

East Campus Redevelopment Community Review Steering Committee Notes from the July 14, 2008 Meeting

Introduction

Doug Duncan opened the meeting and welcomed attendees.

The meeting was then opened to the Committee to raise questions and comments on any outstanding issues. No issues were raised.

Discussion

Note: The presentation portions of each meeting topic largely followed the presentation slides. Printouts of the slides were available at the meeting and will be posted on the project website, so these notes will not reproduce all of the information they contain but will instead focus on any additional information that was provided by the presenter and the Q&A segments that followed each topic.

Introduction

Presentation (Richard Perlmutter, Foulger-Pratt/Argo)

- Quick overview of the agenda (development agreement, schedule, TIF, consensus building, Sector Plan comparison, sustainability, traffic study, detailed site plan).

Development Agreement

Presentation (Richard Perlmutter)

- [No additional information.]

Schedule

Presentation (Richard Perlmutter)

- [No additional information.]

TIF Structure

Presentation (Richard Perlmutter)

- [No additional information.]

Consensus Building Process

Presentation (Richard Perlmutter)

- [No additional information.]

Sector Plan Comparison and Analysis

Presentation (Jon Eisen, StreetSense)

- The project meets many Sector Plan objectives for this site.

Sustainability

Presentation (Jon Eisen)

- The project will meet the criteria for a LEED Silver certification.

Traffic

Presentation (Wes Guckert, The Traffic Group)

- This is a great project from the standpoint of minimizing traffic generation: bike/pedestrian facilities, light rail, shared parking, mixed-use, etc.
 - A recent study shows that mixed-use development alone reduces auto trips by 25%.
- Traffic signal spacing [see slide]
 - The main consideration here is pedestrian safety.
- Road improvements on Route 1 and Pain Branch Parkway [see slide]
 - The project is following the guidelines/plans of the Sector Plan, SHA plan and College Park studies.

Detailed Site Plan

Presentation (Jon Eisen)

- Program [see slide]
 - The program is not exactly the same as envisioned when the process started, due to various forces (e.g., location of utilities, Purple Line) – but it's close.
- Parking
 - A consultant has validated the developer's parking strategy.
 - Phase I will include 4 structures, underground and wrapped.
 - Access points on Paint Branch Parkway are being emphasized in order to minimize the impact on Route 1.
 - The total number of planned parking spaces is much lower than required by zoning and presented earlier: about 3,500 versus 4,500. This is also lower than the number (about 4,000) generated by the ULI standard.

- There will be much shared parking, but most residential parking does need to be kept separate.
- Overhead views of three close-up areas: C Street Gateway, East Campus Plaza and Phase II Residential Plaza and Promenade [see slides]
- New perspective images of several views: From Route 1 North to South, Along Route 1, From Route 1 South to North, Looking down Rossborough, From Main Intersection to Plaza, From Paint Branch, From Terrapin Place to Main Intersection, From Paint Branch to Rossborough, and Plaza [see slides]
- Conclusion
 - [No additional information.]

Frank Brewer next spoke briefly about the role the Architectural Design Standards Board (ADSB) has played since the developer team began its design work:

- People were added to the ADSB specifically for this project.
- There have been 8 formal meetings so far, and many more informal meetings and work. There will be a couple more meetings before the DSP is finalized.

Q&A

- Question: There are about 25% fewer dwelling units now than in the original scope – why?
 - Response: There is less developable land than previously thought.
 - Response: The difference is mostly in Phase II, and is mostly due to having to set aside space for the Purple Line.
 - Response: The number of beds has decreased less than the number of units: only about 200 fewer beds now. [Phase I: about 815 units, 2,200 beds.]
- Question: How realistic is it to use office parking for evening entertainment uses, considering that many people work late?
 - Response: We have engaged 4 different groups to study shared parking, in depth. Shared office parking is just one element.
 - Response: We are trying to project habits going forward, taking into account factors such as rising fuel prices. We are looking at alternatives including motorcycle parking, a car sharing program, and bike sharing.
 - Response: It's in our best interest to get this right – too much or too little parking is problematic.
 - Response: All drivers, including residents, will park (separately) for parking.
 - Response [Wes]: This is a very aggressive strategy, in terms of minimizing parking, but I'm comfortable with the plan, too.
 - Response: Residents who have spaces will not be allowed to buy campus parking permits.
 - Follow-up question: Considering the planned amount of parking and all of these responses, do you still view this as a regional project?
 - Response: Yes. We don't think the reduction in parking will make this not a regional draw.
- Question: What role is planned for bicycles?
 - Response: There will be bike lanes on Route 1 and Paint Branch. On internal roads, outer lanes will be bike share lanes.
- Question: Will there be on-street parking on the internal roads?

