

Attachment H

Feldman, Aaron

From: Carol Alt <carolalt2003@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, May 09, 2016 10:44 AM
To: Feldman, Aaron
Subject: Rockwood Manor Special park

We would like to be included in the May 23rd field walk of the proposals for Rockwood Manor. Our community, Woodrock, borders on the park and is intensely interested. For the record, we oppose anything that results in an outlet on Belfast Road which is our main entrance.

Fred & Carol Alt
301-299-5568

Feldman, Aaron

From: ENaden@aol.com
Sent: Friday, May 27, 2016 3:18 PM
To: Feldman, Aaron
Cc: farl31@aol.com
Subject: Re: Woodrock Neighborhood

I, too, vote for Alternative 3 which would impact our neighborhood less.

Elizabeth Naden
7818 Whiterim Terrace

In a message dated 5/27/2016 9:39:24 A.M. Eastern Daylight Time, aaron.feldman@montgomeryparks.org writes:

Ms. Farley –

Thank you for joining us on the field walk earlier this week and for providing valuable feedback. We will take your comments into account as we prepare our recommendations to the Planning Board.

I agree with you about the impacts Alternative 2 would cause to the Woodrock Community. While it is technically feasible, the main reason we included this alternative in our study is to clarify the differences between it and Alternative 1. Going through the earlier public outreach process for this project, my sense was that several community members assumed we were proposing to construct an exit drive directly across from Whiterim Terrace instead of the actual proposal (Alternative 1). At this time we do not plan to advocate for Alternative 2 based on the reasons you mentioned.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any additional questions or comments.

Regards,

Aaron Feldman

Aaron Feldman | M-NCPPC | 301.650.2887

From: Farl31@aol.com [mailto:Farl31@aol.com]
Sent: Thursday, May 26, 2016 9:53 PM
To: Feldman, Aaron <aaron.feldman@montgomeryparks.org>

Cc: enaden@aol.com; pmcmillen1@verizon.net; karin.maria.herr@gmail.com

Subject: Re: Woodrock Neighborhood

Mr. Feldman:

Thank you for explaining the options for building a road to move traffic into and out of the Rockwood Manor Compound.

I am totally opposed to Alternative 2, which would create a one-way loop that enters Rockwood at the existing driveway on MacArthur and exits onto Belfast directly across from Whiterim Terrace. That area is a busy place with all kinds of trucks, buses, cars, children, and people walking their dogs. There have been several near accidents. I hope the Board has decided that this is not safe and not a viable option.

Alternative 1, the proposal you discussed to build a bridge to bring the traffic onto Belfast still presents a major safety issue. Cars come around the curve very fast. The cost of building a large bridge seems to be a huge expense and waste of money.

Either of the proposals that bring the traffic directly onto MacArthur makes the most sense to me. My preference is Alternative 3 to expand the existing driveway into a full-width, two-way driveway for the entire length of the site. Only one tree would have to be removed. With this Alternative, there would be less noise and pollution from buses and big trucks impacting our neighborhood. I appreciate any special thought given to Alternative 3.

Marilyn Farley, Hon. AIA

Woodrock Owner

7816 Whiterim Terrace

Potomac, MD 20854

301-983-2485

In a message dated 5/18/2016 3:34:21 P.M. Eastern Daylight Time, aaron.feldman@montgomeryparks.org writes:

Ms. Farley –

Thank you for your interest in the Rockwood Manor alignment alternatives project. The alignment alternatives are available for download from the project's webpage, here:

http://montgomeryparks.org/pdd/cip/rockwood_manor_special_park.shtm

Scroll down to the Status/Project Update heading and click the Driveway Alignment Alternatives link.

Also, please make sure you have Adobe Reader installed on your computer to view the document. The program can be downloaded for free, here: <https://get.adobe.com/reader/>

Please let me know if you have difficulty downloading the document and I can email you a lower-resolution file.

