

September 11, 2025

City of Gaithersburg  
800 Rabbitt Road  
Gaithersburg, MD 20878

Re: Casey-Rosedale Property  
Zoning Map Amendment –  
CD Zone with Schematic  
Development Plan  
4<sup>th</sup> Submission

### Casey-Rosedale Property

### Fourth Submission Comment Response (comments issued August 13, 2025)

#### Case #: Z-10030-2025

Comments from the third submission review by City of Gaithersburg Staff, received on August 13, 2025, have been included and responded to below for your use during the 4<sup>th</sup> review of the Casey-Rosedale Property Schematic Development Plan. Comments have been included by plan set and broken out by sheet upon which comment was received.

## 01-CASEY ROSEDALE SDP PLAN SET

### CG-1.1 Notes & Computations

1. Table 4: Project Data Table  
Adjusted Tract Area – 660,912  
Response: Tract Area has been corrected to 665,415 sf and the Adjusted Tract Area has been corrected to 689,491 sf. These numbers now match the land areas in the Boundary Survey prepared by RCI on 2/12/2025. These numbers match the Site Tract Area provided on CG – 2.0.
2. Table 4: Project Data Table  
Check all of these- what are you using as your tract Area for N738 & N881?  
734,381 / 1.6 = 458,988
  - Where is this number coming from?
  - Also need to adjust total FAR based on 660,912 sf.Response: We have fixed the Residential Density (fga/FAR) table (permitted / required). Residential densities have been fixed and the FAR recomputed per the updated 689,491 sf adjusted Tract Area.
3. Table 4: Open Area (Useable)  
Recalculate based on 660,912  
Response: Updated to 9.83%.
4. Table 5: Subsection 1  
Remove “(refer to statement of justification “SOJ” for waiver.)  
Response: Text has been revised as noted.

5. Table 7: Can you provide parking ratio by unit size? Or show the shortage by unit size? I calculated one option for how the ratios work out now-not sure if you want to use these or something different. This may help your justification for the reduction.  
Response: Updated computations provided on the EXB-2.2 Phase 2 sheet. Parking "by lot" numbers have been corrected and an explanation added for the shortage on Building 3 to be provided by a surplus on Building 4.
6. Table 7: I only count 213 based on the boundaries of this lot-staff is concerned about the shortage on this lot in particular (especially because of the phasing)  
Response: 213 is correct, the total parking provided in Lot 1 – block A has been fixed.
7. This is 166 based on lot boundaries. You can have parking on adjacent lots-this should be included in rational for parking ratios- "(D) Location of parking spaces. All required parking spaces shall be located on the same lot as the main building or structure, or on adjacent lots not further than one thousand five hundred (1,500) feet from the boundary of the lot that contains the primary building or structure for which they are required."  
Response: Lot 2 – Block A parking tallies has been corrected to reflect the 24 parking spaces to be used by building 3 in the ultimate site condition. Total parking provided has been corrected to 166 spaces.
8. Lot 1: Block B: update 2-bedroom total to 142  
Response: Corrected to 142.
9. Total Overall Surface Parking: We only count 603  
Response: Correct. Total count has been corrected to 603.

#### CG-2.0 Zoning Plans

10. These total 536,145. Previous sheet has 562,952 total building area. Is this because some of the proposed buildings are in current ROW that will be abandoned (so not technically on the parcel)? Either correct these numbers to match previous sheet or add note to make clear the difference.  
Response: FAR table on Sheet CG-2.0 has been fixed. 562,952 sf is the correct building area and the computations have been corrected to reflect the numbers on the previous sheet.

#### SDP-1.1 Schematic Development Plan

11. Show how this culvert and outfall connect into the new storm drain system.  
Response: 36" existing culvert pipe is now shown on the plan.
12. Is this label in the right spot?  
Response: PUE label has been moved to align with the PUE.
13. Please add these line types to the legend - they appear to be PUE utilities sg  
Response: Legend has been updated to include these Utilities.

#### SDP-1.2 Schematic Development Plan

14. Show culvert connection to storm drain on other side of the street. KE  
Response: 36" existing culvert pipe is now shown on the plan.

