



HOWARD COUNTY PUBLIC WORKS BOARD

3430 Courthouse Drive ■ Ellicott City, Maryland 21043 ■ 410-313-2330 ■ Fax 410-313-3408

James M. Irvin, Executive Secretary
Rachel Roehrich, Recording Secretary

Cory J. Summerson, Chairperson
Abby Glassberg, Vice Chairperson
Pedro Ramirez, Member
Brandon Robinson, Member
Alan Whitworth, Member

Minutes of the Howard County Public Works Board – December 10, 2019

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

Staff present: Thomas Meunier, Acting Executive Secretary; Robert Barnett, Engineering Specialist II, Construction Inspection Division; Daniel Davis, Chief, Utility Design Division; Melanie Bishop, Chief, Real Estate Services Division; Rachel Roehrich, Recording Secretary, Real Estate Services Division.

Mr. Summerson called the meeting to order at approximately 7:30 p.m.

1. **Approval of minutes:** **Mr. Summerson** indicated that the first item on the agenda is the approval of the minutes of **October 15, 2019**. Mr. Summerson asked if everyone had a chance to review the minutes.

Motion: On a motion made by **Ms. Glassberg** and seconded by **Mr. Robinson**, the Board unanimously approved the minutes of **October 15, 2019**.

2. **Public Works Board Road Acceptance**

- (a) **Subdivision:** Subdivision and Density Receiving Plat, Brighton Mill II, Lots 1 through 12, Buildable Preservation Parcel 'A' and Non-Buildable Preservation Parcels 'B' through 'E' R/SW Agreement No. F-17-054
Road Names: Curtis Vista Way and Triadelphia Mill Road (widening)
Petitioner: Highland Development Corp

Staff Presentation: **Ms. Bishop**, Chief, Real Estate Services Division, indicated that **Highland Development Corp.**, a Maryland corporation, has presented a petition to the Director of Public Works for the acceptance of **Curtis Vista Way and Triadelphia Mill Road located in Brighton Mill II, Lots 1 through 12, Buildable Preservation Parcel 'A' and Non-Buildable Preservation Parcels 'B' through 'E'**. 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. Robinson**, and seconded by **Ms. Glassberg**, the Board unanimously recommended that the Director of Public Works accept the public improvements located at **Brighton**

Mill II, Lots 1 through 12, Buildable Preservation Parcel 'A' and Non-Buildable Preservation Parcels 'B' through 'E' into the County's system of publicly owned and maintained facilities.

- (b) Subdivision: Turf Valley, Parcels E-1 & B-1; Non-Buildable Bulk Parcels E-2, B-2, B-3, B-4, B-5 and B-6, A Resubdivision of Parcel 'E' Previously Recorded As Plat No. 12988, Parcel 'B' Previously Recorded As Plat No. 12807-09, and a Subdivision of a Part of Parcel 8
R/SW Agreement No. F-14-096
Road Names: Mount Villa Parkway and Brava Court
Petitioner: Mary C. Mangione

Staff Presentation: Ms. Bishop, Chief, Real Estate Services Division, indicated that Mary C. Mangione, has presented a petition to the Director of Public Works for the acceptance of Mount Villa Parkway and Brava Court located in Turf Valley, Parcels E-1 & B-1; Non-Buildable Bulk Parcels E-2, B-2, B-3, B-4, B-5 and B-6, A Resubdivision of Parcel 'E' Previously Recorded As Plat No. 12988, Parcel 'B' Previously Recorded As Plat No. 12807-09, and a Subdivision of a Part of Parcel 8. 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: Mr. Whitworth asked if the portion of Brava Court only included 30-40 feet. Mr. Barnett confirmed that it did only include 30-40 feet. Mr. Whitworth further asked if Brava Court was only a partial approval, and Mr. Barnett confirmed that the rest of Brava Court was included within another subdivision.

Public Testimony: None.

Motion: On a motion made by Mr. Whitworth, and seconded by Ms. Glassberg, the Board unanimously recommended that the Director of Public Works accept the public improvements located at Turf Valley, Parcels E-1 & B-1; Non-Buildable Bulk Parcels E-2, B-2, B-3, B-4, B-5 and B-6, A Resubdivision of Parcel 'E' Previously Recorded As Plat No. 12988, Parcel 'B' Previously Recorded As Plat No. 12807-09, and a Subdivision of a Part of Parcel 8 into the County's system of publicly owned and maintained facilities.

