

**College Gardens Park SWM and Park Improvements
Task Force Meeting #5
3:00 PM, May 22, 2006, at City Hall**

Call to Order/ Introductions:

- Marylou Berg began the meeting by introducing herself and asking each person to do the same. An attendance sheet was passed around and is included as an attachment to the minutes.
- Marylou handed out a simple agenda to try to establish a timeframe for the meeting.
- Mark Pierzchala asked for a brief discussion on the representation, discussion, and decision-making at the meeting. It was agreed that the meeting was for the purpose of presenting facts and trying to eliminate or prioritize options. All those present at the meeting were free to speak freely. It was also agreed that if issues arose that were outside the scope of the meeting or could not be handled in the time allowed they would be handled at another time.
- Marylou handed out a preliminary tabulation of the citizen survey and opened a discussion of the results. The eighteen project elements were ranked based on survey responses with a weighted ranking. The final results will be distributed after Marylou can add in data for write-in responses.
- Craig Simoneau gave a short background of the process, primarily since CPJ's involvement this year. Craig reinforced that CPJ's work thus far was mostly fact-finding and that the conceptual designs shown were for discussion and to try to show the opportunities and constraints of the different locations and designs.
- Tim Schueler, Project Engineer for CPJ, gave a short intro of CPJ's role and the fieldwork that had been done by CPJ including field and bathymetric survey, a natural resource inventory, stream evaluation, and preliminary wetland investigations.
- Jim Reschovsky asked if any further investigation was made into retrofitting the existing pond at the Gude Office Park. Tim indicated that CPJ had made some assumptions and included the information in their storm models but that no specific investigations were made of whether that structure could be modified. A brief discussion was held on the City's ability to require or assist a private owner financially with SWM retrofits.
- Tim further discussed the findings of the natural resource inventory and the stream evaluation. Tim indicated that the stream was showing stresses normal to an urban environment, primarily streambank erosion from continued lateral and cross sectional adjustment.
- Mark asked how our findings compared to the Center for Watershed Protection (CWP) study in 2001. Tim indicated that CWP's study was much larger in area therefore the detail for area adjacent to the Princeton Place outfall was not adequate. CWP's cross-sections are located well downstream from College Gardens. However, the baseline information such as pebble counts and erosion indexes are very similar. Tim also stated that the location of bedrock and clay lenses was holding the stream in check in many places; otherwise the area may look much worse.
- Tim introduced the first area under consideration deemed Area A. Area A is located south of Princeton Place and to east of the stream. Two options were conceptually explored. The premise behind concept A1 was to divert stormwater from the 54" main trunk storm sewer into a pond or other BMP. Based on existing elevations however the only way to get adequate fall would be to dig back past the existing pond to tie in.

Therefore this option was considered impractical. Concept A2, instead of trying into the main trunk instead relied on input from the storm system from Auburn and Baylor Avenues. Concept A2 would treat approximately 13.5 acres and have a Limits of Disturbance of ~25,000 sq. ft. One hundred percent of the water quality and water quantity targets could be treated in this area. The other benefit of this option was that there would be no impact on the park area for this treatment. Constraints included a high expense to benefit ratio, the impact to a large mature forested area, permitting issues, possible bedrock and water table restraints, and maintenance issues.