15. If applicable, show flood elevation contour or add label/note. KE

Response: No flood elevation has been added to the plan in this area. No flood plain exists per the environmental analysis for the site. Runoff to the existing SHA pond has been reduced with the installation of the onsite storm drain and routed around the existing pond.

#### SPD-1.4 Schematic Development Plan

16. Fix this parking space labels

Response: Parking Space and ADA Parking space labels have been fixed.

## **02-WALL PLAN SET**

#### SDP-2.1 Wall Plan and Profile

1. Show dimension.

Response: The dimension for footing width has been added to wall 1 section.

2. Show top of wall width correctly on plans. Top of unit V6-44 is about 3ft. wide.

Response: The top of wall width is correctly shown on plans. The manufacturer has a top block at surface exposed one-foot from wall face to adjacent finish lawn.

#### SDP-2.2 Wall Plan & Profile

3. Plan shows 8'-5" footing width. Match Plans with sections.

Response: The plan has been updated to reflect the 8'-5" footing width, and larger base stone.

#### SDP-2.3 Wall Plan & Profile

4. Repeat comment: Show top of wall width correctly on plans. Top unit V6-44 is about 3ft. wide.

Response: Top of wall width correctly on plans.

#### SDP-2.6 Wall Details

5. Provide fence details.

Response: Please refer to schematic development plan's "Design Guidelines" for the fencing details.

#### SDP-2.7 Wall Details

6. Repeat comment from previous submission: Show one final drain location

Response: Details shown are schematic and allow for alternate drain if required by final structural design. Final drain location to be determined at Site Development Plan / Permitting stage and to be coordinated with final structural.

7. Provide typical sizes of each stone strong unit. (24-86, 24-62, 24-44, V6-44)

Response: Typical sizes of each stone have been added to the detail sheet.

8. Provide fence details.

Response: Please refer to schematic development plan's "Design Guidelines" pg.30 for the fencing details.

### 03-CASEY ROSEDALE SUBDIVISION PLAN SET

#### CV-2.0 Overall Preliminary Subdivision Plan

9. Add proposed storm drain easement, proposed stormwater management easement, and proposed temporary public access easement to the legend. KE  
Response: All easements have been added to the legend on all sheets.
10. Easements cannot be granted in an existing right of way. Any work in the ROW would need to be approved by SHA through their permitting process. Remove from plan. KE.  
Response: Off site easements have been removed from the plan set. Offsite impacts have been coordinated with SHA and offsite grading to be covered under future SHA Access Management permit.
11. Update labels-walls no longer there, grading only  
Response: Correct. Labels for walls have been removed as walls with offsite impacts have been removed from the plan set.
12. Is this easement needed? The City is usually granted a SWM covenant for the entire property, which allows for future changes without needing to record a new amended easement document. KE  
Response: The SWM easements have been shown per coordination with the SWM review. If Access and Maintenance of SWM facilities will be covered under a Covenant Agreement with the City, the easements will be removed at Site Plan.
13. Easements cannot be granted in an existing right of way. Any work in the ROW would need to be approved by SHA through their permitting process. Remove from Plan. KE  
Response: Off site easements have been removed from the plan set. Offsite impacts have been coordinated with SHA and offsite grading to be covered under future SHA Access Management permit.
14. Easements cannot be granted in an existing right of way. Any work in the ROW would need to be approved by SHA through their permitting process. Remove from Plan. KE  
Response: Off site easements have been removed from the plan set. Offsite impacts have been coordinated with SHA and offsite grading to be covered under future SHA Access Management permit.
15. Is this easement needed? The City is usually granted a SWM covenant for the entire property, which allows for future changes without needing to record a new amended easement document. KE  
Response: The SWM easements have been shown per coordination with the SWM review. If Access and Maintenance of SWM facilities will be covered under a Covenant Agreement with the City, the easements will be removed at Site Plan.
16. Why is this off-site area included in the plan? Is this a proposed temporary construction easement? KE  
Response: Off site PFCP easements have been removed from this plan.

