boarding platform. He also noted how the alighting bays are located near the proposed secondary station access area.

A question was raised about the proposed lane and if it is being shared with RideOn buses. Additionally, there were questions about how the community shuttles will be affected by this re-configuration. The team noted that these shuttles will be accommodated in the local bus area and Kiss and Ride. Kyle noted that the local bus bay area also serves RideOn and Metrobus vehicles. Kyle explained that the bus loop will be re-configured to physically separate the CCT from local buses and shuttles.

A concern was raised about the design and implications for pedestrian safety. Additionally it was asked how pedestrian safety would be addressed. Kyle explained that fencing would be erected to channel pedestrians to designated pedestrian crossings in an effort to promote pedestrian safety.

It was observed that the plan is not consistent with the new proposed development at the CarMax site. Rick explained that the plan is to move the existing CarMax entrance mid-block and allow for right-in/right-out turning movements.

One member asked about the traffic flows in and out of the Park and Ride lot. It was noted that the only left turn movement in the future proposal will be from the Metro Access Road to the maintenance area. It was also questioned if a left turn would be warranted under that scenario.

A question about the number of spaces available was raised and it was noted that 922 spaces are currently available in this lot and all spaces will be retained in the final configuration. Rick emphasized that WMATA has been very active in making their priorities known especially with respect to pedestrian safety and parking.

One member asked WMATA if it was ok with one access point for 922 cars. **Robin McElhenny-Smith** (WMATA) explained how WMATA can't make that final determination until they see the traffic results. The member cited that WMATA required two entrances for other, smaller facilities in the past. It was asked if staff from the WMATA Office of Parking saw the CCT design plans. Robin explained that staff has seen the plans and are satisfied with what was proposed. Again, the model results will ultimately dictate what happens.

WMATA – Shady Grove Presentation

Robin and **Derek Crider** presented on the *Shady Grove Station Capacity Study* and noted the intent of the study is to determine how to best mitigate the crowding experienced at the station. This presentation was the request of AAC Three for WMATA to provide a presentation and update regarding the Shady Grove Metrorail station.

The purpose of the presentation was to educate AAC Three on the current conditions experienced at the Shady Grove Metrorail station as it relates to pedestrian flows and crowding. It was also to demonstrate how WMATA recognizes the increasing challenges of moving people through the facility and the need to address this challenge through various design options that would provide additional entrances to both the overall station facility as well as the station platform. The presentation included a simulation of the AM and PM pedestrian flows, crowding, preliminary design alternatives and outputs of the simulations (heat maps).

During the presentation, Robin noted that based on the model, there was an 18% increase in boardings in 2020 with the CCT. Derek noted that in 2030, the majority of foot traffic is headed to the west lot where the CCT is also located. It was asked if the majority of riders headed to the west entrance is due to the CCT and Derek indicated that the data suggests that assumption.

The simulation demonstrated significant crowding on the platform level of the Shady Grove Metro station as trains arrived in the PM peak. Based on the simulation for the PM peak scenario; passengers leaving the train were all crowded around the one escalator/staircase which leads to the mezzanine on the lower level. The simulation also demonstrated that crowding was less of an issue at the mezzanine level due to the inherent controlled nature of escalator/staircase. Future projections showed even worse crowding at the platform level.

For the AM Peak scenario, less crowding was due to the staggered nature of arriving passengers bound for Washington, D.C.

Derek noted that the AM level of service in 2013 has 2% of people experiencing level of service F. Derek also noted that the PM level of service in 2013 has 50% of people experiencing level of service F on the platform.

It was asked if the analysis takes into account train lengths. Derek noted that in the 2030 scenarios, the study assumed that there was no termination at the Grosvenor station and all 8-car trains operated through to Shady Grove.

Another AAC member asked if concurrent demands of egress and ingress demand (i.e. sporting event downtown during the PM peak) were taken into account. Derek noted that the team observed higher PM peak access as the result of CCT. Expansion of the platform length was also raised as a possibility. Robin noted that the simulation includes the flows in both directions and that the platform cannot be lengthened.

