Minutes of the Howard County Public Works Board – December 14, 2021

Members present: Mr. Cory Summerson, Chairperson, Ms. Abby Glassberg, Vice Chairperson, Mr. Pedro Ramirez, and Mr. Alan Whitworth.

Staff present: Thomas J. Meunier, Executive Secretary; John Seefried, Assistant to the Director, Public Works; Emily A. Iacchei, Chief, Real Estate Services Division; Amah Binde, Chief, Bureau of Engineering; Kristen K. Haskins, Sr. County Solicitor; John Alcorn, Engineering Specialist II; Thomas Auyeung, Engineering Specialist III; Brandon Love, Chief, Transportation and Special Projects; Abdul Akbari, Engineering Specialist III; Donald Koelsch, Engineering Specialist I; Christopher Eatough, Office of Transportation; Daniel Davis, Chief, Utility Design Division; George Gibson, Engineering Specialist II, Utility Design; Rachel Roehrich, Recording Secretary, Real Estate Services Division.

Mr. Summerson called the meeting to order at approximately 7:31 p.m.

1. Approval of minutes: Mr. Summerson indicated that the first item on the agenda is the approval of the minutes of November 9, 2021. Ms. Glassberg asked if everyone had a chance to review the minutes.

Motion: On a motion made by Ms. Glassberg and seconded by Mr. Ramirez, the Board unanimously approved the minutes of November 9, 2021.

2. Public Works Board Road Acceptance

   (a) Subdivision: Bluffs at Turf Valley, Non-Buildable Bulk Parcels 'A' and 'B', a Subdivision of Part of Parcel 706
   R/SW Agreement No. F-16-004  W/S Agreement No. 44-4934-D
   Road Names: Resort Road
   Petitioner: Mangione Enterprises Of Turf Valley Limited Partnership

Staff Presentation: Ms. Iacchei, Chief, Real Estate Services Division, indicated that Mangione Enterprises Of Turf Valley Limited Partnership, a Maryland limited partnership, has presented a petition to the Director of Public Works for the acceptance of Resort Road located within Bluffs at Turf Valley, Non-Buildable Bulk Parcels 'A' and 'B', a Subdivision of Part of Parcel 706. The Bureau of Engineering has inspected the subdivision and certifies that all public improvements have been constructed in accordance with the approved plans and specifications and meets the criteria for acceptance under the Section 18.202 of the Howard County Code. The Bureau of Engineering recommends that the public improvements be accepted into the County's system of publicly owned and maintained facilities.

Board Comments: None.
**Public Testimony:** None.

**Motion:** On a motion made by **Mr. Ramirez**, and seconded by **Ms. Glassberg**, the Board recommended that the Director of Public Works accept the public improvements located in **Bluffs at Turf Valley, Non-Buildable Bulk Parcels 'A' and 'B', a Subdivision of Part of Parcel 706** into the County’s system of publicly owned and maintained facilities.

(b) **Subdivision:** Turf Valley, POD E-1, Phase One, Lots 1 thru 17, Open Space Lots 73 and 74, Golf Space Lots 75 and 76 and Non Buildable Bulk Parcels G, H, & I, A Subdivision of Part of Parcel 706 and Non Buildable Bulk Parcels "A" and "B", Bluffs at Turf Valley, Plat No. 24021, and Part of Non-Buildable Bulk Parcels "E" and "F", Fairways at Turf Valley, Phase 2, Plat No. 24299  
**R/SW Agreement No.** F-17-095  **W/S Agreement No.** 14-4979-D  
**Road Names:** Vivaldi Lane  
**Petitioner:** Mangione Enterprises Of Turf Valley Limited Partnership

**Staff Presentation:** Ms. Lacchei, Chief, Real Estate Services Division, indicated that Mangione Enterprises Of Turf Valley Limited Partnership, a Maryland limited partnership, has presented a petition to the Director of Public Works for the acceptance of Vivaldi Lane located within Turf Valley, POD E-1, Phase One, Lots 1 thru 17, Open Space Lots 73 and 74, Golf Space Lots 75 and 76 and Non Buildable Bulk Parcels G, H, & I, A Subdivision of Part of Parcel 706 and Non Buildable Bulk Parcels "A" and "B", Bluffs at Turf Valley, Plat No. 24021, and Part of Non-Buildable Bulk Parcels "E" and "F", Fairways at Turf Valley, Phase 2, Plat No. 24299. The Bureau of Engineering has inspected the subdivision and certifies that all public improvements have been constructed in accordance with the approved plans and specifications and meets the criteria for acceptance under the Section 18.202 of the Howard County Code. The Bureau of Engineering recommends that the public improvements be accepted into the County’s system of publicly owned and maintained facilities.

