ATTACHMENT 6

From: george@wolfand.com <george@wolfand.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 9, 2018 3:18 PM
To: Tettelbaum, Emily <Emily.Tettelbaum@montgomeryplanning.org>
Cc: 'Gail Bancroft' <gail@gbancroft.com>; 'M Winter' <mwinterfamily5@gmail.com>; briank <briankinmd@gmail.com>; 'Wendy Jonas Calhoun' <wendy1@erols.com>; 'Sanford P. Markey' <markeys6@verizon.net>; 'Eleni Martin' <elenimartin@yahoo.com>; 'Rob Katz' <robkatzindc@gmail.com>; nicole.weidinger116@gmail.com
Subject: RE: WMAL Development - Response to Recent Meeting

Emily,

We received your summary of items discussed pursuant to our meeting 2 weeks ago. Thank you. We have the following requests/concerns:

1. A preface to the noise study explaining the change in analysis from the original noise study:
    a. The change in the noise study was a surprising change to us and candidly appears as a convenient exercise on the part of the applicant to reduce costs and shun responsibility for something that was previously proving to be a costly challenge. Like many complex analyses I've seen performed throughout this process, the originator/author of the review builds a convenient case to meet their objective. The most concerning issue about this approach is that the applicant is biased and the one paying for and conducting their own analysis. In this case, the analysis has been sent to the Planning Department, but we have concerns as whether the County has taken both the time and specialized resources to review this study with as much scrutiny as the community might wish. Please provide the details of what has been done to review these results and if an independent review by 3rd party engineer has been conducted.
2. The updated noise study
    a. We have receive what you provided. However, to further emphasize the above issue -- this is potentially a "show stopper" for us coming up to the public hearing. Unless we can gain an understanding that the noise levels are really different from before and now, amazingly, don't qualify for sound abatement, this issue will be raised with all our options. A thorough unbiased specialist in this area needs to evaluate this change as opposed to the applicant conducting a convenient analysis on their own behalf. Our neighborhood has had significant discussions with SHA about sound barriers and Dba levels and the rules that are in place. The idea that the "rate of growth" should suddenly be less than anticipated and now magically requires that no noise abatement be put in place for a new development is counterintuitive -- its' candidly unbelievable.
3. The concept design for Fernwood Rd/Democracy Blvd
    a. Please provide the design that MCDOT is planning for this intersection. We will work directly with MCDOT once we have access to said diagram.
4. Budget proposal for Fernwood Rd/Democracy Blvd intersection
   Email from DOT accepting the applicant's budget proposal and future contribution
    a. Received.

5. Conservation Area and Path Designation

a. WFCA has argued many times that the placement of the walking path line should be on the “inside canopy” border to:
    i. Limit any disturbance/change to the natural habitat and preserve the conservations area (i.e., that’s why it’s called conservation).
    ii. Maintain the existing community’s privacy that they have enjoyed for 40+ years.

b. Each time this is brought up, the comment is that this path will be a “field placement.” This answer is not sufficient and leaves it up to the discretion of the applicant. WFCA is yelling as loud as we can to explain that the surrounding areas should be preserved and **existing neighborhoods** should be as unaffected wherever possible. The surrounding communities will bear the burden of this new community the most. We find the dismissive response to this issue deplorable and once again ask that the path lines be redrawn with a comment –"to be placed on the side closest to the new community at the edge of the conservation area”. Please leave the natural borders alone!

Please let us know when we can discuss again.

George I. Wolfand
President, West Fernwood Citizens Association

T: 202.WOL.FAND (202.965.3263)
F: 301.715.3880

Tettelbaum, Emily

From: george@wolfand.com
Sent: Wednesday, March 28, 2018 10:17 AM
To: Tettelbaum, Emily
Cc: Butler, Patrick; Meus, Garry; Lindsey, Amy
Subject: RE: WMAL Development

Thank you for your response.

With respect to item #1 – we are not suggesting that the trail not be created, only that it run along the edge of the wall rather than the woods. Again, you might not consider the trail to be harmful, but there is a privacy factor and environmental factor both to consider. We have repeatedly ask that the trail follow the wall and NOT go through the woods. This is not a legal issue and we expect some accommodation to respect the neighboring community. We again ask you to relocate the path as shown to a less intrusive location merely a few away but outside the trees.