3. Water & Sewer Capital Projects

- (a) S6299, FY 2023 Rockburn Branch Sewer Study

Staff Presentation: Mr. Davis, Chief, Utility Design Division, indicated that the purpose of this presentation is to seek recommendations from the Public Works Board concerning a proposed Capital Project S6299, FY 2023 Rockburn Branch Sewer Study.

Mr. Davis stated the first project to be brought before the Public Works Board is Capital Project S6299, the FY2023 Rockburn Branch Sewer Study project. This is a new capital project to study and determine feasible options to provide sewer service to properties along Elibank Dr. in Elkridge, MD. The total estimated cost included within the ten-year capital improvement program is \$600,000.00.

This new capital project is requested by the Department of Public Works in response to a request for sewer service from a property owner on Elibank Dr. The requesting owner's property, as well as others

that make up the study area, is in the Metropolitan District and Planned Service Area. Interested citizens were notified of tonight's meeting by advertisement in local newspapers and by public postings.

Mr. Davis included a map within the materials provided to the board members. Mr. Davis explained the study area borders 95 on the east and the study area goes to Belmont Woods in the south, up to Rockburn hill in the north and back down to the river. This area represents the study area to provide sewer service to Elibank Dr. which runs parallel to 95 from Montgomery Road to the north and out of the County.

Board Comments: Mr. Summerson asked when the study would actually be conducted and Mr., Davis replied that the study will be conducted in FY23 which means it would be conducted in July 2022. Mr. Summerson asked if it was usual to have a 2 ½ year delay for a study to be conducted when a resident is requesting sewer service. Mr. Davis replied that it is not necessarily an unusual time frame as every project is different and has a life of its own. The date was chosen due to another capital project coinciding within the area which is called the Water Project to redo the suction that feeds the water main. The plan is to tie the two projects together, although this project is not an easy project as it involves looking at the many environmental features within the area and a Right-of-Way needs to be obtained as well. It was determined this time frame was the best time to start the project for this area. Mr. Summerson asked if the \$600,000.00 is to do the study and when the study would be completed. Mr. Davis confirmed the \$600,000.00 was to perform the study and it would be completed 2023. Mr. Summerson then asked when the project would be proposed to be redone. Mr. Davis explained the project would have to be designed, come back to the Public Works Board become a capital project and be approved for funding. Mr. Summerson asked if 2025 would be the best-case scenario to begin, and Mr. Davis confirmed that 2025 would be the best-case scenario to begin. Mr. Whitworth asked if a developer requested the study or a private individual requested the study, and Mr. Davis confirmed a private individual requested the study and there is also a developer interested. Mr. Davis further confirmed the private individual lives along the houses that front Elibank Dr. and requested a capital project 5 years ago, although, at the time, the private individual was in a comprehensive grouping, which meant there were no plans for sewer in that area. The private individual was then moved into a 6-10 grouping, which meant that the County would consider sewer in that area within 6-10 years although there are no guarantees. Mr. Whitworth asked what watershed this area was in. Mr. Davis explained it is in the sewer shed for the Patapsco, in which the sewer shed flows into Baltimore County. Ms. Glassberg asked what size parcel the private owner that requested sewer had, and Mr. Davis explained he believed it to be close to 1 acre.

Public Testimony: Mr. Nessly Craig, a homeowner located at 6570 Belmont Woods Road. Mr. Craig explained that his parcel is not within the Metropolitan District and he did not understand why his parcel was included in the area within the study section as he is never supposed to get sewer, and he does not want sewer. Mr. Davis explained that although his parcel is not within the Metropolitan District now, there may be a time in the future when he may want to be within the Metropolitan District. Mr. Craig further asked how the boundary was determined, and Mr. Davis explained the boundary line was drawn per the contours of the land that was felt would drain to the sewer system that is trying to be built. Mr. Craig stated the property/parcel that was left out of the boundary was located upstream of his property. Mr. Craig stated that Rockburn branch drains downhill which the County has tried do for 40 years and himself as well as other homeowners have fought every 10 years to prevent from going down the property which adjoins properties/parcels that are on conservation easements and state park lands. Mr. Craig further stated that every 10 years they have to fight against a sewer system which he does not understand because his property as well as the other homeowners' properties are not within the Metropolitan District, it was taken out of the long term plans and some house/properties have not been included. Mr. Davis explained, that in their opinion, all the properties included were necessary for the

