

August 20, 2019

The Honorable Gavin Buckley and Council Members
City of Annapolis
160 Duke of Gloucester
Annapolis, MD 21401
VIA EMAIL ONLY

Re: Public Works Maintenance Facility Task Force
First Report – Outline of Issues

Dear Mr. Mayor and Members of Council:

With Resolution R-37-19, you formed a Task Force to provide the City Council with findings and recommendations on the benefits and detriments of (a) rebuilding the City's Public Works facility on Spa Road or (b) selling the Spa Road land and purchasing designated property on Forest Drive to build the Public Works facility at that location. I am serving the City as the Chair of this Task Force and write to you with this First Interim Report to ensure that we understood our mission correctly, to share our methods, questions, issues, plans, and preliminary findings so that you may provide any input, answers, or corrections as needed to ensure that our final report is meaningful and helpful to you. I want to emphasize that what you'll read are *preliminary* findings – they can change or be reversed as further information is gathered or existing information changes.

Per R-27-19, the Task Force is to consider the impacts on:

1. **Businesses**
2. **City Employees** (including DPW employee working conditions, employee relations, and morale)
3. **City Finances** (including tax revenues and cost of city services)
4. **Community** (quality of life impacts on residents of Wards 1, 4, and 5, including Kingsport, Village Green, Homes at the Glen, Annapolis Walk, the Enclave, Truxton Heights, and the Bywater corridor)
5. **Environment** (including waterways)
6. **Housing** (need, type, affordability)
7. **Land Use and Partnership with Other Governmental Agencies** (including title searches, historical significance, easements, special exceptions, plus fuel station, pedestrian bridges, disposition of the parcel on the west side of Spa Road, and related issues with Anne Arundel County and State of Maryland governments)
8. **Traffic / Connectivity / Recreation** (including recreational amenities, bike paths, and connectivity of communities)

The Mayor selected the members for the Task Force with the concurrence of Alderwoman Finlayson. At our first meeting on July 23, the Task Force members divided the work to be done by 8 subcommittees with the same headings as the issues above. The Task Force members each agreed to serve on one or more subcommittees and one member of each

subcommittee agreed to serve as its chair. The subcommittees, members (with noted relevant experience or title), and subcommittee chairs (with their contact information) are:

Impact on Business

Darrell Hale** - Attorney; mediator

Jared Littmann*, jared@kbtruevalue.com - Former Alderman, Ward 5; K&B True Value

Impact on City Employees

Don Hankins**, dahankins@annapolis.gov - AFSCME Local 3406 President

Jacqueline Allsup, President, Anne Arundel County Branch NAACP

Impact on City Finances

Bill Davidson – former finance manager, Div. of Solid Waste Services, Montgomery County

Scott Gibson**, Scott.t.gibson@gmail.com - Public Administration Expert; finance

Impact on Community

Curtis Jones - American Legion; communications and security

Dan Brookes - President of Kingsport; Ward 4

Roger Kizer Ball - Truxton Heights, Ward 1 (Backup: Heidi Rothenhaus)

Alan Kushner, Kingsport neighborhood

Kathy Ebner**, kathy@homesforamerica.org - Homes for America; Ward 8

Minor Carter - Ward 1 and 5; lobbyist

Tom Baker, Kingsport Resident, Ward 4, bakertjb39@gmail.com

Impact on Environment

Bill Davidson – former finance manager, Div. of Solid Waste Services, Montgomery County

Jesse Illif**, jesse@arundelrivers.org - So. River Fed.

Impact on Housing

Cliff Martin - Housing Commission for AACo/CEO (Backup: Diane Haislip, Housing Commission for AACo/Deputy)

Kathy Koch** - Arundel Community Development Services, Inc.

Impact on Land Use / Other Gov'ts

Eliot Powell***, epowell@whitehalldev.com - Developer / Economic Development

Phil Hager** - AACo / Planning Director

Impact on Traffic / Connect. / Rec.

Greg Stewart - AACPS / Sr. Mgr. for Planning
Jon Korin - President of Bike AAA
Nestor A. Flores, P.E., PTOE, Chief, Traffic Engineering Division
Joel Campbell**, joel@gisenterprise.com - IT field, mapping; property appraiser
Tom Baker
Alan Kushner, Kingsport neighborhood

*** Task Force Chair**

**** Subcommittee Chair**

***** Task Force Vice-Chair**

In order for the whole Task Force to meet its obligation, each subcommittee is being asked to prepare - for the final report - its section to include (1) findings and recommendations on the benefits and detriments of (a) rebuilding the City's Public Works facility on Spa Road or (b) selling the Spa Road land and purchasing designated property on Forest Drive to move the Public Works facility to that location (2) for each option identify the key decisions to be made and who (and when, if possible) will make them, and (3) a recommendation. These mini-reports will be combined to form the full report.

We are striving to keep you and the public updated and informed throughout our work through the posting of relevant information on the City's website on a dedicated page: www.annapolis.gov/Task. As a side note, you should know that Inna Young has been extremely helpful and diligent in posting to this website new information as it comes and making any requested changes.

