



Memorandum:

To: Cate McDonald, Clerk, Town of Brookeville
From: Jim Klein, Cara Smith, L/KLA
Cc:
Date: May 21, 2021
Subject: Brookeville Comprehensive Plan Update
(Transportation) 05/12/21 Public Meeting #1 Notes

1. **Meeting details** - Zoom virtual meeting; 7 - 8:30 PM on Wednesday, May 12th
2. **Discussion topics** (prompted by polling images exercise and overlay sketches)-
 - a. Sidewalks/pedestrian safety -
 - I. Pedestrians must use the road shoulders, as there are few sidewalks in town. Safety of all citizens should be considered throughout town.
 - II. If sidewalks connect to the southern end (Georgia Ave.), is there enough room to add shoulders and sidewalks? L/KLA will need to look at ROW available, but most likely this area would also include curb and gutter.
 - III. Where are people walking? There is little access from the west side (W. Market/Georgia Ave.) and nowhere to go, unlike south of Town where most walking takes place. L/KLA will need to review all existing pedestrian destinations, as well as possible future destinations.
 - IV. Where will traffic be strongest? It was suggested that traffic volumes from west to east will remain strong, despite the reduced north-south traffic due to the Bypass.
 - b. Traffic calming design function and aesthetics -
 - I. The Town will rely on L/KLA to advise on the appropriate traffic calming devices to use at each priority area, given traffic volumes, ROW, visibility at curves, etc. Aesthetics of the traffic calming devices will need to stay within the context of the Town's historic setting and be appropriate to the character areas (Gateway, Transition, In Town, etc.)
 - II. L/KLA to follow up and confirm the 900 cars through town metric. L/KLA will use projected traffic figures to inform design of traffic calming features. (*See attached table from Montgomery County Staff Report, 2016*)
 - c. "Less is more" approach to traffic calming devices -
 - I. Key words for approach to traffic calming and safety: "simplicity," "consistency," and "bring back nature."
 - II. Use subtle methods, such as example of trees lining the corridor, to influence driver behavior rather than optical speed bars (emphasis on "effective, but subliminal").

- III. Avoid suburban appearance.
 - IV. Keep a simple palette of materials not only for aesthetics but for affordability/practicality.
- d. Historic setting -
- I. Consider what is in the context of the historic town (e.g., splitter islands may not work in a historic setting).
 - II. Use materials that are appropriate and already existing in town.
 - III. Brookeville never had macadam streets.
 - IV. Consider brick sidewalks.
 - V. L/KLA will incorporate review of National Register nomination forms, especially significance statement, and the initial historical review of town street repaving project to ascertain character defining features/setting of District.
- e. Intersection of High/Water/Market Streets -
- I. For Town consideration: If the intersection alignment is adjusted at Water St./High Street/Market St.; should the Town hold off on surfacing improvements to Water St.?
 - II. Roundabout - Would it slow folks traveling down hill on E Market St?
 - 1. Consider the historic context - likely would not be appropriate historically.
 - III. Four-way stop - Consider adding four-way stops at the intersections of High/Water/Market and North/South/E Market.
 - IV. Question about intersection turning radii at High/Water/Market and if they could be much tighter with the reduced traffic volumes (*yes, EMS/Fire trucks become the design factor, as most truck traffic will use bypass, 25' radius should satisfy*)
- f. Curbs -
- I. Brookeville “suffers from bad curbs.” Existing curbs in town are in various states of decline, and materials vary from concrete, asphalt, and stone.
 - II. Consider “nice brick sidewalks and curbs.”
 - III. E Market St. has failing asphalt curbs.
 - IV. Question about speed humps and potential effect on nearby stone curbs; need to preserve original stone curbs.
 - V. If materials are consistent, how will the design of curbs differ throughout Town? There may be some variability in curbs. (May need curb and gutter in some locations but not others.)
 - VI. What does a “header curb” look like? More visual examples will be provided at the next workshop in June.
 - VII. Is there room for green space/vegetation between curbs?
3. Next steps -
- b. Questionnaire to close on May 19th COB. Results to be shared on project web page.

- c. Schedule Community Planning Workshop #2 - Suggest June 15th - 17th (Format TBD - depending on Montgomery County guidance on in-person, indoor meetings in June.)
- d. Invite County, MDOT, other key individuals who should be included in the meetings.
- e. L/KLA will prepare concepts for discussion during the next public workshop.

ATTACHMENT 1

The table below is from “MD97 Brookeville Bypass, Mandatory Referral No. 2016030¹” prepared by Montgomery County in 2016 as the basis for the County’s approval, with conditions, of the bypass project. Attachment 10 contains the full traffic capacity analysis. The table below summarizes the results showing the shift in forecasted volumes to the Bypass (13,025) from High Street (down to 900) and Market Street (down to 600) with current volumes on the left in vehicles per day.

Table 1: Traffic Forecasts

Traffic Volumes (vehicles per day) Road Name	Existing Traffic Volume	Forecast 2040 Volume for No- Build Condition	Forecast 2040 Volume for Alt 7M Adjusted (Proposed Project)	Forecast 2040 Volume for Alt 8B Adjusted (Long Bridge Alternative)
High Street	10,400	13,725	900 (a 93% reduction)	1,225 (a 91% reduction)
Market Street (between High Street and Georgia Avenue)	10,275	13,575	600 (a 96% reduction)	925 (a 93% reduction)
MD97 Bypass (south of Brookeville Road)	0	0	13,025	12,700

1

https://montgomeryplanningboard.org/agenda/2016/documents/MD97BrookevilleBypassMandatoryReferral2016030_staffreport.pdf