study today. Mr. Craig stated he believed that was wrong. Mr. Davis further explained that part of any study is to determine and figure out the larger picture, and that whenever anything is studied it is to determine the maximum area that can be drained. Mr. Davis also explained that if the area needs to change it can be change which was all part of the study. Mr. Craig stated that he believed if an area, parcel or property was not in the Metropolitan District it made no sense to include it in the study as they do not want to be in the Metropolitan District. Mr. Davis stated that even though they may not want to be in the Metropolitan District today, there may be instances where people may want to join the Metropolitan District later in which there cannot be a sewer system that does not account for a property that later wants to join. Mr. Craig explained that his parcel as well as others included on the map for the study are over 6 acres and 25 acres which are under perpetual conservation easements that will never be developed and do not want or need a sewer system. Mr. Davis stated that when the study is conducted all that information will be examined and figured out. Mr. Craig stated that he did not receive a notice or mailing with regard to the study and expressed that it scares the homeowners included within the boundary for the study as they feel they have to fight against the public sewer every time a study like this is presented. Mr. Davis explained that notice of this new capital project is not done through a mailing and that it is advertised in the newspaper and signs were posted, which Mr. Craig replied that a small sign with regard to the water system was out for only a short time. In response, Mr. Davis explained that this project had been advertised as required by the County Code. Mr. Summerson asked Mr. Davis if there was or would be conversations with the homeowners throughout the process, in which Mr. Craig interjected to state there had been no contact, explained they had to fight the pump stations 10 years ago and he feels that the Public Works Department is very focused on what is the cheapest and easiest way to do things when they do not understand the area. Mr. Davis explained that the County is trying to honor the request of a homeowner, in which Mr. Craig interjected to state that it was the request of only one homeowner when there are many others that have put their land in easements and given up their significant development rights and value, but this request was from only one homeowner. Mr. Summerson asked if all of information was taken into account when the study is conducted, in which Mr. Davis confirmed it was.

Mr. Michael Torcisi, a homeowner located at 6448 Elibank Dr., stated he was the homeowner that started this process about 5 years ago. Mr. Torcisi stated that his house is most likely the newest house on the street as it was built in 2002 and he asked for the sewer study as he has a private septic system in which he spent over \$2,000.00 to repair just the pump. Mr. Torcisi further stated that he does not have a lot of confidence in a private septic system and when looking at the average life span of a private septic, which is around 30 years, he stated that they are bound to fail at some point which is a mess and it is expensive. Mr. Torcisi has been pushing for this study as he would like public sewer as a back up and he would like to switch over to public sewage sooner rather than later. Mr. Torcisi further stated that there are other homeowners, Valerie Lash being one, who could not make it due to illness that are in favor of switching to public sewer as well.

Mr. Dale Schumacher, a homeowner located at 6581 Belmont Woods Rd., stated that he was a 45 year resident of the County owning 1.71 acres of a preservation parcel on Elibank Dr. jointly held with Maryland Environmental Trust, as well as, perpetual conservation easements on about 50 acres straddling the Rockburn Branch. Mr. Schumacher distributed a handout to the board to help explain the issues relating to Elibank. Map 1 of his handout showed the properties starting just west of the pump station are within the Lawyers Hill Registered Historic District which raises reviews that are necessary if there are federal monies involved in the program. Map 2 of his handout showed a better perspective of the preservation parcels and state park. Belmont Manor was included in the map in which they had worked with Belmont over a decade ago to get a Maryland Environmental Trust Easement on Belmont to achieve preservation. He stated that one perception, while it does not look

