

Cirner, Casey L.

From: Johnsen, Douglas <douglas.johnsen@montgomeryplanning.org>
Sent: Friday, July 31, 2020 8:02 AM
To: Ken Jones
Cc: Frank Johnson
Subject: RE: Meeting Summary - 12017021A Liberty Mill Forest Conservation Amendment - Storm drain outfall and SVB impacts

Ken,
You are correct, this issue was not discussed at our meeting. It was an afterthought as I was piecing the situation together for the email. It is simply a request with no regulatory authority behind it. In an attempt to help Montgomery County's carbon neutral goal I make the request on most projects to install extra trees. These trees, usually Oak species, also help with our declining insect populations and pollinator species. So, I make the request whenever I can and these 2 small areas on this project seemed ripe for that request. However, there is no regulatory requirement to install these trees.



Doug Johnsen, PLA, ISA
Senior Environmental Planner

Montgomery County Planning Department
8787 Georgia Avenue, Silver Spring, MD
20910
e:
douglas.johnsen@montgomeryplanning.org
o: 301-495-4559



WE'RE MOVING!

THE NEW PARK AND PLANNING HEADQUARTERS WILL BE LOCATED AT
2425 REEDIE DRIVE, WHEATON, MD 20902 IN AUGUST 2020.

From: Ken Jones
Sent: Thursday, July 30, 2020 3:27 PM
To: Johnsen, Douglas
Cc: Frank Johnson
Subject: RE: Meeting Summary - 12017021A Liberty Mill Forest Conservation Amendment - Storm drain outfall and SVB impacts

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Exercise caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding.

Doug,

Ex. 36
OZAH Case No: CU 20-09

Thanks for this summary. However, please clarify your last sentence regarding planting overstory trees. I do not recall this being mentioned in the meeting. What area are you referring to?

Thanks,

Ken



Phone: 301.670.0840 x 1047

Email: kjones@mhgpa.com

From: Johnsen, Douglas [<mailto:douglas.johnsen@montgomeryplanning.org>]

Sent: Wednesday, July 29, 2020 1:18 PM

To: Ken Jones <kjones@mhgpa.com>

Cc: Frank Johnson <fjohnson@mhgpa.com>

Subject: RE: Meeting Summary - 12017021A Liberty Mill Forest Conservation Amendment - Storm drain outfall and SVB impacts

Ken,

Thanks for putting together the meeting and explaining the background to the SVB impacts.

My understanding of the engineering behind the impacts to the SVB on the property stem from the requirement to lower the depth of the outfall pipe. In the original submittal a Landscape Infiltration (LI) facility was proposed to treat the runoff from most of the front of the building including most of the entry driveway. This LI facility does not require an under drain system and does not connect to the outfall pipe that drains the runoff from the SWM facilities to an off-site stream channel. Not connecting the LI to the outfall pipe allowed this pipe to be at a depth that only drained the 2 Mirco-Bioretenion facilities (MB-2 and MB-3) to the north of the LI facility. This allowed the outfall pipe to be at a depth that could be daylighted at approximately the 458-ft contour before it reached the SVB.

However, this approach left a portion of the entry driveway and the driveway leading to the to the below ground parking area untreated. The resulting runoff from this portion of the driveway would simply be sent to a drain and then into the adjacent stream channel. This would allow vehicle contaminants and pollutants to flow freely into a stream. DPS SWM - Water Resources required that this portion of the driveway be connected to the treatment train for the project site. This required that the previous LI facility be converted to a Bio Filtration facility (BF-1). This facility now requires an under drain system and to be connected to the outfall pipe. As a result of this connection, the depth of the outfall pipe had to be lowered in order for BF-1 to drain to the outfall pipe. This new depth of the outfall pipe required that the length of the pipe be increased in order to daylight the pipe. The outfall pipe now had to be extended out to the at least the 456-ft contour in order to daylight the pipe. This resulted in the impacts to the SVB.

