



Area Advisory Committee Three - Meeting #4 Summary
Monday, September 22, 2014, 6:30 pm
Ingleside at King Farm
701 King Farm Boulevard Rockville, MD 20850

Attendees:

Members

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

Apologies

Gerald Calderone	Kevin Johnson
Scott Maravilla	

Staff

Facilitator – Traceé Strum-Gilliam	Stormwater Management - Seyed Saadat, Nimish Desai
Station Architect – Kyle Kramer	M-NCPPC – Nkosi Yearwood
Traffic Engineer – Kevin Permisohn	Public Involvement Task Lead – Crystal Saunders
Segment Engineer – Allison Berkheimer	City of Rockville – Craig Simoneau
Urban Design – Seth Garland, Lindsey DeHenzel	Logistics Staff – Jordan Vann

Handouts:

Meeting packets included: Meeting Agenda; Meeting #3 Summary; Natural vs. Urban Water Cycle; What is Storm Water Management; Filter Facilities; Water Quality/Quantity; Stormwater Management Facilities Map; Stormwater Management Techniques; Stormwater Management concept graphic; Stormwater Management Techniques; What is Urban Design?; Design Considerations; Urban Design-Transit Corridor between Stations, Urban Design-Station Areas; Urban Design-Transitway Conditions; and Urban Design-Station Area Plans; West and East Gaither Site Plans; Station Area Prototype; Conceptual Station Features; and Conceptual Station Renderings.

Introductions and Overview:

Facilitator **Traceé Strum-Gilliam** welcomed committee members and thanked them for their continued participation. She explained that the meeting would cover a topic the committee was particularly interested in - Stormwater Management and Urban Design.

There was a brief discussion about the meeting notes from the last meeting. Traceé explained that they have not been sent to the committee yet as they have just finished internal review and the group will still have one week to provide comments upon receipt. Traceé notified the group that calendar appointments were sent out for all meetings up to March 2015 and that she will keep the committee updated on the possibility for additional meetings after the March date.

Traceé asked that the staff and committee introduce themselves and extended an apology for Rick's absence.

Update from Last Meeting:

Allison Berkheimer began the meeting explaining that the 15% design plans were submitted to MTA Engineering. A series of meetings will be scheduled with Montgomery County, the Cities of Gaithersburg and Rockville, Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, and WMATA who will begin reviewing the plans and providing their comments. She explained that process will go on for the next month or so, and then preparations for the 30% design plan submittal will begin. Finally, Allison explained that the team is currently working to update the capital cost estimate by the end of 2014.

The member wanted to know if the cost estimate would be available at the next meeting in November. Traceé explained that the topic of cost will not be covered until meeting 6, in January 2015.

Stormwater Management Presentation/Discussion:

Seyed Saadat began the discussion by asking how many people were familiar with stormwater management. He briefly discussed the natural water cycle (the existing conditions) and then compared it to the urban water cycle (the CCT). Seyed explained that when land is developed, there is more runoff (runoff is the water that is not absorbed into the ground) and that the quantity and quality of water needs to be managed.

What is Stormwater Management?:

Seyed explained that stormwater management is a landscaping feature that attempts to restore/mimic the natural water cycle in an urban environment. Stormwater management helps to clean the water from pollutants in an urban setting. It manages water quality and quantity.

Why is Stormwater Management Needed?:

Seyed explained that the CCT will generate approximately 52 acres of impervious area and the project is required to treat for both quality and quantity management. In the King Farm area, that impervious area is about 3½ acres. There are regulations regarding stormwater management from the Maryland Department Environment (MDE), Montgomery County, and City of Rockville that must be adhered to.

There are several types of quality management facilities that could be used including: bio swales (ditch), and micro-bioretenion planter (planter box), and micro-bioretenion (planted green space). Currently, the King Farm community has several types of manufactured quality

management systems like a water quality inlet (storm drain opening in curb). Another system is a high flow media planter. For quantity management, there are two types of stormwater management facilities: stormwater management pond and underground detention.

Requirements:

Seyed explained that for King Farm Boulevard, the team believes that they should utilize the existing ponds if there is room in them. They will determine if there is a way to get water to them and if there are any issues that arise if they do so.

MDE will review/approve the CCT's stormwater management design, and the team must meet its current standards. Seyed explained that the existing ponds may not be up to today's standards, and as the CCT adds impervious area runoff, the project must bring the ponds up to the latest standard. Upon review of some of the existing ponds and regional ponds, it was found that the ponds did not have additional storage capacity to manage the runoff from the CCT project. Seyed also mentioned that there were regional ponds that were located several thousand feet from the project site. Even if the regional ponds had the capacity to manage the runoff, it is more than likely that the existing storm drain pipes would not have the capacity to convey the runoff to these ponds. It would be extremely expensive to upgrade the pipes. However, the team is waiting to analyze if the current storm drain system can adequately handle the new runoff that will be created from the CCT. As more information becomes available, the team will explore utilizing the current system.