like they have a high density in the neighborhood, the children go to Howard High which is currently 40 % over capacity. Any burden of new residences will push up burden on education until High School 14 is built. Amendment 1 speaks to previous work done with County, which was put in by Courtney Watson to remove a portion of the proposed Rockburn Branch interceptor sewer. He further explained the specifications and options in the event of future need for sewer to these properties onsite waste water treatment will be considered as the most likely alternative followed by low pressure sewer which would be designed to minimize environmental impact. Mr. Davis explained the challenge is that the properties that sit on the front of the road are higher and the properties below fall in toward the river, in which the County would prefer to provide gravity service to people which is mission number one, and the study area that was determined included anything that could possibly flow in that direction. Mr. Schumacher stated that as his last line in his handout stated he would be happy to work with Public Works to achieve an optimal plan although there are many complexities and without being boisterous both he and the other homeowners have a long winning streak in winning environmental battles, including the Belmont property. Mr. Whitworth stated that it would help to have a contour map, but also said that as he understood this is only a study period in which there will be other times and opportunities for comments which adjustments could be made. Mr. Schumacher stated that a goal to involve the Rockburn Branch would take a motion from the County Council, and the homeowners suspect that unlikely over the short run in the next 10 years. Mr. Whitworth asked if the main concern was losing the preservation land. Mr. Schumacher stated that with the development along Elibank Dr. there is a possibility of 50-75 homes which would destroy the conservation and green areas. Mr. Whitworth asked what the zoning was in that area, in which Mr. Schumacher explained the area is zoned R-ED, but since the properties have environmental easements they are treated as farmland and have given up development rights. Mr. Schumacher said the homeowners feel there has been a change of spirit in the County to preserve fields and forests, so the homeowners hope to work with the County to optimize that, but also respect the fact that other people have sewerage problems. Mr. Whitworth asked if it was possible to have an easement for the sewer lines through the properties following the streambed, but not have developmental rights. Mr. Schumacher stated that the Maryland Environmental Trust would be very unhappy, and Mr. Schumacher feels the State of Maryland would intervene and not allow a sewer through Rockburn Branch. Mr. Whitworth stated with the stormwater management law changing with the different watersheds that the County is reserving 30% of development rights for this type of work, and this area that is being looked at might be affected. Mr. Schumacher asked what property/area Mr. Whitworth meant, and Mr. Whitworth stated the area within the study. Mr. Whitworth also stated as the laws come through 30% of a property may have to be preserved for stormwater management. Ms. Cathy Hudson, a homeowner located at 6018 Old Lawyers Rd., asked Mr. Whitworth if he meant forest conservation, to which he replied no. Mr. Craig stated that everything on the properties has already been conserved which meant no development could happen. Mr. Whitworth stated he understood but stated that as this sewer line goes through it may not be a feasible thing for a developer to do because it may not be cost effective to develop. Mr. Whitworth stated he was just making the homeowners aware as they just passed the law for the Tiber and Hudson Watersheds, and he sees it being County-wide at some point for all stormwater management as the State of Maryland is moving to control all stormwater management. Mr. Craig stated that it would mean the destruction of the narrow valley that the homeowners bought 10 years ago, because 10 years ago they found out a gravity sewer was put down within 30-40 feet and it destroyed everything along the stream. Mr. Craig further explained that to go down Elibank the way the water line goes would be less of a problem, although to proceed with gravity along the stream there is almost no sides and it would totally destroy the ecological valley.

Mr. Burnet Chalmers, a homeowner located at 6560 Belmont Woods Rd., explained that he has 16 acres in which there is an easement and no development rights. Mr. Burnet explained that he moved to Howard County in 1979 and this is the fifth time he as well as the other homeowners have come to

talk to the Public Works about the pristine valley in which two streams, Cascades and Rockburn Branch, that Department of Natural Resources must approve the Right-of-Way, which they rarely ever do. Mr. Chalmers stated that years ago a Mr. Bright within the Department of Natural Resources denied access because there are alternatives to a gravity system. Mr. Chalmers further explained he was a Certified Public Accountant for 10 years and his specialty was cost analysis, after which, he ran a wholesale business for water and sewer pumps for 41 years. He believed, instead of installing a gravity system a two-pump system with a generator like the one on Landing Road could work. Mr. Chalmers also stated that Landing Road was ultimately a study initially meant for a gravity system, but Department of Natural Resources denied access, and both he and the other homeowners are hoping for a similar outcome with this study. Mr. Chalmers proceeded to distribute a letter dated 1985 from Lloyd Knowles, a council member at the time, that included alternatives such as holding tanks or pumping up Elibank Dr. to the west of Route 95. Mr. Davis explained that there is no sewerage from the water tank at the top of the hill at Elibank Dr. to the bottom which is where Rockburn pump station which pump across the river into Baltimore County into an interceptor. Mr. Craig stated that the Elibank Dr. sewer line could go down to the Rockburn pump station in which he felt there would be no need to destroy the stream. Mr. Davis explained that one of the things the study would do is to figure out all of the logistics and stated the complicated matter would be that the properties fronting Elibank are at the lower end and the sewerage would have to be pumped up to the street. Mr. Davis explained that he is unsure of the best solution at this point, but this study is meant to address the concerns and requests of the residents that asked for the study as they are members of the Metropolitan District and they have a right for the County to look into providing them sewer service. Mr. Davis further explained that if the sewer system will not work at the bottom because no one will grant an easement he will have to re-examine and possibly put in a sewer system at the top and determine what it requires. Mr. Davis stated that the County always tries to install a gravity sewer system because it works best for everyone as well as better for maintenance and the homeowner. Mr. Craig stated it was not better for the environment, ecology and neighbors which is why there has been a fight every 10 years. Mr. Chalmers explained his point for attending the meeting was to give information up front so there is not a study that just examines a gravity system as well as prevent a fight later on as he feels there are many factors to be considered. Mr. Chalmers further explained that if a gravity system down the Rockburn Branch is determined there will be a long fight with the homeowners. Mr. Davis stated that if the homeowners had any further information than what was given at the meeting to feel free to contact him, and he would be more than happy to come out and talk with anyone about the history or past decisions, but again, there was a homeowner that asked for service and the County will try to give it to him. At the same time, Mr. Davis is not going to try to go through people who do not want the sewer service as well. Mr. Chalmers again requested alternatives to running the sewer system down the Rockburn Branch, stating again that it would save a lot of time, energy and money.

