Re: Capital Crescent Trail Crossing at Little Falls Parkway

Dear Mr. Tsai,

I am writing on behalf of the Washington Area Bicyclist Association (“WABA”), our 1,500 Montgomery County members and the thousands of other Montgomery County residents who have supported actions by WABA in the recent past. WABA wishes to comment on the plans for a revised crossing of Little Falls Parkway by the Capital Crescent Trail.

The Capital Crescent Trail is one of the most widely used trails in the DC area, and as such is of great importance to the region. The placement of a temporary narrowing of the Parkway traffic lanes in the wake of the death of 81 year old bicyclist Ned Gaylin at this crossing was an appropriate and necessary measure. We applaud Montgomery Parks for taking swift action to protect trail users as well as undertaking a thorough study of alternatives for a permanent, safe solution for this crossing.

Having reviewed the potential alternatives presented by Montgomery Parks at a recent public meeting on June 13, 2018, We feel that any alternative chosen must absolutely maintain the road diet currently in place, leaving no more than one through traffic lane on the Parkway in each direction. Restoring the Parkway to its former configuration of two lanes in each direction would also restore the dangerous nature of this crossing possibly leading to more crashes and even fatalities.

Keeping in place the temporary road diet on Little Falls is also important given the County’s commitment to Vision Zero, the goal to end traffic fatalities and serious injuries. Restoring the road to four lanes of car traffic would undermine that commitment. Further, the Parks Department is currently undertaking an audit of all trail crossings in the County. The solution that Parks chooses here should be a prototype for improving similar crossings County-wide. You can set a wholly positive precedent by leaving the road diet on Little Falls in place.
The need to maintain this road diet would exclude alternatives 1, 2, 3 and 10 and we strongly oppose all of those alternatives. It is likely that bridge and tunnel alternatives (6 and 7) would be cost prohibitive and are therefore unlikely to be chosen, though we note that if resources were not at all constrained those alternatives would provide enhanced safety for trail users.

Of the remaining alternatives (4, 5, 8, 9, 11 and 12), we feel they are all acceptable and provide a safe access for trail users through the crossing. Montgomery Parks should choose among those alternatives to provide the most cost efficient and safe solution.

Please contact Peter Gray at peter@waba.org or 202-518-0524 x231 to follow up. Thank you for considering our comments,

Best Regards,

Greg Billing
Executive Director