**Board Comments:** None.

**Public Testimony:** None.

**Motion:** On a motion made by **Ms. Glassberg**, and seconded by **Mr. Whitworth**, the Board recommended that the Director of Public Works accept the public improvements located in **Turf Valley, POD E-1, Phase One, Lots 1 thru 17, Open Space Lots 73 and 74, Golf Space Lots 75 and 76 and Non Buildable Bulk Parcels G, H, & I, A Subdivision of Part of Parcel 706 and Non Buildable Bulk Parcels "A" and "B", Bluffs at Turf Valley, Plat No. 24021, and Part of Non-Buildable Bulk Parcels "E" and "F", Fairways at Turf Valley, Phase 2, Plat No. 24299** into the County’s system of publicly owned and maintained facilities.

(c) **Subdivision:** Ravenwood at Turf Valley, Lots 1-7; Open Space Lots 8-10; Golf Space Lot 11 and Buildable Bulk Parcel 'AA' (A Resubdivision of Turf Valley, Pod E-1, Phase 1, Non-Buildable Bulk Parcels 'G' and 'H', previously recorded as Plat # 24898-24909  
**R/SW Agreement No.** F-18-027  **W/S Agreement No.** 24-4985-D  
**Road Names:** Resort Road  
**Petitioner:** Mangione Enterprises Of Turf Valley Limited Partnership

**Staff Presentation:** Ms. Lacchei, Chief, Real Estate Services Division, indicated that Mangione Enterprises Of Turf Valley Limited Partnership, a Maryland limited partnership, has presented a petition
to the Director of Public Works for the acceptance of Resort Road located within Ravenwood at Turf Valley, Lots 1-7; Open Space Lots 8-10; Golf Space Lot 11 and Buildable Bulk Parcel 'AA' (A Resubdivision of Turf Valley, Pod E-1, Phase 1, Non-Buildable Bulk Parcels 'G' and 'H', previously recorded as Plat # 24898-24909. The Bureau of Engineering has inspected the subdivision and certifies that all public improvements have been constructed in accordance with the approved plans and specifications and meets the criteria for acceptance under the Section 18.202 of the Howard County Code. The Bureau of Engineering recommends that the public improvements be accepted into the County’s system of publicly owned and maintained facilities.

**Board Comments:** None.

**Public Testimony:** None.

**Motion:** On a motion made by Mr. Whitworth, and seconded by Ms. Glassberg, the Board recommended that the Director of Public Works accept the public improvements located in Ravenwood at Turf Valley, Lots 1-7; Open Space Lots 8-10; Golf Space Lot 11 and Buildable Bulk Parcel 'AA' (A Resubdivision of Turf Valley, Pod E-1, Phase 1, Non-Buildable Bulk Parcels 'G' and 'H', previously recorded as Plat # 24898-24909 into the County’s system of publicly owned and maintained facilities.

3. **Water and Sewer Capital Projects**

**Staff Presentation:** At this time, Mr. Daniel Davis, Chief, Utility Design Division, Department of Public Works, Bureau of Engineering explained the purpose of this presentation was to seek recommendations from the Public Works Board concerning two (2) new capital projects that are proposed for addition into the current FY2022 or the upcoming FY2023 fiscal year and ten-year water and sewer capital improvement programs.

Public notice of these proposed new capital projects, that are to be presented here tonight, were advertised in the Baltimore Sun and Howard County Times on Thursday, December 2nd and Thursday, December 9th, 2021. Public posting (Public Hearing signs) were also placed near the project areas and communities. Copies of the Public Notice advertisement and Public Hearing notification signs follow in the presentation to the Board.