At the Task Force's next meeting on September 3, from 7:00 to 9:00 PM, at the Pip Moyer Recreation Center, the committee will hold a public meeting to receive public input. The report before you and the information on the above-mentioned website are intended to inform the public prior to that public hearing. We welcome you to attend, to share the information being shared with you, and to encourage your constituents to attend that public hearing. After that meeting, the full Task Force will meet again on September 24, October 15, and November 5 from 2:00 pm to 4:00 pm at Pip Moyer Recreation Center to finish its work.

The specific goal for this report is to provide you, from each subcommittee, an issue list, identification of stakeholders, and outline of the benefits and detriments of (a) rebuilding the City's Public Works facility on Spa Road or (b) selling the Spa Road land and purchasing designated property on Forest Drive to build the Public Works facility to that location. As each group sought to do their research, they had many requests for information and documents, and anything relevant has been posted online. You should know that Lyn Farrow, Assistant City Manager, and David Jarrell, Director, Public Works, in particular, have been very helpful and responsive to questions and requests from the Task Force. I have no doubt they've been greatly assisted by many others.

We call out important and intertwined governance and timing questions that the Mayor and Council must resolve: (1) should the City use a competitive process to maximize the value of the Spa Road site and (2) how can the City respond to the demand that a new facility be built

quickly? One option for the Mayor and Council to consider is to negotiate a purchase of the Forest Drive site that is not contingent on the sale of the Spa Road site. That is consistent with [one option offered from LaTerra](#) dated 7/29/19 (see page 15).

That would allow the City to use a competitive process to determine the disposition of the Spa Road site. Note that in its proposal, LaTerra Homes offers a discount of \$200,000 in the sale price of the Forest Drive property if it is a part of a land swap for the Spa Road site. The Mayor and Council would need to weigh the advantages of securing that \$200,000 discount versus the definitive governance benefit and possible fiscal benefit of using a competitive process for Spa Road.

The work of this Task Force is limited. We are not considering or weighing the governance or policy decision regarding the above “split” option or alternative locations for a Public Works Maintenance Facility or other questions not posed above.

The pages that follow are the first reports from each Subcommittee, lightly edited. Following those reports is a list of outstanding questions whose answers would facility this committee’s work.

Respectfully submitted,

Jared Littmann, Chair
Public Works Maintenance Facility Task Force

Impact on Business Subcommittee

Subcommittee Chair: Darrell Hale
Subcommittee member: Jared Littmann

Report:

The business subcommittee was formed to compare the potential impact of relocating the Department of Public Works facility to Forest Drive from Spa Road on the surrounding business community. The approach to this task included: (1) identifying the business owners who would be most impacted by this proposal, (2) looking at the potential benefits and detriments of the relocation, (3) creating a data collection approach, and (4) analyzing the data and reporting my findings. A summary of the findings follows:

I. Who are the stakeholders?

For purposes of this assessment, this Subcommittee defined a stakeholder as any business owner along the South Forest Drive corridor who might be impacted by the DPW facility relocation to the area.

II. How did you contact stakeholders?

Many stakeholders are members of SoFo, which is an association of business owners along the South Forest Drive corridor. The Subcommittee contacted SoFo President, Jennifer Balducci, to request contact information for SoFo members. The Subcommittee used the SoFo listserv to communicate with members via email. The Subcommittee also contacted other business owners, who were not members of SoFo, by phone.

III. What are the issues that require stakeholder feedback?

The Subcommittee asked stakeholders to assess the benefits and detriments of moving the DPW facility to 1701 Forest Drive by selecting options from a preset list. The list of benefits included:

- a) More customers
- b) Improved roads
- c) More job opportunities
- d) More revenue for the city
- e) More business growth along Forest Drive
- f) Other (without specifying)

The list of detriments included:

- a) Fewer customers
- b) More traffic congestion
- c) More noise pollution
- d) More public safety concerns

- e) Less business growth along Forest Drive
- f) Other (without specifying)

IV. What was your research methodology?

The Subcommittee used a survey to capture stakeholders' sentiments about the proposed relocation. The Subcommittee designed the survey using Survey Monkey and made it available to participants using a link to the website. Fifty invitations to participate in the survey were sent out to business owners along South Forest Drive. Invitations were sent to members of SoFo and nonmembers. The Subcommittee received eighteen completed surveys as of August 14, 2019.

V. What does the data show?

Of all surveys collected, participants identified improved roads and more job opportunities as the greatest benefit of moving the DPW facility to Forest Drive. Conversely, participants identified more traffic congestion followed by more noise pollution as the greatest detriments to relocating the facility. When participants were asked do the benefits of moving the DPW facility outweigh the detriments, 29% said "Yes" and 71% said "No" (only 17 completed surveys answered this question). But, when participants were asked the ultimate question: "Overall, would you recommend moving the facility to Forest Drive?" 28% of participants said "Yes" and 72% said "No".

With approximately 36% of survey invitees responding to the survey so far, it would be in the Subcommittee's best interest to collect more data before reaching any conclusions or making any recommendations.

VI. Did survey participants have other concerns?

While many survey participants were concerned about more traffic resulting from moving the DPW facility to Forest Drive, one participant expressed interest in knowing if traffic lights at the intersection of Hilltop and Forest Drive could be changed into a four-way intersection. If so, the traffic lights could then be synchronized with traffic lights at Cherry Grove to reduce traffic delays.