Using the *stormwater management facilities map*, Seyed reviewed a typical section of King Farm Boulevard. He explained that there will be a 24-foot wide median that will be planted with trees, and there will be a stormwater feature in the middle. There is a possibility to integrate small shrubs within the stormwater feature, but that will be up to the landscape architect. Currently planned for quantity management are the underground vault systems, shown on the map as red boxes along the transitway.

Seyed opened the floor for questions.

There was a question about the storm events that need to be managed in the SWM facilities. Seyed explained that the team has to follow the instructions of MDE, typically the water quality features are done at 1-year storm maximum. That will take care of the first 1-inch or run off plus the additional runoff that is required for channel protection volume. For the quantity portion in Montgomery County, if there is no flooding at any outfall, the team is not required to do 2 year+ management. However, it is highly unlikely that we will get a waiver for the quantity management as the existing storm drain pipes are not sized to handle the additional flow from the CCT impervious areas. The water would need to be stored in either a pond or underground storage facility and be released slowly into the existing storm drain system connecting to the CCT's storm drains.

There was concern that the study should be based on actual precipitation, statistics, and the probability rather than if the neighborhood has observed any flooding. Seyed explained that those factors are already covered in the MDE guidelines. The general rule is about 2.7-inches, which includes the first 1-year-storm (which is 99% of the storms we get here). MDE allows for the counties to have higher standards if they choose. Montgomery County is one of the counties that has set higher standards. Seyed explained that if Montgomery County, the City of Rockville or citizens say there is specific flooding above and beyond regulation, the team needs to know so they will not make it any worse.

There was a question about if there is a specific filtration system included in stormwater management to handle pollutants. Seyed explained that MDE has a list of filtration options that the team can pick from, but there is no one-size-fits-all solution.

There was a concern that there will be a lot of construction in the neighborhood to put in all the storm drains to get to the existing stormwater management ponds. Seyed explained that anytime they try to convey the impervious area runoff to the pond, there is a concern about how to get it there. If there is an existing conveying system to get water to the ponds in King Farm, they will utilize it. If the storm drains that feed that pond have a steep slope, it gives the drains more capacity that can be tapped into.

There was a discussion about the whether or not the CCT impervious area was considered in the original planning and design of the King Farm development. Seyed explained that when the team compared the regulations in the year in which that conceptual plan was made with today's regulations, the CCT appears to not have been accounted for. There was a follow-up question regarding the team speaking to the engineer of the conceptual stormwater management plan. Seyed explained that the team has had meetings with her and her team. Seyed reiterated that the current design standards would not likely accommodate the CCT into the original development design approved with the regulations in place then. Even if it was an option and we could prove that the anticipated CCT impervious area was in the original plan, the impervious area was never built. Regulations have changed since then and MDE says that any portion the project touches, has to be re-evaluated based on its original undisturbed condition. Traceé explained that this is in addition to the Montgomery County and City of Rockville guidelines.

There was a discussion about a new building that will be put in at Rockville Park and King Farm Boulevard and its impact on the CCT's stormwater management plans. Seyed explained that the team is responsible for only what is in the project's "limits of disturbance." Traceé explained that when the owners of the new building get their permit, they will be responsible for the stormwater management for their site. MTA is only responsible for its project area. There was a follow-up question about how that building will affect the CCT's projections on water quantity. Traceé explained that the building owners will do it for their site and have to address it themselves.

There was further discussion about the CCT wanting to have its own storm water management in place rather than running through King Farm unless it can be safely conveyed to a closer pond

with minimal disruption. Seyed explained that that was correct, and currently the CCT will be self contained without touching anything else in the neighborhood.

There was a concern about how the team plans to treat the area east of Frederick Road. Seyed explained that the team is talking with WMATA about the configuration of parking. At this time, there is an understanding as to how much stormwater management is needed. Stormwater management at the Shady Grove Metro station will depend on the design of the access road and revised parking areas.

There was concern that the sites shown on the *stormwater management facilities map* may not be adequate. Seyed explained that the micro-bioretenion planned for the median should be sufficient to treat the water and that underground facilities will be installed to handle quantity management. There was a follow-up question about where the micro-bioretenion will be drained. Seyed explained that they will drain into the existing and proposed storm drain system. He further explained that this will mimic what is currently happening today. There was a request to see the preliminary design of the stormwater management plans and its impact on the communities existing system. Seyed explained around April 2015, the team will submit to MDE and seek a concept approval and then share it with the AAC.