(a) **W8336, FY 2023 Longfellow Area Water Main Improvements**

Mr. Davis explained the first project to be brought before the Public Works Board is Capital Project W8336, the FY2023 Longfellow Area Water Main Improvements project. This is a new capital project to design and construct water main improvements (19,250 LF of 3" thru 12") within the Longfellow area. The total estimated cost included within the ten-year capital improvement program is $15,000,000.00.

This new capital project is requested by the Department of Public Works in response to numerous water main breaks which have occurred. The existing mains were installed in 1967 and are showing increasing signs that they are at the end of their useful life. The frequency of breaks in the area is increasing as well as the severity of the breaks. A targeted corrosion elevation of the Longfellow area water mains is underway under the asset management program in advance of the more comprehensive condition assessment and planned improvements to be performed under this capital project.

Interested citizens were notified of tonight’s meeting by advertisement in local newspapers and by public postings. Provided to the Board is a map of the areas in which the water main breaks occurred.
within the last several years as well as a draft of the Capital Budget sheets to be included in the year’s fiscal budget.

**Board Comments:** Mr. Whitworth asked if the dots shown on the map page of the presentation represented the water main breaks, and Mr. Davis confirmed they were. Mr. Whitworth further asked what the color significance was, and Mr. Davis explained that color significance represented the year of the water main break. Mr. Summerson asked when the design for the project was expected, and Mr. Davis explained the expected design would begin July 2022. Preceding the design effort there will be a study done of the area to determine if there is any remaining useful life as well as what the corrosion activity is in the area. Mr. Whitworth asked to confirm what the length of time was that portrayed the twenty-two (22) water main breaks shown on the map, and Mr. Davis stated the timeframe was from 2015 to present day, therefore it was roughly seven years. Mr. Whitworth further asked if the amount of water main breaks portrayed was above average or average, and Mr. Davis explained that it was not to be unexpected, but the breaks were occurring more frequently right now and were more concentrated than in previous years. The map provided to the Board was broken down into two phases. Phase one showed more concentrated, frequent water main breaks that are occurring at a more rapid pace. Mr. Davis further explained that to have water main breaks in a concentrated area is not particularly uncommon, but when they begin to happen more rapidly time after time there may be a larger issue that needs to be addressed. Mr. Whitworth then asked if the water main breaks could be from soil conditions in the area, and Mr. Davis explained that it could be. Mr. Davis further explained that the older pipes were laid right on top of the old soil which is different than newer techniques used today and how newly installed pipe is laid, in which the native soil is not used, and bedding is used around the pipe. Mr. Whitworth asked if the maintenance of the pipe cost was included in the water and sewer bill that people pay. Mr. Davis explained that maintenance is included in that water and sewer bill, but that this is above and beyond anything that would be included in maintenance as it would be a total renewal of water main in the area.

Ms. Glassberg asked if replacing the water main would save money, and Mr. Davis explained that it would absolutely save money in the future by doing a proactive replacement of the water main. Mr. Davis further explained that there are 8-inch water mains and 12-inch water mains in the areas being discussed. A 12-inch water main break could open a hole the size of two cars which could wash away loads of dirt, and destroy the roadway, in which the dirt would need to be cleaned and the roadway be repaired after which the pipe and other utilities be repaired. Therefore, the money spent to proactively replace the water mains would be money well spent. Mr. Whitworth asked if Mr. Davis would do the resurfacing at the time of the project and Mr. Davis explained his division would partner with the Bureau of Highways to determine means of repaving the area. Mr. Davis did not know what would be done at the time but did say it would be coordinated with the Bureau of Highways. Mr. Whitworth further asked if anything was discussed with BGE (Baltimore Gas & Electric), and Mr. Davis stated it was not yet discussed with BGE to date but it will be during the planning process. Mr. Ramirez asked if the water mains would be replaced or if the old water mains would be abandoned and add new ones would be put in, and Mr. Davis explained given the storm drains and tight streets within this community, the water mains will most likely have to be installed within the same trench. Mr. Davis further explained temporary water will most likely need to be brought in during the process as well. Mr. Whitworth asked if there were any metal culverts and Mr. Davis stated he was not aware of any. Mr. Summerson stated it looked as though phase two had only had two water main breaks thus far, and asked Mr. Davis how far out this phase was. Mr. Davis explained most likely around three to four years but stated once phase one was secure phase two would be examined to determine the condition of the water mains to determine if it warrants continuing on.