Mr. John Boyd, a homeowner located at 6589 Belmont Woods Rd., explained he owns about 30 acres including 3 acres that he lives on which is within the Metropolitan District. Mr. Boyd stated that he was very surprised that all his property was included in the study when 27 acres of his property is not included within the Metropolitan District and he has no desire for sewerage. Mr. Boyd further stated that he has tried to remove his property entirely from the Metropolitan District, but was not successful, and he is still interested to remove his property. Mr. Boyd stated that through talking with Mr. Chalmers and others he is interested in alternatives in having his sewer system remediated should it fail, and he feels there are alternatives to support Mr. Chalmers discussion. Mr. Boyd further requested the County remember that the majority of the land in the west, at least 30 acres is parkland or in perpetual easement and outside of the Metropolitan District. Mr. Boyd did not have any new points to add but had several concerns and wanted to echo some of the other homeowners' concerns about losing the preservation

values of this land is incredibly important, and environmental protection of the Rockburn Branch is very important to himself and his family.

Mr. Art Lisowsky of 1529 Seven Chapel Rd., Crownsville, MD, representative of Holy Trinity Cemetery, located at 6480 Elibank Rd., explained the church is celebrating 100 years this year. Mr. Lisowsky explained the cemetery and Chapel had to be moved 70 years ago to Elibank Rd. due to BWI airport, which used to be Lawyers Hill Rd., 25 years ago the picnic pavilions deteriorated to the point to be torn down, and 20 years ago Mr. Lisowsky petitioned to build a new pavilion. Currently there is a Chapel, picnic pavilion, playground and cemetery. Holy Trinity sits on 50 acres of land and there is no intention of developing that land in the immediate future for anything else than what is has been for the last 70 years. Mr. Lisowsky stated that a sewer line down Elibank Rd. is of no importance to the Church, they would not want to connect to it and they have no need for it. The 50 acres is not in the preservation zone, but they will not be developing it as well.

Ms. Cathy Hudson, a homeowner at 6018 Old Lawyers Hill Rd., stated that she wanted to talk about the environment, cost, and right of people to get sewer. Ms. Hudson explained that the people that were speaking that wanted the sewer were at the lower end of Elibank Rd. and lower than the developer's property who has plans for sewer for around 25 units to be developed at Shadowbrook. Ms. Hudson did not understand why the people at the lower end of Elibank Rd. cannot be connected to the sewer planned for Shadowbrook, and said that she felt it could be as simple as taking the houses at the bottom of Elibank Rd. and shoot them into the plans that have already been built at the pumping station below them. Ms. Hudson stated that the developer worked with the County to install the sewer line next to the Rockburn Creek, so it did not go into the Rockburn Creek. Ms. Hudson stated she also felt the \$600,000.00 of cost to be authorized seemed high when there could be a simpler solution for the sewer system, which Mr. Summerson responded that just because the \$600,000.00 is authorized does not mean they have to spend it if they do not have to. Ms. Hudson further spoke of the environment stating that the Rockburn Creek is one of the last and most pristine streams left in Howard County in which she as well as other homeowners have fought diligently to protect the watershed and stream bed as well as worked with DPW to keep utilities out of the stream bed. Lastly, Ms. Hudson asked to continue to work with the homeowners.