17. What is the intent of this? How are you phasing demo of phase 2?

Response: This "Proposed Temporary Public Access Easement" is to provide vehicular access through the existing parking lot during construction of O'Neill Dr in Phase 2. This Access Route will serve residents of the community as well as vehicular traffic from the Casey Community Center to allow for left turn movements from O'Neill Dr onto MD 355.

## 04-LANDSCAPE & LIGHTING PLAN SET

### LL-1.0 Overall Landscape & Lighting Plan

18. What is going in the rest of this box if no plantings?

Response: All understory planting and further landscape detail will be provided at site plan phase. Understory planting areas have been identified on SDP sheets by hatching areas to help define the spaces in a preliminary manner with tree locations identified throughout the landscape sheets.

19. Turf? A hatching for turf grass would help

Response: No turf proposed, this area is "green space / pervious area" that is not included in the "Understory Planting / Planting" area.

20. Add this line type to legend, provide 5' clearance for all utilities and trees.

Response: All utility line types have been added to the legend. This tree has been shifted to allow for a 5' offset from the line. The line type provided on the plan view for the dry utility lines are shown larger than the actual width of the conduit in the field to allow for a visual representation of the routing, 3'4" width is shown for electric routing but the conduit width is closer to 15".

21. Provide 5' clearance from edge of pipe to root ball (estimate 2.5').  
Then bio barrier will need to be installed if trees within 15' of trees.

Response: Vertical clearance provided exceeds 5' from bottom of root ball to top of pipe. A note has been added to the plan sheets to indicate that for pipes with less than a 5' horizontal clearance, the offset requirements are provided vertically. Profiles and additional design info will be provided at Site Plan to further clarify this relationship.

22. This light still meets minimum criteria, but it may be better suited to the right for more clearance?

Response: The location of this light has been determined to allow for runoff from the parking through a backless inlet (more information to be provided at Site Plan) and to meet the photometric design requirements for the parking lot.

23. What's happening here?

Response: The gap in the hatch at the entrance is for the location of the entrance signage with attached concrete base. The sign is now shown on the plan for clarity.

24. Existing trees for preservation ID'd on FCP should be called out.- apply to all

Response: Chart added to sheet LL-1.0 to show the Tree Preservation trees that are listed on the PFCP set. Forest Save area has been provided for reference.

25. For all sheets use the same hatching that is on the schematic development plan for easements, microbios, sidewalks and proposed roads, in addition to the green proposed planting area shown.

Response: Hatches have been revised to match the SDP sheets. Legend has been updated to include correct utility line types as well.

#### **LL-1.5 Canopy Cover**

26. All trees can be shown centrally within the planting area to provide max root space on all sides. We count the whole SF for canopy area as listed in the tree manual so this will not reduce the canopy area provided by the tree

Response: Proposed trees have been provided by size in the applicable Parking Lot Canopy Coverage Calculation comps on sheet LL1.5 to provide a coverage summary.

27. At concept or schematic level a tree cover summary is required, should list proposed trees and their size.

Response: Proposed trees with Size have been added to the Parking Lot Canopy Coverage Calculation on sheet LL1.5 broken out by North or South lot.

28. List number of large (1,000 SF), medium (700 SF) and small (300 SF) trees as near the parking lot to calculate the tree canopy provided and show calculation. Keep the highlighted trees on plan.

Response: Proposed trees with Size have been added to the Parking Lot Canopy Coverage Calculation on sheet LL1.5 broken out by North or South lot.

29. Required area 25,873 SF (Tree Canopy Required (sf) – Lot A (north))

Response: 23,321 sf is correct per the Total Parking Lot A (north) Surface area of 86,244 sf.

30. Area is 86,244 (Parking Lot Surface Area – Lot A (north))

Response: 86,244 sf is the total parking lot A (north) surface area with the center island removed from the area computation. This area has been used for the tree canopy coverage computations.

### **05-ARCHITECTURE PLAN SET**

31. There were no comments provided as part of this plan review cycle

### **07-SUPPORT EXHIBIT PLAN SET**

#### **EXB-1.2A On-site Circulation Plan**

32. Is there an ADA path from each building to at least one of the amenity areas? For instance, can folks in Building 9 access one of the amenity spaces via an ADA accessible route?