**Public Testimony:** Mr. Joel Hurewitz, resident located at 5681 Harpers Farm Road, Columbia, Maryland 21044, and Member of Harpers Choice Community Association Board. Mr. Hurewitz stated he did not get to review a copy of the presentation sent to the Board prior to the meeting, although Mr.
Davis did present him with a copy of the presentation. Mr. Hurewitz did comment that there was a period of time a while back when it seemed there was a leak a day. Mr. Hurewitz asked for some clarity as to when the actual construction of the water main would take place as he believed there would be more leaks. He further asked if the planning would be in 2022 and construction in 2024 or 2025? Mr. Davis confirmed that the earliest construction would start would be the end of 2022 as funding will not come available until July 1st of 2022, after which it will take time to get a design in place and decide on a course of action as well. Mr. Davis further explained at this point next year a decision would have to be made whether to cut ground or to wait until spring. Mr. Hurewitz then commented on Harpers Farm Road as it was included on the map in the presentation as well as related to Complete Streets and stated that the repaving may need to be adjusted, but Mr. Hurewitz stated he did not feel that there had been a lot of breaks on Harpers Farm Road either. Mr Davis stated there have been a lot of breaks on Hesperus Drive and the north area of Elliot Oaks.

Mr. Hurewitz asked where that was in relation to coming from the water tower as one of the crew member thought it could be the pressure coming from the water tower. Mr. Davis explained that he did not want to speculate on what causes the breaks. Mr. Davis further explained that any time the water is down to repair a break it puts more stress on the system because once the water is turned off you have gone from a state of relaxation to a state of pressure which causes a flux and stress on the water main which may cause another break. Mr. Hurewitz mentioned the comment from earlier in the meeting with regard to the road repair, with regard to the condition of Elliot Oaks in particular although he felt the conditions have been better. Mr. Hurewitz further commented on road repair with regard to stripping over the pot holes, and then filling in the pot holes over the newly painted stripes which he felt made no sense, as well as how the intersection at Harpers Farm with a new traffic light put in the stripping for the new crosswalk and then repaved it. Mr. Hurewitz stated he asked the former Director why it was done this way and did not receive a response, so he appreciated the Board raising the questions regarding the repaving issues, process and planning.

Mr. Hurewitz did explain he brought some of these issues up with a Council member and he was affected by the leak shown in the phase two area a couple months ago as well. Mr. Hurewitz stated how Mr. Davis mentioned the runoff of the sediment as well and how that sediment ran off into the stream Columbia Association just had the State restore within the last year. Mr. Hurewitz further stated there is reportedly discussion between Public Works and Columbia Association on who would be cleaning it up. Mr. Hurewitz then discussed the signage notice on Saturday but said notification to the Community Association would have been helpful, although the signage was larger, which was appreciated. Mr. Hurewitz then proceeded to make a recommendation to the Board in general regarding the Capital Project signs particularly that go to Planning Board are way too small and do not say anything or have enough information. Mr. Hurewitz suggested they be the same standard that DPZ (Department of Planning & Zoning) uses which are close to the DPW signs and asked if that could be coordinated, but on the other hand he tried to look up the sign code and could not locate it. Mr. Hurewitz brought up another topic dealing with his condo involving the service lines and meters although they are considered private property, therefore Mr. Hurewitz believes he needs to speak with someone about the issues. At this point, Mr. Davis explained that with regard to the capital project work the County is responsible for any work up to the meter and anything beyond is the responsibility of the private owner, to which Mr. Hurewitz responded by inquiring as to the tearing up of his parking lot, the timing and how much will need to be torn up or if any of the same Right-Of-Way will be able to be salvage and used. Mr. Davis responded by stating that all aspects will need to be explored during the design phase of the project before any of the work has begun, in which Mr. Summerson also explained all aspects of the projects will be discussed with the homeowners and the associations before the start of the project as well. Mr. Hurewitz further stated that his condo lines keep getting breaks in them as well, therefore he wonders if it is a soil issue as well or an age and some are repeatedly repaired. At that time, Mr.
Hurewitz asked for Mr. Davis’ card and to be kept in the loop on the timing of the project and Mr. Davis said that he could call him any time.