- Tim described the second area considered, Area C, was the north end of the park, in the vicinity of the infield. This area was discussed prior to Area B due to the similarity of issues with area A. It was explained that a gravity fed surface facility in this area was not feasible due to the depth of the existing pipe. However CPJ did explore the idea of an underground detention system in this area. An underground system would consist of a series of eight-foot diameter pipes buried beneath the surface to hold stormwater during rain events and release back into the system post storm. This concept would treat approximately 71 acres and have a limits of disturbance of 37,000 sq. ft. The system would not provide a measurable amount of water quality treatment but would provide between 65% and 69% of the water quantity target volume. Although the system would be buried there would be the requirement for access manholes at a 100' spacing, as well as at the end of each pipe, which would probably render the space useless for active recreation. The need for maintenance access would also restrict some passive uses of the area. Underground storage would also be the most expensive option.
- Mark expressed disappointment that conversations occurred and agreements were made between the City and the school system over the use and location of a new soccer field as a shared facility across school and park land without resident input or involvement.
- Tim described area B as the area currently occupied by and adjacent to the existing pond. Two concepts were explored and expanded from the previous CWP study. Concept B1 included expanding the footprint of the existing pond while bringing it up to date to current safety and design codes. These safety features included safety "benches", flat areas adjacent to and within the waters edge, as well as a new dam embankment. Tim mentioned that currently the idea is to build the new embankment in front of the existing embankment in an effort to keep the existing trees. Current safety codes preclude any woody vegetation on a dam embankment. The Natural Resources Conservation Service will need to review and approve, reject, or provide alternatives to this concept. The B1 concept also includes a forebay, or pretreatment pond, which would allow sediment to flush out prior to entering the main pond. This would improve the health of the main pond and concentrate the majority of maintenance to the forebay area.
- Mark stated that he did not feel that any introduction of pollutants to the park was a good idea. Tim explained that the major pollutants were sediment, nutrients (Nitrogen and Phosphorus), and trash with other pollutants such as oil and heavy metals in smaller concentrations. While it would not be recommended that the pond be used for swimming or fishing, the water itself would not pose a health concern. It was also pointed out that the same water would otherwise be found in Watts Branch and other public waterways.
- Tim further discussed the B1 concept. This concept would treat approximately 77.5 acres and have a limits of disturbance of 86,000 sq. ft. The system would provide 62% of the target water quality treatment but would provide 115% of the water quantity volume. Other pros include an increased drainage area reducing the need to supplement water levels with drinking water, and a lower cost. Disadvantages included the larger footprint

within the park and permitting issues as well as the need to resolve any potential dam breach flooding to adjacent homes.

- Mark questioned how the water surface elevation would be affected based on the concept shown. Tim indicated that based on the preliminary layout, which was used for calculations the permanent pool of the new pond would be 407.5 (for B1) while the current permanent pool was at 410.3.
- Jim R. and Lucy asked if trees and other landscaping could be planted on the upstream side of the pond. Tim indicated that trees could be planted around the pond, just not on the dam embankment or on the dry safety shelf.
- Tim explained that concept B2 was a pond similar to B1 but that the footprint was reduced and compacted to a minimal size to a point that the minimal treatment goals were still achieved. Concept B2 would treat the same drainage area as B1 (77.5 acres) but would have a limits of disturbance of 65,000 sq. ft. The system would provide 50% of the target water quality treatment and 75% of the water quantity volume. Due to the reconfiguration of the B2 footprint, seven additional trees would be impacted.
- Mark questioned if an open stormwater pipe would be an attractive nuisance to children. Tim indicated that there are several methods to alleviate this problem including grates, which tend to serve as strainers and cause more problems. Lise mentioned that a grate at the end of the pipe where it enters the pond could be a safety hazard if a child entered the pipe upstream and became trapped underwater at this grate. The idea of placing a park feature such as a boardwalk or gazebo over the pipe to hide it from view was discussed as a better alternative.
- Jim R. indicated that he felt the aesthetics of the pond would be very important and that features such as fountains and landscaping should be closely considered.
- A brief discussion of cost comparisons was held. Tim indicated that cost effectiveness for each concept as a stand alone for water quantity control would be about \$4/ cu. ft of treatment for area B, \$7 for area C, and \$15 for area A.
- A decision was made by the group that further exploring Areas A and C was not productive. Concepts B1 and B2 were to be further analyzed along with the idea of private retrofits.
- Mark brought up two final points. He asked about the timeline for the project and the level of further public involvement. He also asked how the viewpoints of the College Gardens Residents would be weighed against outside residents. Lise indicated that there was a schedule in place and that there was already some deviation from that schedule. The school is also on a separate schedule for meeting their stormwater requirements. A tentative date of June 19th was set for the next task force meeting. Prior to that meeting CPJ would schedule soil borings of the existing dam face and try to schedule a meeting with NRCS. As for public comment there would be a public meeting and a charette to present the concepts, discuss impacts, and receive input. The meeting will be open to all but it would be expected that the citizens of College Gardens would makeup the majority of the attendees.