Under the original proposal, the stormwater runoff from the access drive and vehicle parking areas containing hydrocarbons and vehicle pollutants was being drained and diverted directly to a stream channel. The current proposal directs this runoff to a Bio Filtration facility (BF-1) prior to being discharged into a stream channel. Impacts to SVBs is something we try to avoid, but in certain circumstances these impacts are unavoidable. In this case, the impacts to the SVB are the result of addressing plan review comments issued by DPS to treat stormwater runoff. The impacts to the SVB are minor in nature. The SVB is relatively small in size, about 2,900 sq. ft., and no forest or trees will be removed. The Environmental Guidelines allows staff to make decisions on a case-by-case basis to evaluate impacts to SVBs. The current impacts to the SVB are offset by the fact that previously untreated stormwater runoff is now being diverted to a treatment facility prior to discharge into a stream channel.

Given that the area of SVB is small, the impacts are required to meet other governmental agency requirements and that there are increased environmental benefits resulting in the impacts it is deemed that these impacts so the SVB are acceptable. It is suggested that the areas of SVB be extended between the SVB line and the LOD on both sides of the outfall in order to compensate for the area lost with the installation of the outfall pipe. This area will need to be placed

into a Category I Conservation Easement to satisfy Section 22A-12(b)(1 and 2) of the Forest Conservation Law. This area of SVB will not be afforested since it does not meet the definition of forest, but it is requested that several larger caliper MD native overstory trees be installed in this area.

If you should have any questions or comment please don't hesitate to contact me. Thanks Ken.



Doug Johnsen, PLA, ISA
Senior Environmental Planner

Montgomery County Planning Department
8787 Georgia Avenue, Silver Spring, MD
20910

e: douglas.johnsen@montgomeryplanning.org

o: 301-495-4559



WE'RE MOVING!

THE NEW PARK AND PLANNING HEADQUARTERS WILL BE LOCATED AT
2425 REEDIE DRIVE, WHEATON, MD 20902 IN AUGUST 2020.

From: Ken Jones <kjones@mhgpa.com>

Sent: Friday, July 24, 2020 1:37 PM

To: Johnsen, Douglas <douglas.johnsen@montgomeryplanning.org>

Cc: Frank Johnson <fjohnson@mhgpa.com>

Subject: Meeting Summary - 12017021 Liberty Mill Forest Conservation Amendment - Storm drain outfall and SVB impacts

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Exercise caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding.

Doug,

The following is a brief summary our meeting earlier today regarding the subject development. Please review and let us know if you have and comments or clarifications.

The meeting was held to discuss a proposed storm drain outfall that would extend into the stream valley buffer and onto the adjacent downstream property. A sketch of the proposed outfall is attached.

I provided a summary of SWM requirements for the site and the initial SWM Conceptual design submitted to MCDPS. Full ESDv management was provided, although an upper portion of the proposed drive aisle was unmanaged due to the drainage area restrictions associated with ESD practices (20,000 SF). In their review of the SWM Concept, MCDPS has commented that the upper drive aisle should be managed by converting the receiving ESD practice into a biofilter per Chapter 3 of the MDE SWM Design manual which could exceed 20,000 SF of total drainage area. In order to do so, the biofilter would need to include an underdrain. Based existing topography, the depth of the storm drain outfall as a

function of the biofilter underdrain would need to extend into the stream valley buffer and off-site. The location of the storm drain outfall is constrained by existing WSSC easements in the area. The adjacent property is an open space parcel owned by the Fountain Hills HOA. Permission from the adjacent property owner would be required in order to construct the storm drain outfall.

You said that the Environmental Guidelines gives some latitude on incursions into SVBs, but they are on a case-by-case basis in which staff balances the cost/benefit of the incursion. In the case of this project, you stated that the additional SWM treatment provided by the storm drain outfall is of greater environmental benefit than its' associated SVB impacts. The storm drain outfall would allow for treatment of additional vehicular impervious area which would otherwise discharge directly into an existing drainage channel. You said that buffer averaging may be used to expand the SVB where feasible to offset the SVB impacts. It was agreed that buffer averaging would be addressed when the Amended Forest Conservation Plan is submitted to MNCPPC.

Based on your response to proposed SVB impacts, MHG will coordinate with the applicant to contact adjacent property owner to request permission for the off-site storm drain outfall.

Thank you,
Ken



Kenneth D. Jones, P.E.

Macris, Hendricks and Glascock, P.A.

Engineers • Planners • Landscape Architects • Surveyors

9220 Wightman Road, Suite 120

Montgomery Village, Maryland 20886-1279

Phone: 301.670.0840 x 1047

Email: kjones@mhgpa.com

Web: www.mhgpa.com