Finally, Mr. Hurewitz explained he shared with the County Executive that American Recovery Funds could be used for Water Projects, and he suggested to the County Executive in part because he thought is could free up bonding authority from the County for school and other needs to be used for Water and Sewer. Mr. Summerson stated at this point he was not aware where the Board stood and if that would apply. Mr. Meunier did state that the County is currently taking a look at the American Recovery Funds and the Administration does have a number of projects it is trying to use it on. Some Water and Sewer projects were submitted for that list, but Mr. Meunier was not aware where they stood at the time. Mr. Summerson stated that more than likely, the path that they were on already was probably already the fastest for his neighborhood with regard to repairs.

Mr. Hurewitz than asked where the County was and the timeline for finishing Faulkner Ridge Circle, and Mr. Davis then turned the question over to Mr. George Gibson. Mr. George Gibson, Project Manager and Engineering Specialist II, Utility Design, for the Faulkner Ridge Circle project explained that the project is about 80% complete and all the main lines have been installed. There are roughly 60-70 house connections left to install, which leaves them at about 80% done. Aside from that, Mr. Gibson explained there are five main line tie ins that are needed to be done which all will be completed by January and then paving will begin in the spring. Mr. Hurewitz asked if curbs and sidewalks will all need to be redone when the new service lines go in since they were recently redone in the Elliot Oaks area. Mr. Gibson responded by stating that it will really depend on location. If they can go under the curb and sidewalk they will, but if there are other utilities that are dealt with curb and sidewalk may need to be pulled out to put in the service line, but anything that is pulled out will be redone as well. Mr. Hurewitz stated his point was that the curbs and sidewalks were just replaced a couple months ago, to which Mr. Summerson stated that the departments try to coordinate as best they can but sometimes timelines do not always match up. Mr. Hurewitz also mentioned Swansfield also had a number of leaks and asked if that was an area that was going to be looked into, and Mr. Davis stated it was not a focus at this time.

Mr. Leonard Leffner, a resident residing at 5042 Round Tower Place, Columbia, Maryland 21044, in the north end of Harpers Choice in the Longfellow area. Mr. Leffner explained that he has had three recent breaks, the first one on December 16, 2020 at approximately 6:00-6:30 p.m. until 4:00-5:00 a.m. in front of his house where everything turned to mush between the road and sidewalk. Mr. Leffner also stated at the corner of his property there is a BGE switchgear, which was an island surrounded by water. Mr. Leffner further stated that water not only ran down a path between his house and the house next to him but it came closer and closer to his garage which he did not want to happen. The second water main break occurred October 2, 2021, which was more insidious and occurred around 5:00 a.m. It happened closer to the sewer at the end of the cul-de-sac and there was a lot of silt, followed by another insidious leak in November. Mr. Leffner explained there was a highway crew onsite to pull off the old patch in order to install put new asphalt and another leak began to bubble, therefore another temporary patch was put on. Mr. Leffner is concerned as a homeowner because his property and the property to the east of him sit on a hill and when the water from the leaks begin to gush and cannot be accommodated by the sewer, which it cannot be at times, it runs between their properties. Of the two properties, the other property tends to flood inside the garage, whereas with Mr. Leffner’s property the flow of water tends to splits down the east side of his house and the other creates a ravine through his house and his neighbor’s trickling to a stream behind his house. Mr. Leffner is concerned mainly because after the October water main break bubbling began to occur underneath his driveway which is angled downward to his garage which caused water/silt to accumulate toward his house and garage floor that had just been replaced. Mr. Leffner’s other concern is that every time a water main break
happens in the area whether it be off of Elliott Oak or Hespersus the water is always turned off on Longfellow as well, which is a concern because Mr. Leffner does have some neighbors that are elderly and house bound. Mr. Leffner is an organizer on his street and stated that the water main leaks leading to the constant shut offs does cause anxiety for his elderly neighbors as well. He is glad to hear that there is a project in the planning phase as the water main breaks are happening more frequently and it is more of a concern.

