

**College Gardens Park SWM and Park Improvements
Task Force Meeting #4
2:00 PM, April 24, 2006, at College Gardens Park**

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.
- Representatives of the City led off the meeting by describing the reason for the project and past studies prepared or performed for the area.
- Lise Soukup asked Jim Reschovsky to speak briefly about the Watts Branch Watershed Restoration as a member of the Watts Branch Partnership.
- Lou Marinella questioned the extent of past studies and the size of the watershed included in this project. Lise spread out a map of the study area showing drainage areas for general discussion.
- Tim Schueler discussed CPJ's role in the project, the work CPJ has performed thus far, and the steps involved in preparing concepts for stormwater management retrofits.
- Charles Burrough inquired about the plans for geotechnical investigations, specifically the permeability of the soil. Tim explained the scope of the geotechnical investigation would focus on the makeup of the existing dam face and the installation of a piezometer in the vicinity of the existing pond to determine the level of the water table.
- Mark Pierzchala expressed displeasure with portions of the process to this point including the previously prepared Low Impact Design study.
- A recommendation was made by City staff that the meeting location progress down to the existing pond.

Existing Pond:

- Jim Reschovsky questioned the status of the existing dam face. Tim explained that present MD dam safety laws would prohibit the growth of trees on dam face of any impoundment. At the request of the citizens, Tim explained that options for maintaining or expanding the pond in its existing location could include a new dam upstream of the existing dam face.
- Nate Wall asked about the feasibility of incorporating the existing dam and its trees as an island in the middle of the new pond. Tim responded that it was perhaps possible, and it could be evaluated during the pond sizing computation stage. DPW and Parks would have to give guidance on how close a new dam should be to the southwestern park property line and existing downstream houses in this option.
- Tim mentioned that it was his understanding that the city currently needed to add water to the pond yearly from the drinking water supply to maintain water levels and that using the pond for SWM may reduce or eliminate this need. Mark asked Charles for his historic perspective on the pond. Charles stated that he has lived in the neighborhood since 1969 and that maintenance, including adding water, has increased recently.
- Mark asked for the size of the existing pond. Tim explained that he believed the pond to be approximately 0.15 acres in size from estimation (*office check: 0.31 acres*). Tim described that CPJ had performed a Bathymetric Survey of the pond within the last two

weeks and that the maximum depth of the pond was 6.2' to the top of sediment (*office check: 4.2' to top of sediment*).

- Burt Hall described the role and concerns of the Recreation and Parks Department with any new SWM facilities including park amenities, aesthetics and tree conservation. Burt also asked about the maximum design depth of any proposed pond. Tim explained that many issues would govern the depth of any proposed pond including the location of the water table, maximum allowable slopes, and required safety benches. Tim mentioned that CPJ would rely on the City Forester for guidance about expected tree survival and impacts from each proposed concept.
- Jim R. proposed the idea of a covered pond in the vicinity of the existing ball fields. Tim described that the use of underground detention is a common practice in the development industry but had limitations. At this point the group decided to progress to the ball field area for further discussion.

Ball fields:

- Lise spread out the map again and described the property layout as well as future plans for the expansion of the elementary school. An agreement between the school and the city provides for a change in the orientation of the soccer field reducing the available land for installation of an above ground structure. Albert Dupont stated he believed the new soccer field was to be regulation size. Burt questioned whether an elementary school required a regulation size field. The field orientation needs to be finalized as soon as possible since MCPS is expected to obtain construction permits in the next 2 months.
- Tim further explained the use of underground detention, specifically possible limitations based on the elevation of the existing storm drain pipe and the need for access manholes within the ball fields. Burt inquired on the cost of underground structures versus ponding and it was agreed at the costs were generally about four times more expensive. Lise pointed out that underground facilities are typically used for smaller drainage areas between 5-10 acres. Tim said that CPJ would work with the City to evaluate underground designs, including cost limitations.
- Charles asked that the idea of a series of treatment options be considered to reduce site impacts to any one area. Tim agreed this may be a viable option and briefly described the difference between a series of treatments versus a number of offline facilities.
- Mark pointed out that the existing hill in the Northeast corner of the site was a very popular sledding hill and needed to be maintained as such.
- A recommendation was made by City staff that the meeting location progress down to the Storm drain outfall below Princeton Place.

Princeton Place:

- During the walk from the ball fields to the outfall Tim spoke further about CPJ's data gathering effort including updating the existing survey to include lower-level door and window elevations of properties downstream of the existing pond which will be used to assess flooding issues.
- Mark asked Tim to address any safety concerns associated with pollutants in a SWM facility. Tim described that past studies have shown that the material removed from SWM pond is not toxic by EPA standards but that residents should be excluded from swimming or eating fish from any SWM pond.

- At the outfall Tim discussed the health of the stream and role of stream erosion in the health of the Chesapeake Bay. Tim also described the permitting issues involved with working around or within streams and wetlands. A general discussion was held on whether the stream at this location would be considered perennial or intermittent. It was pointed out that both designations would most likely involve the same permitting issues.
- Mark described a presentation he witnessed which involved providing SWM in forested areas without the clearing of trees. Tim questioned if this method involved the use of vernal pools which would probably not provide a measurable amount of treatment or storage to meet the goals of the project.
- The group moved to the forested area adjacent to the outfall. A discussion was held on the opportunities and constraints of the area including tree conservation, vertical control, and permitting issues. Lise showed the aerial photo map and indicated which areas might be feasible to capture at that location, based on the storm drain and stream elevations. CPJ will verify this with the first round of SWM evaluations.
- Charles Burroughs suggested that losing a few trees at this location was a minimal impact to the extensive forest preserve. Jim Reschovsky pointed out the numerous large trees at this location, and Elise Cary agreed that grading would affect the roots of many surrounding trees outside the limit of grading. Lise mentioned that clearing this area would be noticeable to nearby houses on Princeton Place and College Parkway.
- A recommendation was made by City staff that the meeting location progress to Hungerford Drive. DPW made a brief presentation on the history and function of the City's Stoneridge SWM wetland marsh and answered questions about the design and function. Jim Reschovsky suggested that the City's Potomac Woods SWM wetland marsh is closer in size to what might occur in College Gardens Park and shows the compromises of trying to meet both ballfield and SWM pond uses.

**College Gardens Park SWM and Park Improvements
Task Force Meeting #1
2:00 PM, April 24, 2006, at College Gardens Park**

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	X
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	X
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 – Principal, CG ES	301-279-8470	albert_dupont@mcpsmd.org	X
Mark Pierzchala	CGCA President	301-838-7687	mpierzchala@cs.com	X
Lou Marinelli	Resident	301-762-0781	lmm1442@yahoo.com	X
Charles A. Burroughs	Resident	301-340-6859	stepladr@erols.com	X
Jim Reschovsky	Woodley Gardens CA representative	301-340-7291	jreschovsky@hschange.org	X