Regards,

Aaron Feldman

Aaron Feldman | M-NCPPC | 301.650.2887

From: Farl31@aol.com [<mailto:Farl31@aol.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, May 18, 2016 3:20 PM
To: Feldman, Aaron <aaron.feldman@montgomeryparks.org>
Subject: Woodrock Neighborhood

For the Field Walk at Rockwood Manor on Tuesday, May 24th @ 4 PM, will we be able to see the proposed concepts prior to the walk?

Thank you.

Marilyn Farley

Woodrock Owner

7816 Whiterim Terrace

301-983-2485

301-219-2666

Feldman, Aaron

From: mark moadel <mlmoadel@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, May 29, 2016 12:22 PM
To: Feldman, Aaron; Cadigan, Nancy
Subject: Rockwood Manor Driveway Alignment Alternatives Evaluation

Greetings Aaron and Nancy,

I am a long-time resident of the Woodrock community in Potomac, Maryland adjacent to the Rockwood Manor Special Park and an elected member of the Woodrock Homeowners Association Board. My wife participated in the Rockwood Manor Driveway Alignment Alternatives study field walk on May 24th. Based on review of the Rockwood Manor Special Park Driveway Alignment Alternatives document dated May 2016, and discussion of the field walk results, an evaluation of the proposed alternatives follows for your consideration.

Based on the information provided, it appears that Rockwood Manor Driveway Alignment Alternative #3 'Expand the existing driveway into a full-width, two-way driveway for the entire length of the site' is the best choice; as it would provide optimal long-term features and advantages for the County Special Park usage, along with minimal impact on adjoining community neighborhoods and MacArthur Boulevard traffic flow.

Also, based on the information provided, it appears that the second best choice is Rockwood Manor Driveway Alignment Alternative #5 'Provide minimal improvements to the existing circulation system to reduce some conflicts'; as it would provide good long-term features and advantages for the County Special Park usage, along with minimal impact on adjoining community neighborhoods and MacArthur Boulevard traffic flow.

Finally, based on the information provided, it appears that Rockwood Manor Driveway Alignment Alternatives #1, #2, and #4 should not be further considered; as all have significant disadvantages for the County Special Park usage and significant detrimental impact on adjoining community neighborhoods and MacArthur Boulevard traffic flow.

Please include this email in the Rockwood Manor Special Park Feasibility Study Public Comments record.

Please contact me at 240-672-1367 or by e-mail to discuss further.

Thank you,

Mark Moadel, Treasurer, Woodrock Homeowners Association Board

From: Feldman, Aaron [mailto:aaron.feldman@montgomeryparks.org]
Sent: Monday, May 16, 2016 4:02 PM
To: Feldman, Aaron
Subject: Rockwood Manor Driveway Alignment Alternatives Field Walk

Thank you for your interest in the Driveway Alignment Alternatives study for Rockwood Manor. You are receiving this email because you expressed a desire to attend a field walk at Rockwood Manor to review the alternatives. That field walk will occur on Tuesday, 24 May at 4pm. We will meet at the main entrance to the Manor House and go from there. Be sure to wear comfortable shoes as we will be walking on both pavement and grass. In the event of severe inclement

weather, the field walk will occur on Thursday, 26 May at 4pm. I look forward to seeing you on the 24th. In the meantime, please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions.

Regards,
Aaron Feldman

Aaron Feldman
Landscape Architect | Park Development | Montgomery County Parks Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission
9500 Brunett Avenue | Silver Spring | Maryland | 20901 telephone 301.650.2887 | fax 301.585.1921
www.montgomeryparks.org

Feldman, Aaron

From: Oudinot, Philippe A. <Philippe.Oudinot@aporter.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 31, 2016 4:29 PM
To: Feldman, Aaron
Cc: poudinot@gmail.com; Schahrazad Oudinot (Soudinot@gmail.com)
Subject: Rockwood Manor proposed Driveway Alternatives

Importance: High

Dear Mr. Feldman,

My name is Philippe Oudinot and my wife and I are the owners of a townhouse located at 7718 Whiterim Terrace, and a single-family house located at 10700 Laurel Leaf Place. Both properties are located in the Woodrock community, which consists of 215 homes adjacent to Rockwood Manor that would be negatively impacted by 3 out of 5 driveway alignment alternatives considered by Montgomery County Parks.