Mr. Summerson again responded by stating that there is always a balance to these projects in which you do not want to replace too soon, but when several breaks begin to happen there comes a point when it is determined it needs to then be replaced and managed. Patience is what is asked of the citizens as the projects are managed.

Mr. Whitney LeBlanc, a resident at 5166 Elliott Oaks Road, Columbia, Maryland 21044, stated that he resides right in the middle of the road that is only a mile long. Mr. LeBlanc stated that he is a runner so he sees the occurrences that happen on this street every day and he has also seen the repairs on all of the curb and sidewalks that have also been done. Mr. LeBlanc wanted to thank you for all of the work that has been done as it has been nice to have the sidewalks repaired and leveled to some degree. Mr. LeBlanc stated with regard to the water main breaks, he has had his water cut off before, so he certainly supports this capital project as the breaks are happening much more frequently.

Mr. Jeffrey Withee, a resident at 5248 Open Window, Columbia, Maryland 21044, stated that he wanted to echo what the other residents have said. He stated he has lived there for twenty (20) years and unfortunately this year has been worse than most for the water main breaks and he would encourage the Board to move forward with the capital project and he looks forward to that improvement in his neighborhood. Mr. Withee also asked Mr. Davis if there would be community outreach when the project reached the construction phase to be shut off to go to the temporary and be shut off again to go back to the permanent, so the residents would know what streets the County would be working on and when the shut offs would be occurring. Mr. Davis responded by explaining what happened with the Wilde Lake project. Mr. Davis further explained a meeting was hosted at Wilde Lake High School in which the community was invited to a meeting to discuss who would be impacted by the water main replacement, the County had them meet the project manager, signs were posted throughout the community, and there was also an onsite inspector at the site during the project for any questions if need be as well. Mr. Davis also confirmed that before any construction would be started there would be a meeting with the community to inform them of everything to expect as well as the process and timeline.

**Motion:** On a motion made by Ms. Glassberg, and seconded by Mr. Ramirez, the Board recommended that the Director of Public Works accept capital project W8336, FY 2023 Longfellow Area Water Main Improvements.

(b) S6698, FY 2022 Whiskey Bottom Road Routine Sewer Extension

**Staff Presentation:** Mr. Davis then presented the second project seeking recommendation from the Public Works Board is Capital Project S6698, the Whiskey Bottom Road Routine Sewer Extension; an extension of the public sewer system under capital project S6698, the Routine Sewer Extension Program. The project consists of the design and construction of 225 linear feet of 8-inch sewer. The project will serve the requesting property as well as allow for the future service needs of the only remaining and existing unserved property. The estimated cost for design and construction is $200,000.
The project was requested by Ms. Michele Rosenfield, Esq. on behalf of Mr. Barry Edwin Rowe, owner of 9712 Whiskey Bottom Road; parcel 0795 on tax map 0047. The property is improved, is within the Metropolitan District and is eligible for public water and sewer service. The property is 0.802 acres in size and is zoned R-20.

Homeowners of existing dwellings within the Metropolitan District where sewer mains have not been constructed are eligible for consideration for an extension provided program criteria is meet. Criteria includes:

a. A written request has been made by a property owner who is without a sewer main fronting their property.
b. Properties to be served must abut a County or State road.
c. The extension is less than 1,000 feet.
d. The extension is a gravity sewer main and continues a gravity sewer system currently in service within the sewer shed.
e. Acquisition of utility easements are not required.
f. Capacity is available per section 18.122B of the County Code.
g. The extension is supported by at least 50% of the abutting property owners.

This request meets the criteria.

Interested citizens were notified of tonight’s meeting by advertisement in local newspapers and by public postings.

