

From: Musico, William
To: [Leftwich, Troy](#); [Conlon, Catherine](#)
Subject: FW: SWMC - 282468 - Bloom Montgomery Village
Date: Wednesday, September 06, 2017 3:46:01 PM
Attachments: [3DN 282468 Bloom Montgomery Village.WJM.pdf](#)

Bloom SWM Concept denial attached.

Thanks,
Bill

Bill Musico, PE. CPESC
Senior Permitting Services Specialist / Floodplain Coordinator
Montgomery County - Department of Permitting Services, Water Resources Section
255 Rockville Pike, 2nd Fl.
Rockville, MD 20850
240-777-6340

From: Musico, William
Sent: Wednesday, September 06, 2017 3:43 PM
To: 'mitchell@vika.com' <mitchell@vika.com>
Cc: 'rhines@monumentrealty.com' <rhines@monumentrealty.com>
Subject: SWMC - 282468 - Bloom Montgomery Village

Sherry,

Based on a review by the Department of Permitting Services Review Staff, the Stormwater Management Concept for the above mentioned site is **unacceptable**. The Stormwater Management Concept proposes to meet required stormwater management goals via Microbioretention & Drywells.

Please submit a modified Stormwater Management Concept for review and approval. All submissions must be accompanied by a resubmittal application. Resubmissions do not require additional review fees. The modified submission must incorporate the following items:

1. A detailed review of the stormwater management computations will occur at the time of detailed plan review.
2. Large sections of roadway both private and public sections still receive no treatment, while rooftops and courtyard are over-treating to compensate. ESD to MEP must consider *the primary objective is to manage runoff as close to its source as possible*. ESD to the MEP must consider treating the most polluted areas to the maximum extent practicable first. SWM practices treating the public road must be with the road right of way. The provided in summary table does not breakdown the area of roadway and parking areas that generate the most polluted runoff vs other areas. Before

resubmitting the concept plan for review, please schedule a meeting with DPS to review the chosen layout and why it cannot be adjusted to provide treatment for these roadway and parking areas.

3. The revised layout changes the anticipated hydraulics of cabin branch and invalidates the previously approved floodplain delineation study (FPDS) No.281949. Remove all references to this study from the concept plan and indicate the anticipated delineation limits of FPDS 283274. These changes must also be reflected in the FEMA approved Conditional Letter of Map Revision (CLMOR). While the SWM concept may ultimately be found acceptable without completing the floodplain delineations, DPS will not recommend the planning board permit subdivision of land prior to both the MC FPDS and CLOMR approval.
4. ESD to MEP fail to address use of infiltrations type ESD practices. Per MD Stormwater Management Act of 2007 and MC Code Sec. 19-22A.bE *use ESD practices to maintain 100% of the average annual pre- development groundwater recharge volume for the site.*
 - Thank you for your point by point response dated April 18th, 2017. “The recharge calculation have been provided in accordance with Section 2.2 and added to Appendix B of the report. The drywell provide 77% of the recharge volume. The remaining volume will be provided in enhanced filters with acceptable infiltration rates at the time of final engineering”
 - Enhanced Filters M-9 are distinct SWM practices added to bottom of other appropriate practices. They have their own design specifications and minimum required separation from groundwater that need to be evaluated and approved during the concept phase.
5. The line style used for sheet match lines and SWM drainage divides are too similar in style to be clearly distinguished. Change the line style of the SWM drainage divides and when these divides cross sheet match lines, show the drainage divide line extending past the match line to indicate continuation on the next page. Several the match lines are mislabeled indicated the wrong adjoining plan sheet.
6. Area 2 has three (3) and Area 4 has one (1) SWM drainage divides not draining to any identified SWM practice.
7. DPS acknowledges the receipt of your 300 page print out of notifications to downstream and adjacent properties.
8. DPS agrees with your methodology used to determine the target Pe for each Area and the volume of treatment required.
9. Please note that the fill placement and foundation systems for the proposed buildings will be required to follow the Department of Permitting Services (DPS) complex structure approval due to the nature and complexity of the project. As such, the fill placement and foundation systems must be constructed under the supervision of a DPS approved geotechnical engineer licensed in the State of Maryland. This engineer must certify and submit reports on the compaction and soil bearing capacity of the fills and certify that the fill is adequate for the proposed foundation systems. If you have any

questions please call George Muste, 240-777-6232

This list may not be all-inclusive and may change based on available information at the time.

If you have any questions regarding these actions, please feel free to contact me at 240-777-6340.

Thanks,
Bill

Bill Musico, PE. CPESC
Senior Permitting Services Specialist / Floodplain Coordinator
Montgomery County - Department of Permitting Services, Water Resources Section
255 Rockville Pike, 2nd Fl.
Rockville, MD 20850
240-777-6340