Response: Accessible routes per PROWAG requirements have been added in blue circle paths on sheet EXB-1.2A.

#### EXB-1.3 Right-of-Way Abandonment Existing

Does not match revised easement area on abandonment exhibits that includes the water line

Response: Easement has been fixed on this sheet to show the same area as on the rest of the set.

#### EXB-1.4 Right-of-Way Proposed

Lane labels and pictures are backwards (Section – D Prop. Neighborhood Residential Street at Rt 355 detail)

Response: “Section – D” detail has been updated to show the correct lane layout. This detail has also been fixed on EXB-6.1 “street profile”.

#### EXB-2.1 Phasing Plan PH1

33. There are not 237 spaces shown on this plan in phase 1

Response: The Phase 1 Parking count table has been removed and replaced with a breakdown of parking provided within the Phase 1 limits (rather than the ultimate parking count).

34. Need parking distribution for each phase. Number the spaces in phase 1 and phase 2. I am only counting 212 spaces on this sheet. So your shortage would be 46 spaces in phase 1-can any of the existing parking across the street be designated overflow in the interim/during phase 2 construction? Building 3 in particular looks like it will be short until phase 2 is complete. We are concerned if there is a delay between phase 1 and 2.

Response: Correct, the Required Parking, Proposed parking and deficit parking counts have been added to the sheet. Additional parking has been provided from the existing south west parking lot. Due to the relocation of existing tenants from the south west buildings to the proposed buildings 1-3 in phase 1, the use of the parking spaces in the existing parking lot will not have an adverse impact on the existing tenants.

35. What is the demo phasing plan? This temporary access through the existing lot will need to be maintained-cannot be blocked by demolition

Response: Additional information has been provided for the temporary fire access route. Parking spaces within the fire access path have been noted on the plan “to be removed”. In addition notes to keep the fire access route open throughout phase 2 construction and demolition have been added to the plan. Additional information will be provided at site plan to indicate the fire access routing throughout demolition and construction activity.

#### EXB-2.2 Phasing Plan PH2

1. Does not match how many spaces are shown on this plan in phase 2

Response: The parking count analysis for Phase 2 has been updated on EXB 2.2. A breakdown of parking “by lot” in the ultimate condition is now provided. An explanation is included in the “overparking” provided by building 4 (Lot 2) and how 24 parking spaces are intended for use by building 3 (Lot 1). Expanded information for parking ratios has been provided. Additional parking count callouts have been added to the plan view for clarity.

#### EXB-3.0 Open Space & Amenities Area Plan

2. Add pink and orange lines to legend or remove from plan

Response: These lines have been removed from this sheet.

#### EXB-4.0 Existing Easement Plan

1. Is this an existing easement? If so, add to the legend. KE  
Response: This easement is proposed and has been removed from the existing easement plan.
2. Is this an existing easement? If so, add to the legend. KE  
Response: This easement is proposed and has been removed from the existing easement plan.

#### EXB-4.1 Proposed Easement Plan

3. This may not be needed since the City usually is granted a SWM covenant for the entire property. KE  
Response: SWM easements provided per coordination with SWM review. If access and maintenance are to be covered under Covenant Agreement with the City, the SWM easements will be removed at Site Plan.
4. Is the City granting these SD easements to the adjacent property owner? Who will be responsible for maintenance? KE  
Response: The easement through the property is being granted to the City and will be maintained by the City. The easement provided on the Casey Community Center was provided to maintain the existing easement conditions and allow outfall of the City runoff from O'Neill and the State runoff from the SHA Pond at 355 and O'Neill but that portion of the easement could be abandoned at Site Plan design as the City now owns that property.
5. Update owner with info shown in SDAT. KE  
Response: Lot info has been updated to match SDAT.
6. Is there a grading easement here?  
Response: No, offsite grading will be approved under a State Highway Access Management Permit at time of Site Plan.

#### EXB-4.2 Utility Phase 1

1. Show proposed paving for Phase 1 sg  
Response: Curb and gutter and sidewalk have been provided for phase 1 to show tie in of proposed driveway to existing O'Neill Dr.