**Board Comments:** None.

**Public Testimony:** None

Motion: On a motion made by Mr. Ramirez, and seconded by Ms. Glassberg, the Board recommended that the Director of Public Works accept capital project S6698, FY 2022 Whiskey Bottom Road Routine Sewer Extension.

4. **Complete Streets Design Manual Update Presentation**

At this time, Mr. Christopher Eatough, from the Howard County Office of Transportation as a representative of the Complete Streets Implementation Team joined by Mr. Bryan Townsend of WRA as well as several member of DPW that are on the implementation team as well. Although there will not be a full presentation tonight there will be follow up on some questions the Board had on the fiscal impact of Complete Streets as well as some updates since the last meeting.

**Mr. Townsend** Listed the four changes that had been made in the last four weeks listed below as follows:

1. Chapter 1: A placeholder was replaced with text detailing the public input process.
2. Chapter 5: The distance to public schools that requires a developer study of multimodal connections was changed from 0.5 miles to 1 mile for Elementary Schools and 1.5 mile for High Schools.
3. Chapter 4 and Chapter 5: Assumed background growth rate for motor vehicle traffic was changed from 3% to 2% to align closer with data from the 2011 to 2019 period.
After discussing the updates to the to Chapters 1, 4, 5 and Volume IV Mr. Townsend turned the explanation of Fiscal Impact for Developers over to Mr. Eatough. Mr. Eatough did explain fiscal analysis on this topic was not easy as there was a lot of moving parts, but data was run for new roads built by developers from 2016-2020 and what may have been impacted if built under the Complete Streets standards. The information is listed below:

• Over 90% of developer-built roads over the past 5 years have been local access streets (which will now be known as neighborhood yield streets). The Complete Streets Design Manual specifies 5-foot-wide sidewalks for these streets. Previously, some sidewalks were built at 4-foot width. Construction cost difference between 4-foot and 5-foot-wide sidewalk is estimated to be $9 per linear foot more.

At that time Ms. Glassberg asked what the benchmark price for materials was. Mr. Whitworth stated that cost of materials has increased 25% and that $9.00 was a good price. Mr. Eatough explained that Mr. Townsend helped to determine the price. Ms. Glassberg further asked if the price was based on 10% or 20% more on the extra added foot. Mr. Townsend explained the cost estimating is based upon the overall square footage. Mr. Glassberg asked if that was just materials not land acquisition and Mr. Townsend confirmed as the Right of Way width for these types of streets is not proposed.

• The larger classification roads (Less than 10%) built by developers in the last 5 years (in Downtown Columbia, Turf Valley and Westmount Parkway) most closely resemble Neighborhood Street 1 and would cost slightly less under Complete Streets Design Manual standards due to narrower lane widths.
• Rural development streets are standardized at 24 feet wide under the Complete Streets Design Guide (previously 22 to 28 feet wide), resulting in potential minor cost increase or decrease.
• Analysis is for roads built by development projects and dedicated to the county from 2016 through 2020, assuming 2020 construction prices.

Mr. Eatough then proceeded with listing the Fiscal Impact for the County below:

• Long term fiscal impacts of the updates to the Howard County Design Manual to implement Complete Streets are expected to be manageable. When all benefits are considered, a Complete Streets approach may have a net positive economic impact for Howard County.
• Long term cost savings are due to improvements in public health, air quality and safety as well as avoiding road capacity expansions.
• Complete Streets improvements to existing roads will be made incrementally as opportunities arise, such as marking bike lanes and crosswalks when roads are resurfaced. This process is already incorporated into the Howard County capital budget, with budget areas for Complete Streets improvements such as sidewalks,
pathways, bicycle lanes and intersection improvements already receiving annual funding. In Fiscal Year 2022, approximately $5 million was added to the capital budget for Complete Streets improvements across several budget areas, mostly in the “K” budget items, but also some in the “T” budget items.

Mr. Summerson asked if at this time is the County expecting to spend that $5 million per year, and Mr. Eatough did confirm that for FY22 there are projects that are underway and the $5 million is expected to be spent, but of course it may not all get spent as some projects are multi year projects as well. Mr. Ramirez asked if the $5 million are not spent in the particular fiscal year if it was rolled over to the following year and it was confirmed it was.