Issue #2 – Thank you for pointing out these documents. I missed them among the long list. Are there any thoughts on the improvements from the planning group on this proposed plan? Such as -- While I understand the expense, should lighting a be a consideration for the two "bump out areas and at the intersection into the new development?

George I. Wolfand, CGMA
T: 202.WOL.FAND (202.965.3263)
F: 301.715.3880
E: george@wolfand.com
gwolfand@expensereduction.com

Telecommunications, Operations, & Profitability Consulting

From: Tettelbaum, Emily [mailto:Emily.Tettelbaum@montgomeryplanning.org]
Sent: Wednesday, March 28, 2018 9:30 AM
To: george@wolfand.com
Cc: Butler, Patrick <patrick.butler@montgomeryplanning.org>; Meus, Garry <garry.meus@montgomeryplanning.org>; Lindsey, Amy <amy.lindsey@montgomeryplanning.org>
Subject: RE: WMAL Development

Mr. Wolfand,

Please see the responses to your questions/issues below (in italics).

Issue #1: why cant this running trail run along the edge of the of the conservation area next to the sound barrier/wall. Again – the drawing makes the woods look very deep when in fact this is just the tree canopy. Having a running trail thru these woods literally will be most of the forest in some cases and we will now have people running in our backyards. Why is this so hard to appreciate. Of all the requests we've made, this one is one is clearly discretionary. This trail does NOT have to go where it is placed and we've requested this a dozen times. The purpose of conservation area is:

- Maintain and improve water quality;

- Perpetuate and foster the growth of healthy forest;
- Maintain and improve wildlife habitat and migration corridors;
- Protect scenic vistas visible from roads and other public areas; or
- Ensure that lands are managed so that they are always available

We do NOT see that this running trail is in line with what forest conservation should be and again am requesting that it be moved to the edge of the sound barrier.

We assume you are referring to the natural surface trail segment in the forested area located to the north of the proposed development. As indicated on the plans, the trail will be "field located" so that it does not require tree removal. We consider natural surface trails to be compatible with forest conservation areas.

Issue #2
I do not see any proposed improvements for Greyswood.
Are there also supposed to be preliminary plans for Fernwood & Democracy – which I would also like MCDOT to receive.

The proposed improvements for Greyswood Road are found on two drawings with the following name in DAIC: 32-RDIMP-820170170.

The design concept for the Fernwood Road & Democracy Blvd. intersection was submitted directly to MCDOT. I have attached a copy of the concept and the associated traffic analyses.

Kind Regards,
Emily

Emily Tettelbaum
Area 2 | Montgomery County Planning Department
8787 Georgia Ave | Silver Spring, MD 20910
301-495-4569 | emily.tettelbaum@montgomeryplanning.org

From: george@wolfand.com [mailto:george@wolfand.com]
Sent: Saturday, March 24, 2018 3:54 PM
To: Tettelbaum, Emily <Emily.Tettelbaum@montgomeryplanning.org>
Cc: Butler, Patrick <patrick.butler@montgomeryplanning.org>; Meus, Garry <garry.meus@montgomeryplanning.org>
Subject: RE: WMAL Development

Issue #2
I do not see any proposed improvements for Greyswood.
Are there also supposed to be preliminary plans for Fernwood & Democracy – which I would also like MCDOT to receive.

George I. Wolfand, CGMA
T: 202.WOL.FAND (202.965.3263)
F: 301.715.3880
E: george@wolfand.com
gwolfand@expensereduction.com

Telecommunications, Operations, & Profitability Consulting

From: george@wolfand.com [mailto:george@wolfand.com]
Sent: Saturday, March 24, 2018 2:16 PM
To: 'Tettelbaum, Emily' <Emily.Tettelbaum@montgomeryplanning.org>

Cc: 'Butler, Patrick' <patrick.butler@montgomeryplanning.org>; 'Meus, Garry' <garry.meus@montgomeryplanning.org>
Subject: RE: WMAL Development