Another concern had to do with the impact of noise from DPW trucks and machinery on surrounding neighborhoods on and near Forest Drive. The participant raising this concern asked if sound barriers were a part of the construction plan.

Both questions are better answered by another subcommittee tasked with studying traffic patterns or the impact of the proposed plan on neighboring communities.

Another participant asked if the City could negotiate some improvements to our existing infrastructure with the developer such as having the developer pay for sidewalks from Forest Drive to Spa Road that are currently non-existent and road widening and bike lane on Spa road to link Forest Drive to downtown. SoFo members expressed a desire to be involved in the plans

for the new Facility Management Building to ensure that it is aesthetically pleasing with trees planted in front to return more “green” along Forest Drive.

Impact on City Employees Subcommittee

Subcommittee Chair: Don Hankins
Subcommittee member: Jackie Allsup

Report:

The Subcommittee conducted a survey that was taken by Union and Nonunion employees. There was a 90% participation rate from employees that work from Spa Road and an 85% participation rate from employees that work from Chinguapin Round Road. The respondents are 100% supportive of rebuilding at Spa Road and against building at Forest Drive.

Public Works operations needs a facility desperately. City employees have operated under a hodge-podge of facilities and storage areas. Several locations are an accident-waiting-to-happen. An updated, modern facility would improve morale, safety, and efficiency of the employees.

Benefits to build at Spa Road:

- Larger site
- Better for Public Works operations
- Easier flow of work traffic. The plan allows for combining all Public Works locations and combining 3 fleet operations (Public Works, Fire, and Police)
- Construction can start sooner

Detriments to build at Spa Road:

- None listed

Benefits to build at Forest Drive:

- City employees would have a facility (common to both options)

Detriments to build at Forest Drive:

- Smaller Site
- Cramming the Facility in a small space with more traffic will cause a greater safety risk
- Traffic flow into and out of the facility
- Parking

It's about time that Public Works employees are valued and treated with the respect that they deserve. No other Department would stand for the working conditions that the Public Works employees have endured for the past several years. They deserve a lot of credit.

Impact on City Finances Subcommittee

Subcommittee Chair: Scott Gibson
Subcommittee member: Bill Davidson

Posted Documents (<https://www.annapolis.gov/1558/City-Finances-Subcommittee>):

- [City's Total Fuel Usage FY15-19 \(PDF\)](#)
- [List of Public Works vehicles \(PDF\)](#)
- [Questions and Responses, Finance Subcommittee \(PDF\)](#)
- [Cost Questions and Answers \(PDF\)](#)

- [Summary of Appraisals \(PDF\)](#) The City has had 2 appraisals done of both the Spa Road and the Forest Drive locations. This document provides a summary of those appraisals, which follows:
 - [Forest Drive by Peabody \(PDF\)](#)
 - [Forest Drive by Weinholt \(PDF\)](#)
 - [Spa Road by Peabody \(PDF\)](#)
 - [Spa Road by Westholm \(PDF\)](#)

Report:

1. Executive Summary

There is not enough information to definitively state benefits and detriments at this time. The outline below will, however, shed light on the facts and analysis that will yield our ultimate determination of benefits and detriments.

2. Overview and Objective

The Finance Subcommittee's objective is to determine the financial benefits or detriments associated with the 2 location options (i.e., Spa Road or Forest Drive) for the new DPW facility. We have done this by working through the following questions:

- a. Is the proposed land swap a reasonable deal yielding a net positive fiscal result for the City?
 - b. Assuming that the City receives net proceeds from the transaction, does it have a reasonable chance of increasing the impact of those net proceeds by leveraging grants? If it does, what might that look like?
 - c. Does the location of the DPW facility (i.e., Spa Road or Forest Drive) affect the cost of operations in a material way?
3. Methodology, Analytical Framework, and Qualifications
 - a. Methodology
 - i. Focused on distinguishing costs, and avoided analysis of costs deemed common to both options.
 - b. Analytical Framework

- i. Net Present Value with 20-year Time Horizon
- ii. Inflation (non-construction) is assumed at 2.5% per year.
- iii. Inflation (construction) is assumed at 5.1% per year.
- iv. Discount Rate – *Awaiting response from City.*

c. Qualifications

- i. We relied exclusively on information provided by the City or LaTerra Homes, which we have assumed is factually correct.

4. Net Proceeds of Land Swap

	Spa Road East	Forest Drive
Peabody Associates Appraisal	\$ 3,300,000	\$ 1,920,000
Westholm Associates Appraisal	\$ 4,675,000	
Wineholt Group Appraisal		\$ 1,810,000
MEAN AVERAGE APPRAISED VALUE	\$ 3,987,500	\$ 1,865,000
LaTerra Valuation	\$ 4,200,000	\$ 2,200,000
% Variance to Mean Avg. Appraised Value	105%	118%

With respect to the limited summary appraisals information provided to date, the subcommittee will be seeking to learn:

- Which methodological approach used to derive the fair market values given (sales comparison, income, cost, or discounted cash flow)? Assuming that the “highest and best use” would derive from full subdivision development potential, we expect that discounted cash flow was used.
- In any event, we will seek an opportunity to review basis and arithmetic used to drive the values given.