Mr. Ben Routh, a homeowner located at 6426 Elibank Dr., explained that he lives right at the water pumping station and asked of the sewage was just 1600 feet below the water pumping station. Mr. Davis explained he did not know the exact distance, but it was down the hill from the water pumping station. Mr. Routh stated that he does want the sewerage as he is on the lower end of Elibank Dr., but he is for the environment as well and he agreed that potentially cutting the cost as it is close to pumping station and preserving the land would give the other homeowners what they want as well as give the homeowners that was sewerage what they want. Mr. Davis explained the water pumping is located at the top of the hill of Elibank Dr. and the properties asking for the sewer are down from that. Mr. Davis further explained that if they do not look at the gravity option then we are talking about building something on someone else's property on Shadowbrook pumping it up to Elibank proper and coming down like the water main. Ms. Hudson suggested hooking into Shadowbrook, although Mr. Davis explained that Shadowbrook is not done at this point, and he cannot tell someone who is asking for hookup now that they have to wait until Shadowbrook is finished. Mr. Davis further explained that the study is designed to determine the best course of action and scenario.

Finally, Mr. Davis stated he felt the properties on the map had caused most of the feelings and emotions of the meeting. Mr. Davis asked the homeowners if the preservation parcels listed on the map were not part of the study area if they would still have attended. Mr. Craig stated that if the sewer system

did not involve the proximity to the stream and stayed along Elibank Dr. or Lawyers Hill Rd. he would not have attended. Ms. Glassberg stated that she felt the homeowners' points and opinions were valid, but was not sure this was the time and place to discuss. Mr. Summerson agreed and stated that their opinions were very important to hear, and their testimony was appreciated as this pertained to their land, but also reminded the audience that, at this time, this is just a study to figure out how to serve the people who requested sewerage. Mr. Davis followed up Mr. Summerson's comment by stating that once he has had time to gather concrete information he will hold a community meeting to discuss with homeowners. Mr. Glassberg closed the discussion by stating that as a Board, if someone within the Metropolitan District requested the County to investigate sewer service, it is their obligation to look into the request. Mr. Summerson agreed with Ms. Glassberg and further stated that it is in the best interest to perform a comprehensive study as well as to work with all the homeowners to determine the best course of action. Mr. Summerson further expressed his thanks to all the homeowners for their views, opinions and passion with regard to this matter.

Motion: On a motion made by Ms. Glassberg, and seconded by Mr. Robinson, the Board recommended that the Director of Public Works approve Capital Project S6299, FY 2023 Rockburn Branch Sewer Study. Mr. Whitworth abstained the motion.

(b) S6602, FY 2021 LPWRP Capital Repairs and Upgrades

Staff Presentation: Mr. Davis, Chief, Utility Design Division, indicated that the purpose of this presentation is to seek recommendations from the Public Works Board concerning a proposed Capital Project S6602, the FY2021 LPWRP Capital Repairs and Upgrades.

Mr. Davis stated the second project to be brought before the Public Works Board is Capital Project S6602, the FY2021 LPWRP Capital Repairs and Upgrades project [program]. S6602 is a project [program] to systematically repair, replace, or upgrade existing facilities at the Little Patuxent Water Reclamation Plant (LPWRP). Work under this program encompasses program planning; engineering support and management; energy and alternative power source upgrades or conservation improvements and the maintenance and construction (planned and emergency) necessary and associated with facilities and processes at the LPWRP. The total estimated cost included within the ten-year capital improvement program is \$43,145,000.00. This new capital project [program] is requested by the Department of Public Works. Infrastructure at the LPWRP requires systematic repair, replacement and upgrading to maintain or improve serviceability or extend useful life overall. This capital project [program] is the LPWRP specific equivalent to other asset management programs related to water and or wastewater infrastructure within the County. S6602 will replace S6264 starting in FY21. S6264 will be closed on or before FY23. Interested citizens were notified of tonight's meeting by advertisement in local newspapers and by public postings.

Board Comments: Mr. Robinson asked if this project was in addition to the work that has been ongoing at Little Patuxent, and Mr. Davis stated that Little Patuxent always has ongoing work. The eighth addition, which is the Bio-Solid Project is underway right now and then there is the capital project S6264 which has numerous projects underneath it. Capital Project S6264 will ultimately be closed out and start a new capital project in which some things to be done under S6264 will then be done under the new project. Mr. Summerson asked Mr. Davis to explain the large increase increments as the budget showed \$1.5 million in 2021 increasing to over \$4 million in 2022 and progressively increasing in the future years. Mr. Davis explained that in FY2021 both projects, S6264 and S6602, will be active as the S6264 project will be closing and S6602 will be opening. Mr. Summerson asked to confirm that the total is not really a large escalation, but a normal progression. Mr. Davis confirmed that it was broken out for the particular year of FY2021.

