

Village of North Chevy Chase Council Meeting Minutes July 21, 2026

Meeting called to order at 7:30 p.m. by Adrian Andreassi (Chair), conducted in person and through electronic means; also in attendance were Maury Mechanick (Vice Chair), Brian Hoffner (Secretary), Geetika Sripathi (Treasurer), Jon Macy (Member), and Dana Peterson (Village Manager); and other residents (list attached).

Discussed Topics

Approval of June Meeting Minutes

- The Council reviewed the June meeting minutes, which were distributed in advance. Minutes were reviewed and found to be in order and approved by consensus.
-

Treasurer's Report — Period Ending June 30, 2026

The Treasurer presented the financial summary for June, covering the balance sheet, investment portfolio, and budget vs. actuals.

- Combined assets totaled \$3,762,418.49; Maryland Local Government Investment Pool (MLGIP) balance is \$804,538.03 with an average daily yield of 3.72% for June; the Council will continue evaluating whether to move additional funds there. Approximately \$4,000 in interest earned from MLGIP over roughly two months.
 - One remaining CD with Atlantic Union matures September 9; six CDs remain with UBS. A matured CD (4.15%) was rolled into a Bank of America CD (4.15%, matures December 23, 2027) and a Morgan Stanley CD (4.20 %, matures June 26, 2028).
 - Next CD to mature is the Goldman CD on September 25, 2026.
 - Geetika: June income was \$70,848.68, largely from state income tax payments, bringing FY26 year-to-date income to \$562,181.23 against operating expenses of \$456,779.22.
 - Some July 4th expenses currently showing in June will be adjusted with LSWG to apply to the FY27 budget.
 - QuickBooks does not generate a combined one-month/year-to-date snapshot; a hybrid spreadsheet is being used and will be refined for legibility.
-

Permit Update

- A fast-track approval was granted for a trash truck trailer in a driveway due to a bathroom renovation.

Traffic Calming — Husted Drive/Montgomery Avenue Intersection

Paul Dorr, Director of Engineering Design with the Traffic Group, presented findings from a 24-hour stop sign compliance study conducted on June 3 at the Husted Drive/Montgomery Avenue intersection.

- Eastbound vehicles on Husted Drwy (390 vehicles): 7% full stop, 76% rolling stop, 17.4% total non-compliance. Westbound on Husted Drwy (260 vehicles): 7.3% full stop, majority rolling stops, ~18% total non-compliance.
- 20 pedestrians observed on the northern side of Husted; 19 crossing Montgomery Avenue on the southern side.
- Nationally, approximately 70% of drivers perform rolling stops; the village's numbers are slightly above average, partly due to the T-intersection geometry, lack of crosswalks/sidewalks, and low traffic volumes reducing driver vigilance.
- Two recommendations — (1) solar-powered flashing LED stop signs, triggered by approaching vehicles rather than flashing 24/7; and (2) a raised intersection, with the full intersection raised like a speed hump, traversable at a maximum of 15 mph, estimated at ~\$80,000. If installed, a 15 mph speed hump warning sign would be installed in all directions per MUTCD guidelines
- Flashing LED stop signs show a 40–42% reduction in crashes based on studies; a raised intersection further enforces physical speed reduction.
- Recommended phasing — install flashers first, assess results quickly, then consider a raised intersection if needed.
- Paul confirmed sensitivity can be adjusted for flashing LED stop signs to address bicycle sensitivity.
- Council noted that resident feedback on the raised intersection would be important given that most traffic through the intersection is local residents.
- Council asked about narrowing the intersection; Paul did not recommend it given the absence of sidewalks and the already narrow road.
- Discussion noted the issue is stop sign compliance, not speeding, based on the speed study data.
- Vendor, Shannon-Baum, can supply and install the flashers quickly and may have units in stock.

Conclusion

- Council consensus to proceed with flashing LED stop signs on all three approaches, triggered by approaching vehicles.
- Dana to obtain a quote from Shannon Baum, potentially bundled with other sign maintenance.
- Raised intersection (~\$80,000) deferred for future consideration pending results of flasher installation.