I am submitting these comments as part of the public review and comment period, which is open through June 6, 2016.

Alternatives 1 and 2 would involve the construction of a one-way exit of the site, either via a right-turn only onto Belfast Road or through the widening of the existing pedestrian trail from the Manor parking lot to the intersection of the Belfast Road and Whiterim terrace.

Both alternatives 1 and 2 would create a significant afflux of vehicle traffic on residential streets throughout the Woodrock community, creating backup traffic especially during weekends, and even more importantly a safety hazard for young children and adults alike. Given the fact that most, if not all Rockwood Manor's guests are not familiar with the Woodrock community, it is likely that a significant number of guest will venture in the community before finding their way back to MacArthur Boulevard, hence increasing nuisance and the likelihood of accidents. In addition, since Belfast road is not a thru street, motorists would either need to perform an illegal U-turn or use even smaller residential side streets to get back on MacArthur Boulevard.

Alternative 4, which would involve the construction of an entry-only driveway on MacArthur Boulevard next to Belfast Road, would negatively impact traffic and access by residents to residential streets within the Woodrock community.

All 3 alternatives listed above would unduly burden Woodrock residents and create safety risks. They would also diminish property values throughout the Woodrock community. For these reasons, I firmly oppose them all.

Alternative 3 involves the expansion of the existing driveway into a two-way driveway for the entire length of the Manor site. Alternative 5 provides improvements to the existing circulation system by widening the existing driveway. Both alternatives significantly improve emergency vehicles access to the site, and meet American With Disabilities Act standards, which I understand are the primary goals of any modifications to the current configuration. In addition and although Montgomery County Parks did not provide a budget for each of the proposed configurations, it is likely that these two alternatives would be the least costly among the 5 proposals, as none of them involves the construction of a new entry/exist-only driveway. As importantly, these two alternatives would likely not create a safety concern for Woodrock residents, while allowing the site to meet safety goals. Alternative 3 or 5 would be acceptable for these reasons.

We look forward to be kept informed of the decision of Montgomery County Parks following the public review and comment period.

Regards,

Philippe & Schahrazad Oudinot

Philippe A. Oudinot

Arnold & Porter LLP
601 Massachusetts Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20001-3743

Telephone: +1 202.942.5736

Mobile: +1 202.641.2203

Philippe.Oudinot@aporter.com

[Biography](#) | [v-card](#) | [LinkedIn](#)

www.arnoldporter.com

This communication may contain information that is legally privileged, confidential or exempt from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient, please note that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. Anyone who receives this message in error should notify the sender immediately by telephone or by return e-mail and delete it from his or her computer.

For more information about Arnold & Porter LLP, click here:
<http://www.arnoldporter.com>

Feldman, Aaron

From: marshap1@verizon.net
Sent: Thursday, June 02, 2016 9:15 AM
To: Feldman, Aaron
Subject: Mark & Andrea Shapiro opt for Alternative #5 Rockwood Manor Special Park access

Dear Mr. Feldman:

Thank you for your informative walk-through of the various options being proposed for Rockwood Manor Special Park access. Andrea and I opt for Alternative #5. The purpose of providing increased access to the the Park is safety. Alternative #5 accomplishes this by impacting the Park minimally.

In any case, we oppose Option #2 (opening on Whiterim Terrace) as it would directly and negatively impact our property.

Please include these comments in the record. Thank you.