Public Testimony: None.

Motion: On a motion made by Mr. Whitworth, and seconded by Mr. Robinson, the Board unanimously recommended that the Director of Public Works approve Capital Project S6602, the FY2021 LPWRP Capital Repairs and Upgrades.

(c) W8333, FY 2021 North Laurel and Savage Area – Water System Improvements

Staff Presentation: Mr. Davis, Chief, Utility Design Division, indicated that the purpose of this presentation is to seek recommendations from the Public Works Board concerning a proposed Capital Project W8333, the FY2021 North Laurel and Savage Area -- Water System Improvements.

Mr. Davis stated the third project to be brought before the Public Works Board is Capital Project W8333, the FY2021 North Laurel and Savage Area Water System Improvements project. W8333 is a project for the design and construction of water system improvements within the North Laurel and Savage areas. System modeling, condition assessment, engineering and construction will be performed. The total estimated cost included within the ten-year capital improvement program is \$4,000,000. This new capital project is requested by the Department of Public Works. The North Laurel and Savage areas include water mains from the 1960s and have begun to experience breaks at an increasing rate. In addition, PlanHoward 2030 emphasized the desire to revitalize the Route 1 corridor. Water main improvements in the North Laurel and Savage area are necessary to support redevelopment and revitalization projects along the Route 1 corridor. Interested citizens were notified of tonight's meeting by advertisement in local newspapers and by public postings.

Mr. Davis stated the main focus will be the area along Route 1 between Gorman Rd. and Whiskey Bottom Rd. in which there is a 12-inch water main, which drops to an 8-inch water main, and then increases back up to a 12-inch water main. Mr. Davis explained this was one of the first projects to target as the difference in water mains creates a bottleneck within that area. Mr. Davis proceeded to say that other areas that may include bottlenecks and/or water main breaks will also be looked into at the same time, therefore, instead of having numerous programs/projects for the issues, it was determined one dedicated project including all of the different programs/projects for North Laurel and Savage would be introduced.

Board Comments: Mr. Whitworth asked if this was a study or actual Capital Project, in which Mr. Davis confirmed that it was an actual Capital Project. Mr. Davis stated that if funded, the first task would be the design beginning with Route 1 at Lynn Buff Ct. and upsize 2,500 linear feet of 8-inch water main to 12-inch. Mr. Robinson asked if it was a design study to evaluate the other needs proceeded by further construction based on the needs determined by the study, and Mr. Davis confirmed that to be correct. Mr. Whitworth asked if the 2,500 linear feet of 8-inch water main at Lynn Buff Ct. would be an upsize, upgrade or replacement, and Mr. Davis stated it would be a replacement and upsizing. Mr. Whitworth further asked if it was being upgraded due to density changing within that area. Mr. Davis stated that the density is not changing in that area, but a bottleneck occurs as there is a larger line necking to a smaller line, and it would be hydraulically better with everything happening south if more water was being pushed through that direction. Ms. Glassberg stated she thought there was going to be more density with plans regarding the racetrack, but it would still be the same factors.

Public Testimony: None.

Motion: On a motion made by **Ms. Glassberg**, and seconded by **Mr. Robinson**, the Board unanimously recommended that the Director of Public Works approve Capital Project W8333, the FY2021 North Laurel and Savage Area – Water System Improvements.

(d) W8334, FY 2027 Clarksville Elevated Water Tank

Staff Presentation: **Mr. Davis**, Chief, Utility Design Division, indicated that the purpose of this presentation is to seek recommendations from the Public Works Board concerning a proposed Capital Project W8334, the FY2027 Clarksville Elevated Water Tank.

Mr. Davis stated the fourth project to be brought before the Public Works Board is Capital Project W8334, the FY2027 Clarksville Elevated Water Tank project. W8334 is a project for the design and construction of a 0.5 million gallon elevated water storage tank and related piping to serve the 630 West water zone. The total estimated cost included within the ten-year capital improvement program is \$5,000,000.00. This new capital project is requested by the Department of Public Works.