- Follow-up compliance study to be conducted shortly after installation.

Traffic Calming — Kensington Parkway Speed Study

Paul Dorr presented speed study findings for Kensington Parkway within the village limits.

- 85th percentile speeds: southbound 33 mph, northbound 34 mph. However, notable outliers were recorded — vehicles traveling 46–55 mph and isolated instances at 61–66 mph, possibly emergency vehicles.
- Three recommendations — (1) radar speed display signs, solar-powered and data-logging; (2) speed hump (~\$8,000, traversable at max 15 mph); and (3) widened edge line striping, which makes the lane feel narrower at relatively low cost. Radar signs log speed data by hour and day, enabling ongoing monitoring.
- All three measures can be installed before cold weather; waiting until winter would push installation to spring.
- Brian: Strongly supported all three measures; emphasized that outlier high speeds, not just averages, represent real fatality risk. Recommended radar signs as the quickest first step.
- Maury: Supported radar signs and striping as immediate steps; suggested sequencing a speed hump as a later measure and raised concern about emergency vehicle access with speed humps. Paul Dorr noted that firefighters generally prefer driving 15 mph over a speed hump to responding to a fatality.
- Adrian: Personally not a fan of speed humps but supportive if it benefits community safety; raised concern about interaction with upcoming Kensington Parkway repaving and not wanting to install and then remove a speed hump.
- Discussion noted that the stretch between Beach Drive and the village boundary lacks posted speed limit signs southbound, which may contribute to speeding; advocated for the county/state to install signage in that area.
- Paul confirmed radar signs can be installed on existing poles with solar panels; hardwiring is not necessary.
- Vendor Shannon-Baum also performs striping; recommended for both sign installation and road striping.
- Paul: Offered to provide quotes from multiple vendors, including Radar Sign and Shannon Baum.
- Council asked Paul to help advocate with the county/parks department for speed limit signage on the stretch north of the village boundary.

Conclusion

- Council consensus to immediately pursue radar speed display signs — two units, one per direction — and road edge line striping. Village Manager requested to get quotes.
- Speed hump deferred to a future phase, potentially 2027, pending repaving schedule review and data from radar signs.

- The Traffic Group to assist in advocating with county/state for speed limit signage north of the village boundary.

Sightline Analysis — Jones Bridge Road/Kensington Parkway and Jones Bridge Road/Montgomery Avenue

The Council discussed commissioning sightline studies at two problematic intersections, building on a prior Brudis & Associates report recommendation for Kensington Parkway and Jones Bridge Rd, in particular.

- The Brudis report identified obstructed sightlines at the Jones Bridge Road/Kensington Parkway intersection; a Traffic Group sightline analysis would provide concrete remediation recommendations. It was noted that a portion of the Jones Bridge Road/Kensington Parkway corner is owned by the State, condemned in a 2020 court proceeding, which has bearing on remediation options.
- The Council also flagged the Jones Bridge Road/Montgomery Avenue intersection as a concern.
- Proposals for both locations have been prepared by The Traffic Group; two-week turnaround upon execution of agreements.
- The Traffic Group identified an operational issue — illegal right turns on red from Jones Bridge Road onto northbound Connecticut Avenue conflict with Kensington Parkway green-phase traffic, creating T-bone accident risk. Recommended a formal letter to State Highway Administration advocating for red light camera enforcement at that approach. The Village noted that State Highway had indicated camera enforcement is planned but 9–11 months away due to existing camera replacement backlog.
- A Traffic Group recommendation letter could help elevate the priority of that camera installation.
-

Conclusion

- Council approved moving forward with sightline analyses at Jones Bridge Road/Kensington Parkway and Jones Bridge Road/Montgomery Avenue. The Village Manager to execute and send signed proposals to The Traffic Group the following day.
-

Connecticut Avenue Speed Camera Coverage

Brian raised a concern about the disproportionate distribution of speed cameras on Connecticut Avenue.