Mark & Andrea Shapiro
7831 Whiterim Terrace
Potomac, MD 20854
marshap1@verizon.net

Harold L. Segall
7601 Laurel Leaf Drive
Potomac, MD 20854
hsegall@bdlaw.com
(202) 641-5133 – Cell

June 6, 2016

VIA ELECTRONIC AND FIRST CLASS MAIL

Casey Anderson
Chairman
Montgomery County Planning Board
8787 Georgia Avenue
Silver Spring MD 20910-3760
mcp-chair@mncppc-mc.org

Re: Comments on Rockwood Special Park Driveway Alignment Alternatives

Dear Chairman Anderson:

I write on my own behalf, and on behalf of other neighbors of Rockwood Manor to comment on the Rockwood Special Park Driveway Alignment Alternatives (“Rockwood Alternatives”) as requested in the recent public notice from the Maryland-National Capital Public Parks and Planning Commission, Public Parks (“Montgomery Parks”). Please include this letter in the record, along with my previously submitted letter of July 17, 2015, email request for reconsideration dated July 23, 2015, the Planning Board’s and your responses to our July 17 letter and electronic mail dated July 21, 2015 and July 24, 2015 respectively, as well as my follow up letter to you dated July 28, 2015. All of this correspondence is attached to this letter for the Planning Board and Montgomery Park’s convenience. I am also hereby providing this letter and the attachments to Mr. Aaron Feldman as directed in the public notice.

Alternatives 1 and 2 noted in the Rockwood Alternatives include the construction of a road from Rockwood Manor to Belfast Road in the Woodrock community. Woodrock currently is a quiet residential neighborhood with no commercial establishments or associated commercial traffic. Both Alternatives 1 and 2 are unacceptable because they would unnecessarily imperil both the safety and character of our neighborhood by funneling substantial traffic from Rockwood events into Woodrock. The resulting traffic issues present safety concerns because the road will add a large volume of traffic into a residential area with only two access points. Belfast Road, which would receive the Rockwood traffic, is heavily used by pedestrians, bicyclists, and children. There are no sidewalks on Belfast Road at and beyond both of the proposed exit points from Rockwood Manor, continuing to MacArthur Blvd. Currently, there is little traffic on

Belfast, and thus the large volume of traffic that would occur after Rockwood events would substantially increase the risk to pedestrians.

Alternatives 1 and 2 would also create a high level of traffic congestion. Belfast is the only exit point for all residents of the single family homes in Woodrock. It simply is not true that Alternative 1 is “removed from residential development,” as the Rockwood Alternatives contends. There are residences located close by in both the town home and single family communities, and residents, including children, from both of those communities frequent that area of Belfast on foot, on bikes, and in cars when entering and exiting the neighborhood.

After Rockwood events, there will be a long back up of traffic at the stop sign where Belfast meets MacArthur Blvd. This will not only greatly inconvenience residents (many of whom moved to Woodrock to have the benefits of a quiet, traffic-free neighborhood), but pose a serious hazard in the event of emergency conditions requiring quick ingress to, or egress from, the neighborhood, *e.g.* a medical emergency or fire involving medical personnel, ambulances or fire trucks.

Alternatives 1 and 2 likely would also lead frustrated residents of the single family homes to attempt to avoid congestion from Rockwood by turning from Belfast Road onto Whiterim Drive. Whiterim runs through a densely populated townhome community with a large population of children who often play on that road and connected streets. Whiterim Drive is the only other road in the neighborhood that connects to MacArthur Blvd., and would typically not be used by single family home residents because, in part, that area is densely populated. Rockwood visitors too likely would drive through Whiterim to avoid congestion on Belfast, and likely would not be deterred by signs suggesting they stay on Belfast if they face the likely long back up at the Belfast stop sign.

Neither the feasibility study previously prepared by Montgomery Parks nor the Rockwood Alternatives gives serious consideration to the safety and other impacts on Woodrock. Woodrock safety and conditions are barely mentioned, in striking contrast to the extensive discussion of impacts on trees, structures and business at Rockwood Manor. As far as we know, there never was any effort to survey Woodrock residents, nor, as far as we know, has there been a study by Montgomery Parks of neighborhood character or traffic patterns. This is consistent with the fact that there can be no adequate justification for Alternatives 1 and 2 if safety and traffic impacts on the Woodrock neighborhood are genuinely taken into account.