a. Spa Road Property

i. Property Description

- 1. Approximately 8.25 acres.
- 2. “It is split zoned between R2 and R3. There could probably be approximately 23 units on the R3 portion, and 35 units on the R2 portion. However, on the R2 portion, only 30% of the units could be townhomes. The rest of the units would need to be single-family detached (assuming the project comes in as a planned development). There are also critical area limitations that would need to be taken into account and would restrict impervious surface.” (Source: L. Farrow e-mail, 8/5/19, 11:52 AM)

ii. Valuation/Independent Appraisals

- a. *Awaiting clarification on who paid for appraisals.*

- iii. Pending Offer – LaTerra to Purchase for \$4.2MM
 - b. Forest Drive Property
 - i. Property Description
 - 1. Approximately 3.59 acres
 - 2. “(T)he property is also split zoned between R2 and R3. R2 is a single-family detached district. Duplexes and multifamily are allowed on R3.
For dwelling units in R3, you can have 3600 ft.² per unit. In R2 it is 5400 sq. ft. per unit. A 20% density bonus could be given with the provision of a MPDUs. Some commercial use could be allowed through a type of planned development called a “special mixed.” However, commercial would be limited to 30% of the land area. (Source: L. Farrow e-mail, 8/5/19, 11:52 AM)
 - ii. Valuation/Independent Appraisals
 - 1. *Awaiting clarification on who paid for appraisals.*
 - iii. Pending Offer – LaTerra to Sell for \$2.2MM
 - c. Reasonableness of Offers
 - i. Process to arriving at offer.
 - 1. *Pending further research.*
 - ii. Whether a different process would likely return a better offer.
 - 1. *Pending further research.*
 - iii. Reasonableness of offer.
 - 1. *Pending further research.*
 - d. Cost of Remediation and its Impact
 - i. Remediation at Spa Road
 - 1. The City is currently liable for the cost of any remediation required at Spa Road.
 - 2. The City will have to suffer the cost of remediation at this site at some time.
 - 3. Timing of when the City suffers the cost of remediation is the only variable dependent upon the decision of whether or not to proceed with the land swap.
 - 4. As such, this is a cost common to both options.
 - 5. There is a possibility that the City could receive a material benefit, should it choose to locate DPW at Forest Drive. In our August 13, 2019 meeting, Tom Baum went on record saying that should he develop the property the cost of remediation is incremental, because he has to lay 24 inches of fill anyway. He clarified in subsequent correspondence with the subcommittee: “based on the limited testing that was performed, it would seem that a cap of some sort - like a clay layer or perhaps a liner material (although no significant VOC’s were noted), would be the likely plan for remediation. This clay cap could be performed in the anticipated structural fill operation you note above, so having a layer of clay

could be part of that operation and I would anticipate that being covered in my earthwork allowance which is already included in my proposal. Given the limits of the testing and no input from MDE, there is no way I can absolutely say that the remediation is completely covered in my budget. Soil removal and disposal is not part of my budget, and since all tests were composite tests (mixed together from different soil depths), you can't see if there are any "hot spots" that might require removal/disposal. Typically MDE would want us to cap it, not remove it, unless there were some soils that were just too elevated to remain. I think it is unlikely here- usually it is found in spill areas - like a gas tank or a drain from a dry cleaner- but only further testing and a remediation plan approved by MDE will determine that extent." If we can confirm that a clay cap is appropriate for Spa Road, then the City could gain a benefit by saving the cost of remediation.

- ii. Remediation at Forest Drive
 - 1. Potential Cost
 - 2. Potential impact of remediation cost on reasonableness of appraisals and LaTerra's valuation.
- e. Net Proceeds
- 5. The Multiplier Effect of Grants on the Purchasing Power of Net Proceeds of the Swap
 - a. Summary of relevant Grants
 - i. *Awaiting further input from the City.*
 - b. Analysis of multiplier effect
 - c. Net Proceeds of Land Swap after leveraging grants.
 - i. Worst Case
 - ii. Base Case
 - iii. Best Case
- 6. Whether there are material differences in the Capital Costs of construction at Spa Road versus Forest Drive.
 - a. Summary of capital construction costs at Spa Road.
 - i. *Awaiting further input from the City.*
 - b. Identification of material differences in construction at Forest Drive.
 - i. Acquisition of easements.
 - 1. "The only easement required at the Forest Drive site is over a portion of the American Legion property. The commandant of the American Legion Chapter has indicated that they are interested in improvements to their parking lot, re-roofing their building and construction of a memorial garden in return for use of the portion of their property for a driveway onto Newtowne Drive. There is not a binding agreement in place addressing the use of the American Legion land." (Source: L. Farrow e-mail, 8/2/19, 2:39PM)
 - ii. Additional design costs.