It was asked when 8-car trains with no termination at Grosvenor would operate through to Shady Grove. Robin estimated that by 2030 8-car trains would be operating to Shady Grove with no termination at Grosvenor.

Robin noted that the Shady Grove Metro Station improvement project is not in WMATA's CIP program and it is not known how this project would be funded. It was also noted that this project is not included in the CCT budget. Robin explained how the need for this project is here now and especially with the addition of the CCT.

Robin explained how WMATA intends to have joint development at the Shady Grove Metro station site however she added that no timeframe is currently tied to these plans. Robin noted that office development would help to draw more people to Shady Grove, alighting at the station as opposed to the current patterns which is all “on” in the AM and all “off” in the PM. It was asked if the Derwood development was included in this study. Robin noted that this was accounted for in all scenarios.

Robin (in response to a question) elaborated on the “open well stair case” option and how the open well is an existing feature of the station. As a low cost alternative, stairs can be added in that opening to supplement the existing escalator/staircase with the intent of spreading out passengers who are disembarking from the train. Derek noted through the presentation that there is little improvement in the level of service by implementing the open well staircase option in 2020.

One member asked how CCT would affect WMATA’s decision to move forward with this project. Robin explained how this would be a partnership with WMATA and MTA and local jurisdictions.

It was asked if this will have an impact on MTA’s decision to move forward with CCT. Rick explained the challenge of getting passengers off the platform is where the actual problem lies as opposed to discharging passengers at the station.

Finally, -it was asked how long it would take to build option 3C. Robin says the estimated schedule is roughly 24 months but this estimate was used for cost estimation purposes. The estimated date of completion is 2025.

Robin noted that the final report for the study will be uploaded to the WMATA website in the near future.

Station Naming

Traceé asked the group for proposed station names based on the MTA station naming criteria that was shared at the March 9th AAC Three meeting.

Station name suggestions for East Gaither included:

- King Farm
- King Farm – Pleasant Drive
- Bailey’s Common
- King Farm Village

Station name suggestions for West Gaither included:

- Piccard
- King Farm – Piccard
- Irvington

One member noted that the names of the streets in King Farm were named after the different farms on the site, livestock and whatever relevant history associated with the original site prior to development.

General Discussion/Closing

Traceé discussed the number of changes as a result of the AAC process with AAC Three. Tracee noted that the group only lost one member throughout the year.

Allison then outlined the changes made over the course of the project as a result of the AAC process and input from the committee members. The group was provided with a list of changes which highlighted the following based on input from AAC Three:

- Typical Section
- Median Closures
- Pedestrian Access North to South
- Canopy
- Station Section
- Station Area Length
- Platform Size
- Bump Outs
- Parking Impacts
- Traffic/Signal Operations

It was asked if the shorter platform length at East Gaither would have an effect on Crestfield Drive - specifically, would it still need to be closed. It was clarified that the shortened station has no effect on the proposal to close Crestfield Drive.

Traceé thanked all the members for allowing her to serve as the facilitator, providing feedback and being open to the process. She also re-emphasized that the group is not disbanded and the group will get notification when the Environmental Assessment is ready for public review. She also assured the group that they will be informed when the hearing date/location has been selected. When asked about the public hearing location, Traceé noted that it is proposed to be held at the Universities of Shady Grove.

She emphasized that it is each member's responsibility to disseminate information to their communities. Traceé also suggested that if they hear misinformation, to speak up and correct that person politely.

Rick added that he observed a lot of emotion and misinformation early on during the AAC process and noted his appreciation for the way the process has helped to clarify the intent of the project, clarify facts and work towards productive conversations.

Craig Simoneau (City of Rockville) noted his appreciation for the process and how the members participated, regardless of their opinions on the project, and they did not back out of the process.

One member asked if the team is assuming that the roadway east of Ingleside will be extended to Piccard Drive from King Farm Boulevard. Craig says that the City of Rockville is not planning to build it. One member noted that this extension is not in the Ingleside phase 2 plan and it was asked who the appropriate person is that this issue should be raised. The preference is for the road not to go through. The City of Rockville says they can review the site plan to clarify this.

The meeting adjourned at 8:26 PM

###