- Multiple speed cameras are concentrated northbound near Kensington, but only one southbound camera exists on Connecticut Avenue; southbound speeds can be very high during low-traffic periods.
- Brian referenced prior commitments from Evan Glass and state delegates, including Jared Solomon, regarding a Connecticut Avenue Safety Corridor Study, with little apparent follow-up and noted the absence of a speed camera near the Jones Bridge Road school zone.
- Maury acknowledged the imbalance; noted a cyclist fatality on University Boulevard approximately eight months prior may have shifted focus; agreed to follow up with Kate Stewart or Jared Solomon.
- Paul confirmed the Traffic Group conducts speed studies to support speed camera placement requests and is familiar with the procedural requirements; offered to obtain a copy of the Connecticut Avenue Phase 2 study.

Conclusion

- The Village Manager to follow up with Evan Glass and state legislative contacts regarding Connecticut Avenue speed camera coverage and the status of the safety corridor study.
- The Traffic Group to attempt to obtain a copy of the Connecticut Avenue Phase 2 SHA study.

Tree Maintenance — Pruning, Removals, and Remediation

The Village Manager presented competitive quotes from three qualified tree contractors for upcoming tree work.

- Task orders issued for tree pruning, removal of six trees, and root remediation (vertical mulching) at two trees affected by nearby construction — a sassafras and crabapple near a retaining wall.
- Mulheron came in with most competitive bid for pruning; Potomac River Arborists most competitive for removals; Mulheron quoted \$400 for vertical mulching versus higher quotes from others. Vertical mulching involves aerating around roots and inserting rods to rejuvenate potentially stressed root systems; previously used successfully on Montgomery Avenue.
- Up to 14 new trees to be planted this fall to replace removed trees; Richard, the arborist, to assess locations and recommend species in September, with ordering from Stadler in October.
- Discussion included concern about maintaining the canopy shade tree count; suggested ensuring replacement plantings include a proportional number of large canopy trees, even if in different locations. Village Manager acknowledged that some replacements may need to be understory trees due to site constraints, including power lines and space limitations.

- Council suggested offering canopy tree plantings on private property as part of the fall program, with the condition that residents commit to watering and care.
- Maury noted that street lighting coverage must also be factored into canopy tree placement decisions.
- Village Manager also noted that two recently-approved construction permits already require residents to plant canopy trees.
- Council discussed the idea of incorporating tree remediation costs into permit fees for construction-impacted trees; Village Manager confirmed this will be part of a broader permit fee review planned for fall.

Conclusion

- Council approved proceeding with the most cost-effective qualified contractors for pruning, removals, and vertical mulching.
- Fall planting program to prioritize canopy trees; private property planting option to be offered to residents for canopy trees only, with a care commitment requirement.
- Village Manager to work with the arborist on species and location recommendations for September Council review.
- Permit fee review to include consideration of tree remediation cost recovery.

Church Tree Maintenance and Grounds Collaboration

- Village Manager suggested offering the services of Richard, the village arborist, to assess the health of trees on church grounds outside the village right-of-way and potentially folding church tree work into village task orders for cost efficiency.
- Council supported the idea; noted the church property contains significant canopy trees that benefit the village as a whole.

Conclusion

- Council supportive of exploring tree maintenance synergies with the church.
- Village Manager to follow up with the arborist and Church administrator to discuss a collaborative assessment and maintenance arrangement.

Church Grounds Cleanup — Right-of-Way Adjacent to Parking Lot

The church requested village assistance in cleaning up the right-of-way strip adjacent to its parking lot.

- Miller Landscapes quoted \$2,100 combined for the Village right-of-way cleanup past the Church driveway along Kenilworth and the 8900 block of Clifford Avenue work; however, the Clifford work was already included in the approved Miller Landscapes contract, so the incremental cost for the church cleanup is approximately a few hundred dollars.

- Council raised concern about double-charging for Clifford; Village Manager confirmed separate invoices will be requested.