1. “Although a detailed estimate hasn't been prepared for the Forest Drive site design, it is expected that the cost will be in the \$250,000-\$300,000 range.” (Source: L. Farrow e-mail, 8/2/19, 2:39PM)

c. Analysis

7. Whether there are material differences in the operating costs of a DPW facility at Spa Road versus Forest Drive.

- a. We have confirmed that if the DPW facility were to relocate from Spa Road to Forest Drive all functions that were located at Spa Road will move to Forest Drive with the exclusive exception of the fueling operations. This means that all other of the operating cost of the DPW facilities will be common to both solutions (e.g. the same regardless of site) and therefore not distinguishing costs. As a result, our operating cost analysis focuses on two questions: (1) whether there are material differences in cost between maintaining fuel tanks and dispensers on site (Spa Road option), versus purchasing fuel from a third-party (Forest Drive option); and (2) whether there are material differences in efficiency based on the location of the DPW Maintenance Facility. (Source: L. Farrow e-mail, 8/2/19, 2:39PM)
- b. The operation and maintenance of fuel tanks and dispensers on-site versus purchasing fuel from a third-party.

i. Purchasing of Fuel

1. Current Cost Trends – Spa Road Option

	UNLEADED GASOLINE			DIESEL FUEL		
	GALLONS	COST	AVERAGE	GALLONS	COST	AVERAGE
FY19	173,427.50	\$372,209.51	\$2.15	141,272.50	\$308,142.62	\$2.18
FY18	162,191.20	\$346,448.15	\$2.14	171,412.90	\$353,650.34	\$2.06
FY17	166,548.10	\$309,508.37	\$1.86	174,969.10	\$292,858.93	\$1.67
FY16	163,280.50	\$302,332.09	\$1.85	183,608.30	\$288,571.59	\$1.57
FY15	160,084.20	\$398,937.69	\$2.49	190,153.80	\$470,418.90	\$2.47

(Source: L. Farrow e-mail, 8/5/19, 8:57AM)

2. Fuel Cost Projections for Forest Drive Option

- a. *Awaiting Reply from the City.*
- ii. Costs of Maintaining Fuel Tanks and Dispensers
 1. Environmental compliance costs (e.g., LUST, NPDES<, etc.)
 - a. *Awaiting Reply from the City.*
 2. Tanks likely need to be replaced in near future – Spa Road Option Cost
 - a. “The underground fuel tanks and pumps were installed in 1987-1988 timeframe. The tanks are epoxy coated, double wall steel tanks made by Buffalo Tank, which had been a division of Bethlehem Steel. The piping was replaced in the late 1990's-early 2000's. The life expectancy is

approximately 30 years for the tanks and dispensers.”
(Source: L. Farrow e-mail, 8/2/19, 2:39PM)

- c. Whether there are material differences in efficiency based on the location of the DPW maintenance facility.
 - i. *Pending clarification from the City.*
- 8. Weems-Whalen Field
 - a. The City has determined that whether or not the Weems-Whalen field is relocated depends on the decision of whether to relocate the DPW facility. As a result, the cost of maintaining Weems-Whalen field should be noted as a cost for the Spa Road option and a Savings for the Forest Drive option. (Source: L. Farrow e-mail, 8/2/19, 2:39PM)
 - i. AACPS Acceptance of Responsibility
 - 1. *Awaiting reply from the City.*
 - ii. Maintenance Costs of Weems-Whalen Field.
 - 1. *Awaiting reply from the City.*
- 9. Net Cost of Community Services
 - a. Tax Revenue
 - i. *Awaiting reply from the City.*
 - ii. Forest Drive
 - 1. Estimated Tax Revenue
 - 2. Basis
 - iii. Spa Road
 - 1. East Parcel
 - a. Estimated Tax Revenue
 - b. Basis
 - 2. West Parcel
 - a. Estimated Tax Revenue
 - b. Basis
 - b. Cost of Community Services
 - i. *Awaiting reply from the City.*
 - ii. Forest Drive
 - 1. Estimated Cost of Community Services
 - 2. Basis
 - iii. Spa Road
 - 1. East Parcel
 - a. Estimated Cost of Community Services
 - b. Basis
 - 2. West Parcel
 - a. Estimated Cost of Community Services
 - b. Basis
 - c. Net Cost of Community Services
 - i. Analysis
- 10. Findings and Recommendations

Impact on Community Subcommittee

Subcommittee Chair: Kathy Ebner

Subcommittee members: Curtis Jones, Dan Brookes, Roger Kizer Ball (Backup: Heidi Rothenhaus), Alan Kushner, Minor Carter, and Tom Baker

Posted Documents (<https://www.annapolis.gov/1559/Community-Subcommittee>):

- [Questions and Responses, Community Subcommittee \(xlsx\)](#)

Report:

The purpose of this subcommittee is to assess the quality of life impacts on residents of Wards 1, 4 and 5, including Kingsport, Village Green, Homes at the Glen, Annapolis Walk, the Enclave, Truxton Heights, and the Bywater Corridor in regard to the two proposed locations for the Department of Public Works (DPW) facility. Representatives of Wards 1, 4 and 5 have attended the subcommittee meetings and the subcommittee plans to reach out to other stakeholders in the community.

The two proposed locations for the DPW facility are: 1) its current¹ Spa Road location and 2) relocation to 1701 Forest Drive. The proposal for relocation of the DPW to Forest Drive includes many suggested community benefits, including: a pedestrian/bicycle bridge over Forest Drive and Spa Road; upgrade of the American Legion facility; construction of a new park at Spa Road; and upgrade and relocation of the athletic fields at Spa Road. It is important to understand whether these benefits are in fact possible because they have a large impact on the desirability of the Forest Drive proposal.

In reviewing the information provided to date, the subcommittee concludes that the above suggested benefits either do not appear feasible or there is not enough information in which to determine whether they are feasible. Therefore, the subcommittee has not included them in the following preliminary outline of benefits and detriments that are unique to each of the locations.