Although we have great concern that the Montgomery Park’s plan for Rockwood will bring much more commercial traffic to an area that has never had such volume, and do not believe a persuasive case for any road building has been made, any of alternatives 3-5 are preferable to Alternatives 1 and 2, which are unacceptable. For example, the Rockwood Alternatives notes that there are substantial advantages to Alternative 4, in terms of safety, ease of access and circulation, visual appeal, and preservation of the Belfast frontage, both aesthetically and environmentally.

Although inexplicably omitted from the discussion of Alternative 4 in the Rockwood Alternatives, Alternative 4 has the important advantage of avoiding the impacts on the Rockwood neighborhood associated with Alternatives 1 and 2—all of which implicate safety, neighborhood character, and traffic congestion. These advantages plainly outweigh the supposed disadvantages listed in the Rockwood Alternatives.

While pedestrian proximity and proximity to Belfast Road are noted as disadvantages of Alternative 4, Alternatives 1 and 2 would create much greater pedestrian contact because Belfast lacks sidewalks in the impacted area, and certainly would result in far more “proximity” to Belfast Road (by directing traffic directly onto Belfast). The Rockwood Alternatives notes that Alternative 4 “may” require significant “land disturbance” and removal of “smaller trees not shown on the plans”, but the use of “may” highlights that this is merely speculation that is out of place in the document, and certainly does not outweigh safety and traffic impacts on Woodrock. Similarly, the possible removal of an oak tree simply does not compare to the overall environmental and safety impacts of introducing a large volume of traffic into a quiet residential community, the associated emissions, or the overall environmental impact of extending the road at Rockwood and the associated clearing on that property. Nor does removal of the tree compare to the adverse environmental impact of bringing many more consumers to Rockwood as Montgomery Parks plans. Alternatives 1 and 2 also would require substantial clearing in order to extend the road onto Belfast.

The Rockwood Alternatives notes that an emergency vehicle could block the road at the Manor House, but the road could be blocked by an emergency vehicle regardless of which alternative is implemented. Presumably, emergency personnel are trained to avoid such blockage where needed for safety reasons, and there is no indication in the Rockwood Alternatives that emergency personnel were consulted. This is no reason to adopt Alternatives 1 or 2. Finally the Remediation Alternatives notes that a widened driveway and new sidewalk in front of Manor House might make some buildings less “desirable.” We suspect this could be avoided through careful design work, but even if not, such considerations are both speculative and insufficient to outweigh the safety and traffic impacts on Woodrock associated with Alternatives 1 and 2. Moreover, a road funneling traffic into our neighborhood would likely make the homes in Woodrock less desirable. This would likely have a much greater financial impact than any impacts on Rockwood associated with the other alternatives, yet it is not considered in the Rockwood Alternatives.

I also note some concerns that we have previously raised with the Planning Board. We attended a meeting of the Woodrock Homeowners Association in 2015 at which staff of Montgomery Parks and employees of Rockwood Manor spoke and asserted that the reason for the proposed rerouting of traffic into our neighborhood was the need to provide access for the largest ladder truck operated by the fire department. This purported safety concern was the sole justification offered by Montgomery Parks and Rockwood Manor staff for the proposed road construction. Members of our community raised questions about this justification at the meeting because it is apparent that a large ladder truck would never be needed for a relatively low building such as Rockwood Manor. Not only was no response provided to this question, but it

appeared to us that the Montgomery Parks had not consulted with the Cabin John Volunteer Fire Department, which services our community, about whether an exit point was needed, much less one that would funnel traffic into our neighborhood. We have seen no indication since then that the Fire Department was ever consulted.