#### EXB-5.1 Sight Distance Plan

2. Two parking spaces block sight line. Remove these or push out the curb on the EB receiving leg of O'Neill Dr and check whether that resolves the issue.  
Response: Parking spaces have been removed.

#### EXB-5.2 Sight Distance Plan

3. Parking blocks sight line  
Response: 4 parking spaces have been removed to allow to allow for unimpeded sight line.

4. Parking blocks sight line  
Response: 4 parking spaces have been removed to allow to allow for unimpeded sight line.

#### EXB-5.3 Sight Distance Plan

5. Remove parking spaces in sight line and move curb  
Response: 2 parking spaces removed to remove sight distance conflict from crosswalk.

## 08-FIRE ACCESS PLAN SET

#### FDA-1.0 Fire Access Plan

6. The fire access road shall be established and maintained in accordance with NFPA 1 Chapter 18 - 2018 ed.  
It shall be maintained clear of all weather conditions, passable, and debris free at all times to all areas with two points of entry during all phases of demolition and construction..  
Response: The requested information has been added to the Notes block on all sheets.

#### FDA-1.4 Fire Access Plan

7. The fire access road shall be established and maintained in accordance with NFPA 1 Chapter 18 - 2018 ed.  
It shall be maintained clear of all weather conditions, passable, and debris free at all times to all areas with two points of entry during all phases of demolition and construction..  
Response: The requested information has been added to the Notes block on all sheets.

## DESIGN GUIDELINES

#### Sheet 18-19:

*"Breezeway" (so it's clear the 5 story buildings with an elevator don't have designated high-vis facades). Label buildings with 5-ST or Breezeway*

Response: The legend and the building labels have been added to the plan.

*Label buildings with 5-ST or Breezeway.*

Response: Exhibit updated to label each building "5 story building" or "building with breezeway".

#### Sheet 24-25:

*Are the same materials allowed for wall sign? Need to specify materials allowed for both-wall materials are on a separate page, but specify materials sign face/lettering. Need to list all allowable materials (remove "but are not limited to"). Remove "and extent of any requested zoning relief".*

Response: The requested notation has been removed, and the wall signage note has been updated for clarity. It now states " Retaining walls, whether constructed of brick veneer, cast in place concrete, Keystone block, or Stone Strong units, will be selected based on site conditions and structural requirements, with finishes and colors coordinated to complement the community's architectural palette. Signage associated with the retaining walls will be fabricated from concrete or aluminum and may be integrated into the wall, affixed directly to it, or

mounted above. The final design will be coordinated with the wall manufacturer to ensure proper installation, material compatibility, and a unified appearance. Final signage will be reviewed and approved as part of the sign package during Final Site Plan approval.”. In addition, conceptual wall signage images have been added to the sheets for reference.

*Need to list all allowable materials.*

Response: Materials have been provided under the signage materials palette.

Let us know if you have any questions or if you would like to meet to discuss any of the plans or design elements.

Sincerely,  
Rodgers Consulting, Inc.



Jeff Lynch, P.E.  
Senior Engineer  
240.912.2121

Cc:  
Randall Rentfro, Rodgers Consulting  
Amanda Stamper, Rodgers Consulting  
Brian Fields, City of Gaithersburg

September 11, 2025

City of Gaithersburg  
800 Rabbitt Road  
Gaithersburg, MD 20878

**Re: Casey-Rosedale Property Zoning Map Amendment – CD Zone with Schematic Development Plan Z-10030-2025 4<sup>th</sup> Submission**

Comments from the third submission review by City of Gaithersburg Staff, received on August 13, 2025, have been included and responded to below for your use during the 4th review of the Casey-Rosedale Property Schematic Development Plan. Comments have been included by plan set and broken out by sheet upon which comment was received.