Preliminary Outline of Benefits and Detriments Unique to each Location

1701 Forest Drive Location:

Benefits:

¹ The Public Works facility at Spa Road could arguably be referred to as its “current” location because it has been at that location for many years or, arguably, its “former” location because the facility has been demolished and the facility is temporarily across the street at Spa Road.

- Provides for a new housing community on Spa Road that could enhance surrounding property values and provide a better entry to the West Street Arts District.

Detriments:

- As a commercial, industrial use facility, the DPW facility on Forest Drive will negatively impact the value of homes in the area. It's likely the value of the homes at Homes at the Glen, an affordable first-time homebuyer lease purchase community, will be substantially negatively impacted because the DPW facility would be located directly behind several of the homes, some of which have been recently sold. This is particularly distressing, as residents have invested substantial time and effort and waited many years to purchase their homes. The property line is 30' from some of the homes, decreasing the quality of life of the residents and devaluing the homes.
- Locating the DPW facility adjacent to low income communities along Newtowne Road and directly behind Homes at the Glen perpetuates a long-standing pattern of undervaluing low-income communities and government taking action to make affordable areas less desirable.
- The 72 Public Works vehicles (including 21 medium-duty and 12 heavy-duty trucks as defined by FHWA) as well as 33 other pieces of equipment (i.e., 4 generators, 6 signboards, etc.) assigned to the site, the 75 Public Work employees based on the site, and the approximate 85 additional vehicles serviced at the site will increase traffic on heavily congested Forest Drive. Forest Drive is a major artery for many Annapolis residents who commute to and from work. The location of the DPW on Forest Drive will significantly increase commuting time and decrease the quality of life of the residents who frequently travel up and down Forest Drive. The increased traffic will also decrease the values of the homes which are accessed off of Forest Drive.
- Based on current information, a four-way intersection at Newtown Road is not possible. Therefore, the DPW traffic making a left hand turn in and out of the facility would be routed through South Cherry Grove Road. This would have a major impact on the residents who reside in close proximity to the site and regularly access South Cherry Grove Road.
- A tall industrial building that is architecturally inconsistent with the surrounding area, creates an eyesore along the Forest Drive corridor and changes the aesthetic living environment of the area.
- Construction of the DPW facility on the Forest Drive site will take more time than construction of the DPW facility on the Spa Road site, where site design work has been completed and grading and special exception permits have been issued. This extends the

amount of time that DPW employees work in an uncomfortable environment, extending a hardship for city employees.

Spa Road Location:

Benefits:

- Construction of a new DPW facility can happen quickly, providing city residents who are DPW employees a more comfortable working environment.

Detriments:

- Continues location of an institutional, commercial, industrial use facility on Spa Road in close proximity to residential neighborhoods.

Pedestrian Bridges

The subcommittee notes that it is critically important for the City to make public the feasibility of the pedestrian bridges. To date, no information has been provided about the grant funds which would be the source of funds for construction of the bridges, including: the type of grants the City plans to pursue; the amount they plan to request; the timing for receipt of the grants; and the likelihood of receiving the grant funding. Additionally, the City has not consulted with structural engineers nor have they met with the County, who has jurisdiction over Forest Drive. Based on current information, the County will not allow a pedestrian bridge over Forest Drive.

The Subcommittee believes the community at large is under the impression that pedestrian bridges would be part of the Forest Drive location proposal, when in fact there is no information to support that they are feasible. Therefore, it is important that this information be made public prior to obtaining public testimony about relocating the DPW facility to Forest Drive.

Impact on Environment Subcommittee

Subcommittee Chair: Jesse Illif

Subcommittee member: Bill Davidson

Posted Documents (<https://www.annapolis.gov/1560/Environment-Subcommittee>):

- [2016-08-02 Revised 935 Spa Road WOUS Rpt \(PDF\)](#)
- [DNR Environmental Review \(PDF\)](#)
- [Letter - Weems-Whalen soil investigation \(PDF\)](#)
- [Phase I and II Environmental Site Assessment \(PDF\)](#)
- [Soils Report \(PDF\)](#)
- [Subsurface Soil Investigation for Weems Whalen Field 08-01-19 \(PDF\)](#)

Report:

The environment subcommittee respectfully submits the following findings and recommendations to the City Council regarding environmental impacts associated with redevelopment of the City's public works facility in its current location and impacts associated with execution of the proposed land swap with the 1701 Forest Drive parcel.