Conclusion

- Council supportive of proceeding with the church right-of-way cleanup.
 - Dana to confirm separate invoicing to avoid double-charging for Clifford work and to notify Miller Landscapes and Church Administrator to proceed.
-

ADU (Accessory Dwelling Unit) Ordinance Amendment

The Village Manager presented a final draft amendment to the village's ADU ordinance, required by state law and due by October 1.

- The ordinance must be amended to align with state law; formal adoption targeted for the September 15 Council meeting, providing residents more than the required two-week comment period.
- Village General Counsel, Ron Bolt, recommended aligning with Montgomery County's standards: side and rear setbacks of 5 feet, with an additional setback of 2 feet per foot of height above a threshold, and 1 foot of additional setback per foot of linear dimension exceeding 24 feet.
- Off-street parking requirement to be removed, as a full parking study would be required to retain it and the village currently has no ADUs.
- Council noted that since the county enforces building inspections for the village, unlike the Town of Chevy Chase, which has its own inspector, aligning with county standards is the practical approach.

Conclusion

- Council preliminarily accepted the proposed amendments.
 - Residents to be notified; formal adoption scheduled for the September 15 Council meeting.
-

FY26 Audit Engagement

Dana presented the audit engagement letter from LSWG for FY26.

- LSWG proposed a fee of \$10,450; the budgeted amount was \$10,000. The engagement letter is to be signed electronically by Council Treasurer and the Village Manager.
- Audit to begin mid-August; highway user revenue for FY26 expected around August; audit deadline is October.

Conclusion

- Council approved proceeding with the audit engagement.
 - Village Manager and Treasurer to sign the engagement letter electronically.
-

Fall Leaf Collection Solicitation

Village Manager confirmed the need to issue a new fall leaf collection solicitation following the expiration of the current contract.

- Current contract with Bethke, now acquired by Landscape Workshop, does not allow extensions; a new solicitation to go out by the end of August.
- Council confirmed the service contract should continue weekly leaf collection service during the fall.

Conclusion

- Village Manager to issue fall leaf collection solicitation by the end of August; Council to approve a new vendor at the September 15 meeting for an October 1 start.
-

July 4th Event Recap

The Village Manager provided a financial and operational summary of the July 4th community event.

- Total event cost: \$11,668. Blackhog BBQ food vendor total: \$4,608 after a \$973 refund for a rib order shortfall (104 ribs delivered vs. 500 ordered for 250 guests); food quality was praised by attendees.
- Compost Crew: \$355 for bin drop-off and waste collection. ABC Talk of the Town: credit of \$100 being pursued for incomplete order. Compostable materials, including plates and forks: \$235. Decorations: ~\$150. Some decorations, including acrylic sign holders and small decorative items, were retained for future use; plastic table covers were disposed of.
- Church kitchen access created issues; recommendation to restrict kitchen access and use the adjacent room with a serving window for beverages next year.
- Council discussed reducing overall food order quantities next year, particularly seltzer and mac and cheese; ribs and brisket quantities were approximately right. One recommendation was to add a budget line item for professional event labor (~\$75/hour per person, estimated 5–6 people for ~6 hours) to reduce the burden on Council members and volunteers and allow them to enjoy the event.

- Jon: Agreed that sweat equity from Council and staff should be reduced; professional event staff would handle setup, logistics, and breakdown.

Conclusion

- Blackhawk BBQ to be considered again next year with a reduced food order.
 - Budget for FY27 event to possibly include a line item for professional event labor.
-

McGregor Cul-de-Sac Annexation

The Village Manager provided a status update on a previously discussed potential annexation.

- The resident who had been leading the annexation interest effort indicated that residents of the McGregor cul-de-sac are no longer supportive of joining the village.

Conclusion

- No formal annexation request is expected at this time; matter closed pending any future resident-initiated request.
-

Additional Attendees:

Paul Dorr, The Flanagans, Jane Houlihan, Rebecca Wrady, Ilona Prucha, Seamus McCloskey, Jean Lewis, Juan Mayagoitia, Sandy Tennies