## **06-PRELIMINARY FOREST CONSERVATION PLAN SET**

### **PFCP-1.0 Overall Preliminary Forest Conservation Plan**

1. Clarify intent here. Proposing 166 SF for a conservation easement? Distinction between Forest Retain and Easement is not included in tables below (Retain is totaled 0.29)  
Response: This area of forest is not included in a conservation easement. The easement that is referred to is a utility easement. The forested area in this location is not proposed for removal but is within an easement so therefore cannot be put into a forest conservation easement – this area is not being counted in any of our forest conservation calculations but we wanted to call out that this area is not going to be removed. It also is such a small area that we would have to go to multiple decimals to show the difference of area being retained vs what is being put into an easement.
2. Per canopy edge, appears impact would extend in these areas; was this surveyed? Explain why forest removal area excludes these.  
Response: The area was surveyed by an ISA certified arborist on XXX. While there may be canopy data from aerial imagery there is no forest located in this location. The forest boundary lines presented in the PFCP, not the tree canopy lines, accurately reflect the boundaries of the environmental features.
3. What is this line?  
Response: The line was a draft easement line, it has been removed from PFCP plan.
4. Reduce gap in SVB line or change symbology; it's hard to see where it continues through LOD.  
Response: SVB line type has been adjusted to reduce gaps in linework.
5. Linework – extend LOD around proposed  
Response: The LOD has been expanded to include the proposed sidewalk.
6. This should be reforestation/conservation easement signage; no permanent fencing  
Response: The legend description has been changed to corrected verbiage.
7. Increase text to match plan  
Response: Text size for legend items has been increased to match plan.
8. Doesn't this extend forest removal area?  
Response: Yes, the forest remove area has been expanded to include this offsite area.

9. If this forested area is outside LOD, then it is forest save area, not reforestation...  
Response: The area shown in green is not previously forested, however we are proposing to plant forest in this area. The forest boundary lines presented in the PFCP, not the tree canopy lines, accurately reflect the boundaries of the environmental features.
10. Use same symbology fill (line weight?) for onsite and offsite forest removal. Offsite is hard to see.  
Response: Symbology fill for offsite forest removal has been changed to match onsite forest removal.
11. Combine these tables; should just account for full LOD  
Response: The tables have been combined to account for the full LOD in one table.
12. Remove this row; is not part of City forest con worksheet/calcs  
Response: This line has been removed from the table.
13. Update (76 lf)  
Response: Linear feet of stream quantity has been updated to include the linear feet of stream within the LOD.
14. Ensure these #s are still correct after addressing comments on plan (yellow highlighted areas).  
Response: The numbers have been reviewed to reflect accurate information as a result of any plan changes.
15. Confirm still correct after addressing comments on plan.  
Response: The numbers have been reviewed to reflect accurate information as a result of any plan changes.

#### PFCP-1.3 Preliminary Forest Conservation Plan

16. What is this yellow line?  
Response: The yellow line depicts an existing WSSC easement. The yellow linework has been changed to gray for clarity.

#### PFCP-2.0 Forest Mitigation Plan

17. Medium tree symbols are not consistent.  
Response: Medium tree symbols on legend has been corrected to match plan. Additionally, colors have been added to the tree symbols to easily denote which size class they belong to.
18. Trees proposed on pavement?  
Response: These trees have been removed from any forest conservation credit sheet.
19. 8-ft planting strip required for large trees (1000 SF)  
Response: As established during the Lakeforest Mall project, the planting strip is measured from the front of curb to the sidewalk. In this case, that measurement results in an 8-foot planting strip, which accommodates the planting of large trees.

20. What is gray dashed line?  
Response: The gray dashed line was denoting a drainage divide it has been removed for clarity.
21. Tree symbol size doesn't match legend (or consistent w/ others on plan)  
Response: Tree symbol on legend has been adjusted to match plan.
22. Plan shows: 165 large, 27 medium, 62 small; This totals 4.65 ac credit; Confirm counts and revise credit tables as necessary.  
Response: The counts of the trees being utilized for credit have been reviewed and confirmed.
23. What is yellow line?  
Response: The yellow line depicts an existing WSSC easement. Yellow linework has been changed to gray for clarity.
24. Trees proposed on pavement?  
Response: These trees have been removed from any forest conservation credit sheet.
25. Same small tree symbol is no consistent size (only one size in legend)  
Response: The legend has been updated to match plan.