**College Gardens Park SWM and Park Improvements
Task Force Meeting #5
3:00 PM, May 22, 2006, at City Hall**

Attendance

Name	Organization	Phone Number	Email	Present
James Fetchu	Charles P. Johnson and Associates	301-208-9573	jfetchu@cpja.com	X
Tim Schueler	Charles P. Johnson and Associates	301-208-9573	tschueler@cpja.com	X
Elise Cary	City of Rockville, Forestry Department	240-314-8713	ecary@rockvillemd.gov	
Marylou Berg	City of Rockville, City Manager's Office	240-314-8105	mberg@rockvillemd.gov	X
Burt Hall	City of Rockville, Recreation and Parks Department	240-314-8602	bhall@rockvillemd.gov	
Susan Straus	City of Rockville, Department of Public Works	240-314-8512	sstraus@rockvillemd.gov	X
Nate Wall	City of Rockville, Department of Community Planning and Development Services	240-314-8212	nwall@rockvillemd.gov	X
Lise Soukup	City of Rockville, Department of Public Works	240-314-8515	lsoukup@rockvillemd.gov	X
Craig Simoneau	City of Rockville, Department of Public Works	240-314-8502	csimoneau@rockvillemd.gov	X
Albert Dupont	Montgomery County Public Schools	301-279-8470	albert_dupont@mcpsmd.org	
Mark Pierzchala	President, College Gardens Civic Association	301-838-7687	markpierzchala@cs.com	X
Charles A. Burroughs	Resident	301-340-6859	stepladr@erols.com	X
Jim Reschovsky	Woodley Gardens representative	301-340-7291	jreschovsky@hschange.org	X
John Wright	Plymouth Woods representative	301-424-3729	johnwrihome@yahoo.com	X
Lucy Roberts	Resident	301-251-5524	LR123g@nih.gov	X
Mike Critzer	City of Rockville, Recreation and Parks Department	240-314-8703	mcritzer@rockvillemd.gov	X
Jerry Leighton	Vice President, College Gardens Civic Association			X

Paul O'Brien	Stormwater Management Representative, College gardens Civic Association	301-424-6491	Pobrien776@aol.com	X
Dwayne Jenkins	City of Rockville, Neighborhood Resources	240-314-8343	djenkins@rockvillemd.gov	X
David Fallis	Resident	301-251-2885	David_Fallis@comcast.net	X
Debbie Fallis	Resident	301-251-2885	David_Fallis@comcast.net	X

Flipchart Notes taken during the meeting

COLLEGE GARDENS TASK FORCE MEETING – May 22, 2006

A2 – Princeton Place

Cons

- Can not take direct drainage from park
- Most expensive option per cubic foot for treated stormwater
- ½ Acre Limit of Disturbance - has 115 mature trees which would need to be removed
- Assuming 2:1 tree replacement, need 1 acre site for tree replacement
- Permitting issues
- Soil borings still required to determine feasibility
- No room for forebay/pre-treatment; maintenance issues

Pros

- Can capture stormwater from ~13 acre drainage area
- Will provide 100% water quality and quantity from the drainage area
- Likely does not contain jurisdictional wetlands

B – College Gardens Park Pond - Pond aesthetics important for park

Cons

- Will have trash that accumulates (can be hidden by aquatic bench)
- Dam safety requires additional review by NRCS
- At least 31 trees (maybe more depending on dam requirements) would have to be removed
- B2 forebay (on smaller pond) requires more maintenance than B1 (larger pond) due to configuration

Pros

- Control of ~ 78 acres
 - Large enough drainage area to maintain permanent pool
- B1 – 100% quantity, 50% quality
B2 – 75% quantity, 50% quality
- Could cover forebay inlet w/gazebo, etc

C – Underground system - (Above – ground system not feasible at this location)

Pros

- Gravity-fed system is feasible
- Will treat significant portion (63-69%) of drainage area to that point for quantity
- Out of sight

Cons

- Cannot provide water quality via underground systems of this size
- Large costs associated (twice the cost of pond retrofit)
- Maintenance intensive – requires special breathing apparatus for cleaning
- Multiple manholes required for access – will need to reduce size of structure to get manholes off of soccer field/play area

- Some mosquito issues w/underground systems