The Feasibility Study does not indicate that the fire department was ever consulted. Thus, while fire department access was the sole justification for constructing a commercial road into our neighborhood offered by Montgomery Parks to our community, and all of us understand the importance of genuine fire-safety matters, the purported safety concern has never been substantiated. We ask that the Montgomery Parks and the Board invite the Chief of the Cabin John Volunteer Fire Department to testify about fire safety issues at the upcoming hearing. Before so much as considering an alternatives that involve constructing a commercial road into our residential community, Montgomery Parks and the Board should fully and fairly consider whether there really is a fire-safety hazard (that neither Montgomery Parks nor the County would have done anything to address in the decades that the County has owned Rockwood Manor nor in the more than 90 years in which Rockwood Manor has been in existence). Consideration of purported fire department access cannot occur meaningfully without consulting the Cabin John Volunteer Fire Department, and a report to the community on the results.

In addition, while the Feasibility Study recognizes that Rockwood Manor is an environmentally sensitive area and located next to a national park, the Feasibility Study fails to recognize that the adjoining Woodrock neighborhood too is an environmentally sensitive area. For example, county imposed conservation easements impose stringent restrictions on the cutting of trees on our properties, and equally stringent covenants place limitations on how our properties may be developed. Nonetheless, Montgomery Parks has not done an environmental impact study regarding the proposed construction and expansion at Rockwood, including the construction of a new road that will involve extensive tree removal, and direct cars and buses through our community. (In fact, some of us noticed and are concerned that the County has begun clearing trees at Rockwood Manor prior to Planning Board approval.) An environmental impact study should be undertaken before the Board decides whether to approve the proposed construction, including the road, or continues tree clearing at Rockwood Manor.

If in fact a fire safety issue at Rockwood Manor is legitimately determined to require the construction of a new exit road (which could occur only upon completion of the needed fire safety study, including the provision of information from the fire department, and with due consideration of an environmental impact study), then we request that Montgomery Parks propose and the Planning Board require the following in order to address the safety and neighborhood concerns that we and others in our community have raised with the Montgomery Parks and the Board: (1) select Alternatives 3, 4, or 5, and (2) restrict use of any new exit road to emergency vehicles. As noted, Montgomery Park staff has assured our community that the fire safety is the reason for the proposed construction of the exit road. This proposal would allow full access for emergency vehicles while avoiding a highly detrimental commercial and vehicular impact on our neighborhood.

Mr. Casey Anderson

June 6, 2016

Page 5

We urge Montgomery Park and the Planning Board to genuinely consider the concerns we have raised in this letter, and respond as requested herein. This is a serious issue for our community, and we are aware of deep concern among those of our neighbors who have become aware of Montgomery Park's proposed plans and the Rockwood Alternatives.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Harold L. Segall". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, prominent initial "H".

Harold L. Segall

Cc (via email):

Mr. Aaron Feldman

Mr. Robert Bernius

Ms. Lauren Gross

Feldman, Aaron

From: Fred Alt <fredalt2004@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 07, 2016 8:10 AM
To: Feldman, Aaron
Subject: Rockwood Manor Special Park

Mr. Feldman:

Thank you for the recent walk-through of options for the Driveway Alignment at Rockwood Manor. As residents of Woodrock for over 30 years, we naturally have a keen and abiding interest in the proposals. It would be our strong preference that only options three, four and five receive consideration. For safety reasons, we believe the first two options exiting on Belfast should be discarded both because of the impact on residents of the immediate area and because the road itself has blind spots and hills that would result in potential accidents and other traffic problems especially for the people in the single family homes at the bottom of the hill who use the road as their primary access. We have no strong preference among the other three proposals and defer to your professional judgment and budgetary considerations in making your decision. Thanks for the opportunity to comment. Feel free to contact us if you have any further questions.