Redevelopment of downtown Columbia has increased the demand for infrastructure improvements including the need to include planning and construction for additional water storage in the Columbia and Clarksville areas. This project was initiated by the Department of Public Works in response to the needs of the County's approved Master Plan for Water and Sewerage. A new elevated water tank is required to stabilize zone pressures, provide system reliability and fire protection in the western half of the 630 West Zone. The western half of the Elevation 630 West water zone extends from the Middle Patuxent River to Guilford Road and encompasses Clarksville, western Hickory Ridge and River Hill. The eastern 630 West Zone includes Harpers Choice, Wilde Lake and the eastern portion of Hickory Ridge. Interested citizens were notified of tonight's meeting by advertisement in local newspapers and by public postings.

Board Comments: Ms. Glassberg stated that western Howard County has tanks underground for water and asked if that was an option for this project/location. Mr. Davis explained that the tanks in western Howard County are different tanks as they are smaller community tanks which would not be suitable for the area that will be served. Mr. Davis further explained the tanks in western Howard County are fire suppressant tanks, and the tank in Clarksville needs to be elevated to balance out the Harpers Choice tank and 630 pressure zone. Ms. Glassberg asked if the size of the tank was due to the proposed Erickson Development and would it still be needed if that was not coming. Mr. Davis confirmed that tank would still be needed with or without the proposed Erickson development. Mr. Whitworth asked if the tank was a supply tank or deep well tank, and Mr. Davis replied that it was an elevated tank much like the tank at Maple Lawn on 216. Mr. Whitworth further asked if the tank at Maple Lawn fed by pressure and not a deep well, in which Mr. Davis stated it was fed by pressure. Mr. Robinson asked if this tank was previously approved for a study before and Mr. Davis explained that was the Guilford water tank. Mr. Robinson further asked if an area for the Clarksville tank was determined yet, and Mr. Davis stated a location has not been determined.

Public Testimony: None.

Motion: On a motion made by **Mr. Robinson**, and seconded by **Mr. Whitworth**, the Board unanimously recommended that the Director of Public Works approve Capital Project W8334, the FY2027 Clarksville Elevated Water Tank.

(e) W8335, FY 2021 Elkridge WPS Suction Line Replacement

Staff Presentation: Mr. Davis, Chief, Utility Design Division, indicated that the purpose of this presentation is to seek recommendations from the Public Works Board concerning a proposed Capital Project W8335, the FY2021 Elkridge WPS Suction Line Replacement.

Mr. Davis stated the fifth and final project to be brought before the Public Works Board is Capital Project W8335, the FY2021 Elkridge WPS Suction Line Replacement project. W8335 is a project to replace 6,500 LF of 36-inch water main in Elkridge, MD. The 36-inch main serves as the suction line to the Elkridge WPS. The total estimated cost included within the ten-year capital improvement program is \$16,000,000. This new capital project is requested by the Department of Public Works.

The Elkridge WPS suction line is part of the Southwest Transmission Main and is a critical component of the Howard County water supply from Baltimore City. The transmission main was constructed in 1974 of prestressed concrete cylinder pipe manufactured by the Interpace Corporation. Pipe from this manufacturer and vintage has a history of failures in Howard County. Previously the County has replaced 6,700 LF of the 22,000 LF 36-inch SWTM that was found to be defective. This project is a continuation of that replacement effort. Interested citizens were notified of tonight's meeting by advertisement in local newspapers and by public postings.

Mr. Davis explained the area from Patapsco River up to the pumping station needed to be replaced.

Board Comments: Mr. Summerson asked to confirm if an insert could be performed or if it had to be an actual replacement, in which Mr. Davis stated it needed to be a replacement. Mr. Davis further explained that hydraulically the diameter cannot be changed to try to put anything into it, and when trying to do an insert many times more problems are created, in which a replacement makes more sense.

Public Testimony: None.

Motion: On a motion made by Ms. Glassberg, and seconded by Mr. Robinson, the Board unanimously recommended that the Director of Public Works approve Capital Project W8335, the FY2021 Elkridge WPS Suction Line Replacement.

4. Presentation of Certificate of Recognition

Mr. Summerson presented Brandon Robinson with a certificate of recognition from County Executive Calvin Ball to thank him for his service and contributions to the Public Works Board. Mr. Summerson, Ms. Glassberg and Mr. Whitworth all proceeded to thank Brandon for his service on the Board as well and wished him luck. Mr. Robinson returned the thanks to all the other Board members as well and accepted his Certificate of Recognition.

There being no further business, the Public Works Board meeting adjourned at approximately 8:45 p.m.


James M. Irvin
Executive Secretary


Rachel Roehrich
Recording Secretary