Resource Base: The following findings and recommendations are offered based on review of the following materials (by review of this draft, the City is requested to correct any inaccurate assumptions or statements of fact):

- 1) All materials distributed at the initial Task Force meeting on July 23, 2019;
- 2) Phase I & II Environmental Site Assessment for the City's Spa Road facility, performed by Drum Snell & Associates, dated September 20, 2002;
- 3) Record of Soil Exploration for the City's Spa Road facility performed by Hillis-Carnes Engineering Associates, Inc., dated April 24, 2019;
- 4) Waters of the U.S. Delineation Report for the City's Spa Road facility performed by ECS Mid-Atlantic, Inc., dated August 2, 2016;
- 5) Report of Subsurface Exploration, Laboratory Testing, and Geotechnical Engineering Analyses for the City's Spa Road facility, performed by ECS Mid-Atlantic, Inc., dated February 28, 2017;
- 6) Environmental Review for 937 Spa Road, City of Annapolis Department of Public Works- Spa Road Facilities, redevelopment, Anne Arundel County, Maryland, performed by the Maryland Department of Natural Resources, dated April 19, 2017;
- 7) Redevelopment Proposal for Department of Public Works, prepared by La Terra Homes, received by the Task Force via email on July 29, 2019;
- 8) Inventory of Public Works Vehicles, provided by Public Works Director David Jarrell to the subcommittee;
- 9) Maryland's Environmental Resources and Land Information Network;
- 10) Maryland's Searchable Integrated Report Database [Combined 303(d)/305(b) List].

Assumptions: In addition to the materials reviewed above, the following findings and recommendations are made on the following assumptions:

- 1) No immediate or substantial increase in vehicular traffic in or out resulting from selection of either alternative for the new DPW facility;
- 2) Disturbance to soils and attendant contaminants located on the Spa Road site resulting from either development proposal;
- 3) The City will execute robust and thorough review of all proposed development plans, and thoroughly inspect and enforce all erosion and sediment control devices during construction and stormwater management facilities when construction is completed;
- 4) The 1701 Forest Drive Parcel, being relatively small, non-forested, and privately owned, will eventually be developed in some fashion.
- 5) Generation, at the PW site, of vehicular emissions and noise would be the same regardless of location of the PW maintenance facility location, and the City has informed the committee that, independent of site location, the City intends to switch out its diesel fleet for low emissions and quieter vehicles regardless of location.
- 6) Low and/or wet areas at neither site would call for wetlands mitigation under the development options described.
- 7) Contamination of the Weems-Whalen ball field will eventually require remediation regardless of location of the PW site, although this requires answers to these questions:
 - o What abatement measures would be required by the State authorities?
 - o Would the City act to remediate with the same urgency and applying the same abatement measures if it redeveloped PW facilities at the Spa Road site?
 - o What is the source of funds for the remediation?

The Environment Subcommittee recognizes three and potentially four primary areas for consideration of environmental impacts:

- 1) Stormwater management during and after construction;
- 2) Contamination of soils underlying Weems-Whalen field;
- 3) Environmental Justice concerns, and
- 4) If needed, Forest Drive wetlands or other environmental mitigation needs.

Option 1: Redevelopment of Spa Road site for new Public Works Maintenance Facility

Stormwater: The Spa Road site (11.97 acres) is substantially larger than the Forest Drive site (3.59 acres), and therefore affords the City more space to construct the facilities it needs and provide robust erosion and sediment control during construction and long term stormwater management after construction. However, the site is closer to receiving waters than the Forest Drive parcel. If Assumption 3 above is accurate, the extra space to install stormwater management and erosion and sediment control devices may be adequate to protect Spa Creek from excessive sedimentation impacts. However, the City's stated intention to treat 50% of stormwater on the Spa Road site, while it may improve conditions from the status quo, will still be insufficient to treat stormwater fully, especially in light of the increasing severity and frequency of rainfall events in the area. Therefore, the Environment Subcommittee recommends

that if the City elects to redevelop the Spa Road parcel, that it commit to treating 100% of stormwater on site, notwithstanding the lower legal minimum. This is especially important because the Severn River, into which Spa Creek flows, is already listed as impaired by total suspended sediments (TSS) in Maryland's Integrated Report [Combined 303(d)/305(b) List].

Weems-Whalen:

Environmental Justice: Retaining the facility at its current location does not appear to affect as much environmental justice concerns relative to the Forest Drive site.

Option 2: Land Swap with Forest Drive Parcel-New Developments at Both Sites

Stormwater: As the City notes in its Maintenance Facility Task Force Presentation, "Area for SWM would be extremely tight" at the Forest Drive site. This fact raises concern about the ability of the City and its contractors constructing the new facility to adequately treat stormwater, both during and after construction. Spa Creek, the tidal receiving waters for the Forest Drive parcel, and the non-tidal tributary streams that will be immediately impacted by any sediment from construction, are both listed as impaired for Total Suspended Solids by the Maryland Department of Environment, so robust stormwater management during and post-construction is critical to minimizing environmental degradation.

Weems-Whalen:

Environmental Justice: The operations of the Public Works facility will result in an increase of traffic on Newtowne Drive, which is the entrance road to the Newtowne 20 and Woodside communities. Environmental justice concerns include: vehicular emissions; noise (including time of day issues); visual, aesthetic and light (also including time of day issues) issues. Both communities are predominantly comprised of people of color. The subcommittee notes that there are no representatives from the Housing Authority of the City of Annapolis, which manages the Newtowne 20 community, are on this Task Force. This raises the question of whether the communities that will be most directly affected by this development have been able to weigh in on the proposal. The Subcommittee recommends targeted outreach to the neighboring communities to ensure that community members' concerns are addressed.

Standing Water and Flooding Issues: Standing water and flooding issues, representing an environmental nuisance for the immediate surrounding area have been reported with respect to the rear of the Forest Drive property. The significance of such should be evaluated as amelioration of such conditions as part of the City's development of the property could be a benefit of that option.