Fred & Carol Alt
10718 Goldwood Court
Potomac, MD 20854

301-299-5568

Feldman, Aaron

From: Feldman, Aaron
Sent: Monday, June 13, 2016 9:16 AM
To: 'Michele Rosenfeld'
Cc: Ma, Michael; McManus, Patricia
Subject: RE: Rockwood Manor
Attachments: 2016 0524 Field Walk Sign In.pdf

Michele –

I am still the project manager for this project and I will be presenting the staff recommendation to the Planning Board on June 23.

I'm sorry you were unable to attend the May 24 field walk. The purpose of the field walk was to review and clarify the driveway alignment alternatives on site. We did not give a formal presentation but generally reviewed the alternatives that were posted on our project website: http://www.montgomeryparks.org/pdd/cip/rockwood_manor_special_park.shtm. Approximately eighteen people attended the group walk. Our intent was for residents to respond to us with comments by early June, in time to help inform our recommendation.

Your request comes very late in the process, as the staff report is currently being finalized and routed for signatures so it can be posted for review. Unfortunately, at this point, we just don't have time to schedule and provide adequate notification to hold another public meeting. However, I've attached a copy of the sign-in sheet from the field walk if you would like to discuss the project with other members of the community who did attend.

We did not conduct additional traffic studies for this project, nor did we prepare additional cost analyses following the last Planning Board meeting.

Please let me know if you have any additional questions.

Regards,
Aaron

Aaron Feldman | M-NCPPC | 301.650.2887

From: Michele Rosenfeld [mailto:rosenfeldlaw@mail.com]
Sent: Friday, June 10, 2016 8:57 AM
To: Feldman, Aaron <aaron.feldman@montgomeryparks.org>
Subject: Rockwood Manor

Hi Aaron: Are you still the lead staff person on this project? If so, could we schedule a site visit to view the alternatives that are being presented to the Board? There are about 3 of us who were unable to attend the last site visit and we'd appreciate an opportunity to hear staff's presentation.

Also, has there been an updated traffic study since the last Planning Board hearing?

Thanks, and if you're not the right person to contact please just let me know who I should follow up with.

Regards, Michele.

Michele Rosenfeld
The Law Office of Michele Rosenfeld LLC
1 Research Court
Suite 450
Rockville MD 20850
301-204-0913 (direct)
rosenfeldlaw@mail.com (email)
michelerosenfeldllc.com (website)

Feldman, Aaron

From: Cadigan, Nancy
Sent: Monday, June 13, 2016 9:54 AM
To: Turnbull, Christy
Cc: Feldman, Aaron; Finney, Gina; Allbrooks, Julie; Ma, Michael; McManus, Patricia
Subject: Re: Street Sign

I've not heard of it either.

On Jun 13, 2016, at 9:22 AM, Turnbull, Christy <Christy.Turnbull@montgomeryparks.org> wrote:

This is the first I am hearing of this

Christy Turnbull
Enterprise Division Chief
Montgomery Parks
301-495-2592

On Jun 13, 2016, at 9:14 AM, Feldman, Aaron <aaron.feldman@montgomeryparks.org> wrote:

Hi all –

Just wanted to keep you in the loop about yet another issue at Rockwood Manor. Had anyone heard about this sign being installed prior to it actually happening?

Please let me know.

Thanks,
Aaron

Aaron Feldman | M-NCPPC | 301.650.2887

From: Nancy Altman [<mailto:user880050@aol.com>]
Sent: Monday, June 13, 2016 8:53 AM
To: Feldman, Aaron <aaron.feldman@montgomeryparks.org>
Cc: Farl31@aol.com; enaden@aol.com; helyn39@aol.com; pmcmillen1@verizon.net; jmoore7716@gmail.com; McManus, Patricia <patricia.mcmanus@montgomeryparks.org>
Subject: Re: Street Sign

Not sure if his answer isn't more like,"it depends on what the meaning of "is" is." Don't think we can eliminate the P&P as the responsible party based on his response. But, even so, it was to be a sign of the county's flexing (pun intended!). Sent from my iPhone

On Jun 13, 2016, at 8:28 AM, Feldman, Aaron <aaron.feldman@montgomeryparks.org> wrote:

Ms. Farely –

This sign is something that would have been planned for an installed by the Montgomery County Department of Transportation. Your email is the first that I am hearing about it. While we did consult with representatives from MCDOT about the driveway alternatives and their impacts to county roads, we did not discuss taking any action prior to the Planning Board hearing on the 23rd.