Issue #1

Emily/Patrick – why cant this running trail run along the edge of the of the conservation area next to the sound barrier/wall. Again – the drawing makes the woods look very deep when in fact this is just the tree canopy. Having a running trail thru these woods literally will be most of the forest in some cases and we will now have people running in our backyards. Why is this so hard to appreciate. Of all the requests we've made, this one is one is clearly discretionary. This trail does NOT have to go where it is placed and we've requested this a dozen times. The purpose of conservation area is:

- Maintain and improve water quality;
- Perpetuate and foster the growth of healthy forest;
- Maintain and improve wildlife habitat and migration corridors;
- Protect scenic vistas visible from roads and other public areas; or
- Ensure that lands are managed so that they are always available

We do NOT see that this running trail is in line with what forest conservation should be and again am requesting that it be moved to the edge of the sound barrier.

George I. Wolfand
President, West Fernwood Citizens Association

T: 202.WOL.FAND (202.965.3263)
F: 301.715.3880

From: Tettelbaum, Emily [mailto:Emily.Tettelbaum@montgomeryplanning.org]
Sent: Friday, March 23, 2018 10:12 AM
To: 'George Wolfand' <george@wolfand.com>; Brendan Grainger <brendan.grainger@gmail.com>; Brian Krantz <briankinmd@gmail.com>; Dave Weinstein (Treasurer <davemwein@gmail.com>; Eleni Martin (At-Large <elenimartin@yahoo.com>; Sanford Markey (Secretary <markeys6@verizon.net>; Stephanie Guerin-Yodice (VP <sgy1@verizon.net>; Rob <robkatzshopping@gmail.com>
Cc: Butler, Patrick <patrick.butler@montgomeryplanning.org>; Meus, Garry <garry.meus@montgomeryplanning.org>
Subject: RE: WMAL Development

Good Morning,
I am writing to inform you that the revised site plan drawings for the WMAL project (#820170170) have been submitted and uploaded onto our website. The drawings can be viewed here; the revised versions are labelled as Submitted Drawings-Final Revision. At present, the project is scheduled to be reviewed by the Planning Board on 5/24.

I am working closely with Patrick Butler to review the site plan, so please direct any questions or comments to both of us.
Kind Regards,
Emily

Emily Tettelbaum
Area 2 | Montgomery County Planning Department
8787 Georgia Ave | Silver Spring, MD 20910
301-495-4569 | emily.tettelbaum@montgomeryplanning.org

From: Wendy Jonas Calhoun
To: Tettelbaum, Emily
Cc: Butler, Patrick
Subject: Re: Update on the WMAL Site Plan Application
Date: Monday, July 23, 2018 5:05:46 PM

Emily and Patrick:

I opened all of the 7/18 files (there were a lot), and I don't see the land dedicated for the school in any of them - just more houses.

Also - I thought there was some plan for this development to fit in/mix in with the existing community, which with the "modern" design, does not (especially the community building - it's awful, and will stick out as a sore thumb). Weird question re: the lounge pool, because I can't tell. Is it large enough for a swim meet? (how many lanes/how long? Would need to be 6 lanes, 25 meters long) If not, it just goes to show how much TB really does not get this community...

Finally, I'd like to respectfully request that this 11/15 meeting happen in the evening, and not during the day, so that community members who work may attend.

Thank you,
Wendy

From: "Emily Tettelbaum" <Emily.Tettelbaum@montgomeryplanning.org>
To: "Emily Tettelbaum" <Emily.Tettelbaum@montgomeryplanning.org>
Cc: "Patrick Butler" <patrick.butler@montgomeryplanning.org>
Sent: Monday, July 23, 2018 4:05:07 PM
Subject: Update on the WMAL Site Plan Application

Good Afternoon,

Toll Brothers recently submitted revised site plan drawings for the WMAL project (Site Plan #820170170). The drawings can be viewed here; the revised sheets have a July 2018 date and they are located under the Submitted Drawings-Final Revision heading. This project is scheduled for a Planning Board hearing on 11/15.

Feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Best Regards,
Emily

Emily Tettelbaum
Area 2 | Montgomery County Planning Department
8787 Georgia Ave | Silver Spring, MD 20910
301-495-4569 | emily.tettelbaum@montgomeryplanning.org