Urban Design Presentation/Discussion:

Seth Garland, Urban Design Lead, began the discussion by defining the field of urban design and the people/jobs that contribute to it. He explained that Urban Design sits at the intersection of several different disciplines and the Urban Design Team works directly with architecture, landscape architecture, stormwater management, planning, and civil engineering. Urban design helps to determine how people will move through or arrive at a space and the use of urban design elements can create those places.

Overall Role in Project:

Seth explained that in the context of transit projects, urban design focuses on how people will get to and from the stations (walking, biking, being dropped off, etc.) and creating a safe and comfortable environment upon arrival. These elements are developed in tandem with the architects, roadway engineers, civil engineers, stormwater management and landscape architects to create a system that is easy for people to use. He highlighted the fact that issues of safety and sustainability are intertwined into urban design, using lighting as an example.

Urban Design Elements:

Transit Corridor between Stations:

Seth walked through the Transit Corridor presentation packet and discussed crosswalks, stormwater management/landscape, pedestrian/bike access, transitway treatment, retaining walls, signage and wayfinding, and Art-in-Transit.

In the stormwater management areas, Seth explained that the team works with the stormwater management team and landscape architects to identify opportunities where required elements can enhance the pedestrian environment.

Pedestrian/bike access is taken into consideration by urban design, even when certain elements such as new bike lanes are not a part of the project. For example, even though the project is building only portions of the County's shared use path, urban design considers how it can be integrated into the entire alignment. Seth noted that the team works with the county and the cities to make sure that such connections are accommodated.

Seth explained some ideas for different treatments for the transitway, such as using a unique color for the transitway in the station area.

Other large elements between stations are retaining walls, MSE (mechanically stabilized earth) walls, and portals. These structural elements can receive finishes that integrate them with the neighborhoods and surrounding areas.

Another design opportunity is the potential signage both at and between the stations. There could be signs at key intersections indicating direction and distance to the nearest station, and there are also opportunities for the community to add information at these signs as well, such as points of local interest.

Seth explained that large transit projects that get federal funding generally have an art-in-transit program. The current trend is for art-in-transit to be functional and integrated into the transit project.

Station Areas:

Seth walked through the Station Area presentation packet and discussed paving areas, bike parking, pedestrian lighting, street furniture/landscaping, local transit coordination and sustainability/stormwater management.

Paving areas can give the station areas an identity, and be an element that is consistent throughout the corridor.

Bike parking is an important station area element. Seth noted that he will present plans that illustrate how bicycle parking is integrated into the station area schemes at each station.

Seth stated that pedestrian lighting is very different from roadway lighting and serves a different purpose. Lighting for pedestrians needs to be at a lower height to allow for the perception of details, such as faces of other people in the area, and to create the perception of safety. Street furniture could include benches, newspaper corrals and trash and recycling cans.

The team has worked with the County to identify existing bus routes and locations of bus stops, determine what stops the CCT would impact, and the potential to co-locate some of those stops with the stations allowing people to move quickly between the systems.

Because the right-of-way is limited in many of the station areas, the team is focusing on opportunities for micro-bioretenion to provide stormwater management and planting areas around the stations.

Project Specific Urban Design:

Representative Transitway Conditions:

Using the Representative Cross Section handout, Seth described the current design as well as what is planned for King Farm Boulevard when the transitway is built. He noted the team has designed a continuous median with two planting areas on the outside edges to provide areas for shade trees and a central micro-bioretenion area to provide stormwater management.

Station Area Plans:

Seth noted that there are three primary types of station areas in the corridor, but this area only has one, the center aligned-center platform. Generally, this station type occurs where there is an existing or planned development area where the team will need to work with existing buildings and sidewalks.

For this station type, the team has proposed an “urban” sidewalk condition, where paving goes all the way to the curb, planters are set back from the curb edge, space for street parking is provided along the station block, and bump outs at the corners are provided to allow for the ease of pedestrians crossing.

Seth noted that in the station area prototypes, there are no amenities shown on the station platform since this will be a topic to be discussed in a future meeting. Within these station areas, the team is looking at the planters as potential stormwater management facilities. There will also be shade trees and low plantings such as decorative grasses. It is the team’s intent that this layout will encourage pedestrians to cross at the appropriate location. There will be pedestrian lighting, street furniture, and areas for bicycle parking. Currently there are place holders for the bicycle parking, but as the project moves from 15% to 30%, the team will look at the actual number of spaces that are required.

Using the *Station Area Prototype* handout, Seth showed the committee what the station area could look like from an aerial view and street level view. Seth briefly showed the committee the prototypes for the other station area types (side platform-side of road and center platform-side of road).