- Response: Yes.
- Question: What will the graduate student bed rent be?
 - Response: 450 beds will be about \$690 a month, plus parking (about \$100). Other beds will cost about \$800.
 - Response [Doug]: These numbers are still under discussion.
 - Follow-up comment: Graduate students continue to be concerned with the affordability of this project.
- Question: What is the current plan for the Pocomoke building?
 - Response [Doug]: This is not part of the project, but we are still looking at a market on the ground floor and offices on the second floor.
- Question: What is the project's relationship with Old Town?
 - Response: The only auto connection will be from Yale Avenue. Other connections will be built but not connected for cars.
- Question: In connection with the TIF, will you enter into a Community Benefit Agreement?
 - Response [Doug]: We are in negotiations with the local governments on community benefits.
- Question: Are the sidewalks along Route 1 going to be 16 feet?
 - Response: No; 16 feet refers to car lanes.
- Question: Who will be providing security?
 - Response: University police and private security.
 - Response: It will not be a gated community. Residential access will be controlled with key cards. There will be public and private elevators in the parking garages.
 - Response: Security is being looked at from many angles including design.
- Question: What will be the impact on Route 1 of the planned additional intersections?
 - Response: There is only 1 new intersection planned, at Terrapin Place.
 - Response [Wes]: We have prepared a synchronization study and submitted it to local government for review. Synchronizing lights would help minimize the impact.
 - Response: The garages and signage will be oriented toward Paint Branch and away from Route 1.
 - Follow-up question: How far south on Route 1 would the synchronization go – all the way to East-West Highway, which has terrible traffic?
 - Response: No; to about College Avenue. But other projects are looking at the intersection of Route 1 and East-West.
- Question: Will we get information on the cumulative impact on Route 1 of East Campus and other projects?
 - Response: The traffic study will be posted on the project website.
 - Response: Looking at the weighted average impact on Route 1 intersections (from Guilford Road to Berwyn Road):
 - In the morning, level of service (LOS) will go from A to C.
 - In the evening, LOS will go from C to E (but would go to E even without this project).
- Question: Can you say more about planned sustainability measures?
 - Response: The LEED categories that the project will be measured against are LEED for Core and Shell and LEED for Homes (not LEED-ND).
 - Response: The scorecards will be posted on the project website.
 - Response: We are looking at many areas and measures, but this is still at an early stage.
 - Response [Mark Morelock, VIKA], on stormwater:

- There will be quality and quantity facilities.
- The plan has been approved by the county.
- Phase I will include 2 water quality structures and 2 channel protection structures.
- The storm drains will be upsized from 10-year to 100-year flood standards. This will also help with drainage in the west campus area.
- There may be cisterns, to irrigate the Fraternity Row field.
- Comment: There is less green space than called for in the Sector Plan.
 - Response: But more than the site currently has.
 - Response: There will be green spaces, as well as pervious surfaces and trees, on all streets (except in the Purple Line right of way).
- Question: Who will enforce parking regulations?
 - Response: A tax-exempt authority that will be funded with the TIF.
 - Response: there will be no parking tickets – all drivers will pay upon exiting.
- Question: If graduate students don't rent all of the capped units, will they be priced at market rents for the general market?
 - Response: No. And this seems very unlikely.
- Question: Given the detailed site plan (DSP) timeline, will there be any time for the committee to give feedback?
 - Response: The DSP will be submitted this week, probably, but there will still be about 30-45 days for changes, so yes, there is time for feedback.
- Comment: The current project is a dramatic improvement over where we started. I like the scale, Purple Line access, etc. good job.
- Question: Can you give us more details on the TIF?
 - Response: College Park has signed a letter of intent (LOI) and has engaged consultants to review our TIF proposal.
 - Response: The TIF funds are for parking and other infrastructure.
 - Response: We expect to have an LOI with the county this week.
 - Response: We hope for legislation by the end of the year.
 - Response: College Park wants to add other things to the TIF; you'll have to discuss what with them.

Other Issues

Bryan Foulger (Foulger-Pratt/Argo) thanked the committee and ADSB again for their participation and contributions. He feels good about where the project is and how it has evolved.

Doug ended the meeting by mentioning two upcoming events:

- Presentation to College Park City Council – August 6
- Next committee meeting – When the Fall semester has begun; date TBD