Mr. Eatough explained that was all the follow up that they had and were hoping to move to the Legislative process with the Council and would ultimately like to wrap up with Public Works Board at tonight’s meeting.

Board Comments: Mr. Summerson asked for any further questions from the Board. As there were none, he asked for a motion to approve. At this time, Mr. Whitworth stated his vote would be a no. He further stated, he in no way meant to diminish all the hard work the consultant and Implementation Team put into this project but felt the resurfacing projects and water main projects needed to be addressed first before getting into the Design Manual as he also felt it would be double work for the County. Mr. Summerson then asked if anyone could address Mr. Whitworth’s concern. Mr. Eatough explained form their end, they had a Legislative Requirement to go before the Council with a Design Manual Update as part of the Complete Streets Policy. There was a two-year window to do that, and they are at the end of that window in which they are trying to go proceed with that process. Mr. Eatough further explained the Council will also do a fiscal impact analysis as well and make their decisions, but at this time Office of Transportation does have a Legislative Requirement to come before the Public Works Board for approval. At this time, Mr. John Seefried, Assistant to the Director of Public Works, stated that he believed the question, as he understood it to be, was that there seemed to be a conflict between the multimodal improvements which would be in placing the bike lanes and sidewalks to be in conflict with infrastructure improvements needed (for example: we heard tonight it would be something to the effect of paving the road and then tearing it up to replace the water and sewer). Mr. Seefried then stated that Mr. Eatough would lead the charge from the Office of Transportation coordinating with DPW (including Bureau of Highways and Bureau of Utilities) to make repairs if needed. Mr. Seefried further stated he believed the question to be would the $5 million to make improvements and then destroy them with maintenance work make sense, although with the coordination of locations where the improvements are planned; specifically, water and sewer maintenance targeted areas can avoid lack of efficiency because no one wants to make an improvement, and have it torn up for another reason.

Mr. Whitworth also explained that he was also concerned about the impact on the tax payers in the future. Mr. Whitworth further explained that it is uncertain what the cost for the bike lanes and all of the restriping, the possible maintenance fees, or extra work may be to ultimately maintain these new types of roads 10 years in the future may be, and he did not feel comfortable voting for something that he did not know what the cost to the taxpayer may be on a 5 year or 10 year plan. Mr. Eatough explained that part of the challenge of quantifying the impact of what Mr. Whitworth was speaking about was because the Design Manual Update was not about one specific project, but more so to put down guidelines for when projects come along and are
designed. For example, bike lanes in Howard County already exist, they were not previously in
the Design Manual, therefore, Federal Design Manuals had to be utilized for guidance. With this
update, Howard County will now have guidance within its own Design Manual for use.
Mr. Ramirez then asked if the changes that are being proposed are updates to the Design
Manual to standardize, and Mr. Eatough confirmed yes, and it was all guidance that was located
elsewhere as well, but it is just being updated to include in the Howard County Design Manual.

Public Testimony: None

Motion: On a motion made by Mr. Ramirez, and seconded by Ms. Glassberg, the Board
recommended that the Director of Public Works approve the Complete Streets Design Manual
Update. Mr. Whitworth voted against the approval of the Complete Streets Design Manual
Update.

Lastly, Mr. John Seefried provided a brief update on the J4211 Gorman Road at Skylark capital
project that was brought before the Board previously. He stated there was much community
engagement and they are now working on a design on a roundabout. The project will be brought
back before the Board for approval once new plans are drawn up. Mr. Seefried also stated there
was also a question at the last meeting as to what capital projects come before the Board, to
which he answered consist water and sewer and scenic road capital projects. Mr. Seefried stated
water and sewer are a bit more complicated, which can be discussed at a later time, but scenic
roads come before the Board because they are required by code for recommendation. One
example of a scenic road project is the Gorman Road project, which is why it was brought before
the Board, and which is also why it will need to come back before the Board for approval.

There being no further business, the Public Works Board meeting adjourned at approximately
8:43 p.m.

[Signatures]

Thomas J. Meunier
Executive Secretary

Rachel Roehrich
Recording Secretary