#### **PFCP-3.0 Notes & Details**

26. City of Gaithersburg  
Response: M-NCPPC has been replaced with "City" of Gaithersburg" on plan
27. Should be "Conservation"  
Response: Noted. The City of Gaithersburg Forest Conservation Calculations worksheet has been updated to use the correct verbiage.
28. Rounds to 4.13 (4.126)  
Response: 4.12 is the correct value. The worksheet uses unrounded values within the calculations and leads to a value of 4.12. Using the numbers shown on the worksheet that are rounded to 2 decimal places leads to a value of 4.13, but a more accurate calculation gives a value of 4.12.
29. Will be 2.22 w/ above revision  
Response: See response above for comment #28.
30. Include maintenance and management agreement at Final.  
Response: Noted.
31. Include tree planting details.  
Response: Tree planting details will be provided at the final forest conservation plan.

## 10- ENVIRONMENTAL WAIVER PACKAGE

\*Note – the stream buffer has been updated to reflect what was on the approved NRI per guidance from City review.

32. Why mowed? Why not a garden bed?

Response: Where feasible and determined through final site plan and engineering native riparian seed mix will be proposed.

33. Is all this needed for environmental waiver? When you say site limits, is this for all the sites, or just one or 2?

Response: The waiver has been updated to only include information critical to the environmental waiver.

34. Background on foundation is needed. Is this project led by them?

Response: Background on the foundation has been added to the waiver

35. How is this being done? Please elaborate on the proposed of phases.

Response: The phases of the Project have been elaborated in further detail.

36. I would rework this paragraph to explain that buildings have declined dramatically so that the cost of improvements if prohibitive versus building new with better safety features and updates to current code.

Response: The paragraph has been reworked as described above.

37. Beneficial manner? I would take out the last sentence and describe that the final product will be a park-like setting that supports the city goals for creating livable spaces with access to facilities and nature similar to other upscale housing withing the city.

Response: The last sentence was reworked as described above.

38. These impacts will enhance public safety, SWM, and improve integration of the tree canopy and open spaces

Response: Noted

39. Lawn is not really recommended as an ecological benefit. Why not a buffer of native grasses

Response: Where feasible and determined through final site plan and engineering native riparian seed mix will be proposed.

40. Please list some of the alternatives, and the following paragraph is confusing.

Response: This section has been re-written as a result of comments and conversations with the City.

41. Isn't part of the buffer forested?

Response: No this portion of area off-site was confirmed to be unforested during field investigation.

42. Please discuss ecological benefits such as fish passage, improved flow, better habitat, etc.

Response: This section has been re-written as a result of comments and conversations with the City.

43. Turf is not ecological uplift.  
Response: Noted
44. Numbers are not consistent with earlier number on page 3!  
Response: Noted, all tree and mitigation quantities presented have been reviewed for consistency.
45. Please discuss WSSC easement allowance.  
Response: This section has been re-written as a result of comments and conversations with the City.
46. I would put this paragraph first as community health and safety.  
Response: Noted, this change has been made.
47. Why not a native buffer?  
Response: Where feasible and determined through final site plan and engineering native riparian seed mix will be proposed.
48. Please make sure these are consistent with prior totals which say 239 trees.  
Response: Noted, all tree and mitigation quantities presented have been reviewed for consistency.
49. Stream plantings for water temp coverage included?  
Response: This section has been re-written as a result of comments and conversations with the City.
50. See prior notes on mowed lawn versus native buffers.  
Response: Where feasible and determined through final site plan and engineering native riparian seed mix will be proposed.
51. See prior notes n mowed lawn versus native buffers and consistency with tree counts and acreage.  
Response: Where feasible and determined through final site plan and engineering native riparian seed mix will be proposed.

Let us know if you have any questions or if you would like to meet to discuss any of the plans or design elements.

Sincerely,  
Rodgers Consulting, Inc.



Kelly Donovan, ISA Certified Arborist .  
Environmental Project Manager  
240.912.2131

Cc:  
Matthew Wessel, Rodgers Consulting; Randall Rentfro, Rodgers Consulting  
Jeff Lynch, Rodgers Consulting; Amanda Stamper, Rodgers Consulting  
Nancy Schumm, City of Gaithersburg; Brian Fields, City of Gaithersburg