Using the *Site Plan* handouts, Seth explained how the elements previously discussed will be incorporated at the East and West Gaither Stations. At West Gaither, the team will look at how much pedestrian lighting there is today and make sure that it meets the level that is needed for a station area. If it is determined that existing lighting levels are not sufficient, additional lighting will be proposed. Seth noted that the fixtures would match the current fixtures whenever possible. The team will add a little extra planting areas for the bump outs at the corners. There will also be bicycle parking at this station. Currently, the team plans to do half covered parking and half uncovered parking for bicycles.

Seth explained that East Gaither will have a similar treatment to West Gaither. The biggest addition proposed for this area, is to modify the sidewalk treatment on the eastbound side of King Farm Boulevard to match the sidewalk treatment on the westbound side.

Seth opened the floor for questions.

There was a question about reducing the amount of pavement in the station area and making it greener. Seth explained that the increased paved area is only in the station block; there will be a break at Havencrest Street where the grass area ends and the station area begins. There was concern that the community would prefer not to look out at a large area of concrete. **Kyle Kramer**, Station Architect, indicated that he will be discussing stations at the next meeting, and there will be a more complete illustration of what the stations will look like to give the committee members an opportunity to comment.

There was discussion about incorporating the community's concerns about minimizing the concrete area before the committee has the opportunity to comment on the station designs. The committee noted that they do not want their community to look like a downtown area. Seth noted that by necessity, there will be more pavement because of the transitway, but also noted that the team incorporated the community's preference to have a continuous green median.

The committee members expressed that they had hoped that the decision to have the transitway with outer lanes would allow for more green space in the transit area and at the stations. Another concern raised was that the committee perceives East Gaither station to not be a high volume station since King Farm has a shuttle that takes people to the metro station. The committee expressed the opinion that this portion on the transitway will be for people to get through King Farm to the Shady Grove Metro Station. The committee expressed the need for the project team to understand and consider the planned community as it was envisioned. Traceé explained that these concerns have been noted. She asked that Kyle's station presentation show layers to illustrate the proposed condition.

There was a discussion about making the station at East Gaither smaller. Traceé explained that station sizing is based on the design standard, and will be discussed in more detail at the stations meeting. The committee questioned the forecasted load for this station area.

There was concern that the committee was told there would only be changes made between existing facing curb and based on today's discussion there will be changes in pavement patterns, adding bike racks, etc. Seth explained that the addition comes from the bump outs. The curb will not be moved, but the team is proposing bump outs to allow for shorter crossing and bike racks. There was a follow-up concern about the need for bike racks and if they are subject to the King Farm Review Board. Craig Simoneau, City of Rockville, explained that the bike racks are in the City right-of-way and they will work with the state to coordinate the appropriate approach.

There was a question about covered parking; Seth explained that covered parking was for the bicycles. There was a follow-up concern that the current bike racks are Bikeshare racks and they

are in the parking lanes and that they would be where the covered parking is proposed. Seth explained Bikeshare parking is a separate matter. The bike racks presented are for people who ride their personal bikes to the station area.

There was a comment about the possibility for art and color at the station area, and making it a beautiful space. Traceé explained that the team will bring in some visual elements for the next meeting to give the committee examples of options that are available in the station area.

There was a question about the maintenance of the transitway along King Farm Boulevard, like snow removal paid for by residents. Traceé explained that King Farm Boulevard is a city owned street and the City covers the cost of snow removal. MTA will be responsible for maintaining the station and transitway.

There was a follow-up question about the maintenance of the stormwater management facilities. Allison Berkheimer, segment engineer, explained that whoever eventually owns and operates the CCT will handle the maintenance of the facilities. There was a concern that it should be clear who will handle it. Allison explained that there was no decision made on the owner and operator of the CCT yet. Traceé noted that the decision may not be made by the end of the committee meetings. The owner will have to take on the responsibility of maintenance but at this time it is unknown who the owner will be. She assured the committee that the responsibility will not fall on the residents. She further explained that MTA's goal is to be a good neighbor. They will not building something that would not be able to be maintained.

There was a concern about snow removal. The committee explained that currently when the snow is plowed, the snow is then put in the cross streets. Will the city be responsible for trucking away the snow? Craig explained that with the CCT snow will no longer be able to be pushed into the median. The City is aware and will have to determine where to move the snow, as will the owner of the CCT.

Closing Thoughts/Next Meeting:

Traceé again thanked the members for their participation and stated the next meeting will be held November 3rd at Ingleside at King Farm and the topic of discussion will be Stations. Traceé offered to allow those who came late to the meeting the opportunity to stay behind and ask questions.

Tracee also addressed the concern of the committee members about the amount of paper used for the meeting. She explained that we understand the environmental impact but realize a home computer may not be handle the volume of documents created and using a compact disc is not an option that we believe will be effective She opened the floor for suggestions and none were mentioned.

Meeting adjourned at 8:01pm

###