Regards,

Aaron Feldman

Aaron Feldman | M-NCPPC | 301.650.2887

From: Farl31@aol.com [<mailto:Farl31@aol.com>]
Sent: Sunday, June 12, 2016 9:28 AM
To: Feldman, Aaron <aaron.feldman@montgomeryparks.org>
Cc: enaden@aol.com; helyn39@aol.com; User880050@aol.com; pmcmillen1@verizon.net; jmoore7716@gmail.com
Subject: Street Sign

I recently wrote to you about our Woodrock Community and changing traffic patterns into and out of Rockwood onto MacArthur Boulevard.

I was out of the country for a week and returned to a huge “NO OUTLET” sign installed at the corner of Whiterim Terrace and Whiterim Drive in our neighborhood. It is enormous, shocking actually.

This seems strange coming right after our meeting at Rockwood with you. Many of us feel that a decision has already been made and this is an indication that you plan to channel traffic from your events out onto Belfast and Whiterim Terrace and the "NO OUTLET" sign is intended to intercept cars coming down Whiterim Terrace and channel them down Whiterim Drive out onto MacArthur Boulevard.

Mr. Feldman, this sign is so huge it should be placed on an interstate and not on a small neighborhood street. No one here seems to know why this sign was placed and who ordered it.

Our neighborhood has been very sensitive to signage. We have a small "children playing" sign at the Whiterim Drive entrance. I know that as a Landscape Architect you are sensitive to signage and the environment.

Did you or someone under your direction have anything to do with the appearance of the "No Outlet" sign? Thanks for letting me know.

Marilyn Farley, Hon. AIA
7816 Whiterim Terrace
Potomac, MD 20854
301-983-2485
301-219-2666

Feldman, Aaron

From: Michele Rosenfeld <rosenfeldlaw@mail.com>
Sent: Sunday, June 12, 2016 2:03 PM
To: Feldman, Aaron
Subject: One more question re: Rockwood Manor

Hi Aaron:

Do you have any cost analysis for the various alternatives? If so, would you please forward them to me?

Thank you in advance, Michele.

Michele Rosenfeld
The Law Office of Michele Rosenfeld LLC
1 Research Court
Suite 450
Rockville MD 20850
301-204-0913 (direct)
rosenfeldlaw@mail.com (email)
michelerosenfeldllc.com (website)

Feldman, Aaron

From: TrafficOps <TrafficOps@montgomerycountymd.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2016 11:04 AM
To: helyn39@aol.com
Cc: Feldman, Aaron
Subject: Whiterim Drive and Whiterim Terrace

Dear Ms. Lynch:

Thank you for your email dated June 8, 2016 and June 10, 2016, regarding traffic operations and pedestrian safety on Whiterim Terrace at Whiterim Drive. I share your concerns for traffic safety on our roadways, and would like to address your specific concerns regarding traffic operations. In your email you sought the information as to who requested the no outlet sign on Whiterim Terrace at Whiterim Drive.

The no outlet sign was requested by a homeowner in this community. We conducted a field investigation and found that the no outlet sign was necessary to alert motorists at this intersection. Therefore, we installed the sign at a proper location on Whiterim Terrace at Whiterim Drive.

Again, thank you for your interest in these matters of traffic control and safety. If you have any questions regarding our study, please feel free to contact me at 240-777-2190.

Sincerely,

Kyle Liang, Senior Planning Specialist
Division of Traffic Engineering and Operations
Montgomery County Department of Transportation

KL: aj