Environmental Remediation of the Weems-Whalen Ball Field: As noted in assumption #6, the City will be responsible for carrying out whatever environmental site remediation is ultimately required relative to the historical landfill (reportedly comprised mostly of incinerator ash). So, presuming that remediation would be done in either case, the environmental values associated with site remediation need not mediate in the direction of either option, swap or no

swap. Time and practical considerations, however, might mediate in the direction of a swap. Explanation: As a practical matter, any land swap agreement would create an urgent time-imperative for any remediation needs to be defined and carried out—a time imperative that would not exist if the City continued to hold the land. If site remediation is needed (and it appears that is is), then an approach to remediation (physical measures) acceptable to the state authorities would have to be defined, and, presumably, these measures would have to physically be carried out to the satisfaction of the state, prior to construction of housing on the site. Thus, in the case a swap, or even serious pursuit of a swap, both parties—the City and the potential private equity partner—would be motivated to get remediation needs defined and implemented in a timely manner. Absent pursuit of a swap agreement, this time imperative (to get environmental remediation done) is lessened. This consideration may mediate in the direction of pursuing the swap. Better definition of the need for remediation of the old landfill could clarify this consideration.

Abatement Requirements Need Clarity:

Based on the limited testing that was performed, it would seem that a cap of some sort - like a clay layer or perhaps a liner material (although apparently no significant VOC's were yet noted), would be the likely plan for remediation. This clay cap could be performed in the anticipated structural fill operation for residential development, so having a layer of clay could be part of that operation and one could anticipate that being covered in the earthwork allowance already included in the developer's proposal. Given the limits soil of testing performed to date, and no input from the environmental authority, Maryland State Department of Environment (MDE), there is no way that one can absolutely say that the necessary remediation is completely covered in La Terra's proposal. The Committee has been given to understand that soil removal and disposal, as might be part of a remediation requirement, are not part of his budget, and that since all tests were composite tests (mixed together from different soil depths), one can't readily see if there are any "hot spots" that might require removal/disposal. However, unless there were some soils that were just too elevated to remain, it could be that MDE would require only a "cap-and-seal" approach, the costs of which, incremental to normal development costs for structural soil import and placement, may fall well within the price proposal of La Terra. Clarification of the site conditions with additional testing and clarification of what MDE would require (as well as who would pay), in the cases of residential the Spa Road site, and in the case of the ball field remaining in recreational use, could be pivotal to the analysis.

Impact on Housing Subcommittee

Subcommittee Chair: Kathy Koch

Subcommittee member: Cliff Martin (Backup: Diane Haislip)

Report:

No report was submitted. However, the following information is relevant:

The Spa Road site “is split zoned between R2 and R3. There could probably be approximately 23 units on the R3 portion, and 35 units on the R2 portion. However, on the R2 portion, only 30% of the units could be townhomes. The rest of the units would need to be single-family detached (assuming the project comes in as a planned development). There are also critical area limitations that would need to be taken into account and would restrict impervious surface.” (Source: L. Farrow e-mail, 8/5/19, 11:52 AM)

Impact on Land Use / Other Governments Subcommittee

Subcommittee Chair: Phil Hager

Subcommittee member: Eliot Powell

Posted Information (<https://www.annapolis.gov/1562/Land-Use-and-Partnerships-with-Other-Sub>):



Posted Documents (<https://www.annapolis.gov/1562/Land-Use-and-Partnerships-with-Other-Sub>):

- [Critical Area Commission staff clarifications \(PDF\)](#)

Report:

No report was submitted.

Impact on Traffic / Connect. / Rec.

Subcommittee Chair: Joel Campbell

Subcommittee members: Greg Stewart, Jon Korin, Nester Flores, Alan Kushner, and Tom Baker

Posted Documents (<https://www.annapolis.gov/1563/TrafficConnectivityRecreation-Submitt>):

- [Traffic Subcommittee Questions \(PDF\)](#)
- [City's Total Fuel Usage FY15-19 \(PDF\)](#)
- [List of Public Works vehicles \(PDF\)](#)
- [Subsurface Soil Investigation for Weems Whelan Field 08-01-19 \(PDF\)](#)
- [ADA Overpass Standards](#)
- [Annapolis Bicycle Master Plan 2011](#)
- [Bike/Path Map](#)

Report:

The traffic/connectivity/recreation subcommittee was formed to compare the potential impact of relocating the Department of Public Works facility to Forest Drive from Spa Road on the surrounding business community. The approach to this task included identifying the issues necessary for a valid comparison of the sites in the categories being reviewed. Comparing the issues identified for each location in a quantitative manor where data is available and a qualitative manor, based on stakeholder feedback, where data is insufficient.

I. Who are the stakeholders?

- All residents, visitors and businesses impacted by increase / decrease in traffic
- Communities impacted by Forest Drive location and connectivity plans
- Public Works and other city employees impacted by fuel pump relocation and access to new the facility
- Drivers, pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users along and crossing the Forest Drive corridor and the Spa Road corridor
- Users of the designated sports facilities
- Owners of Providence Point property
- Anne Arundel County government
- Maryland State Highway Administration

II. How did you contact stakeholders?

The subcommittee members have met several times to determine the approach that will be utilized to evaluate the impacts of the proposed swap. Having identified the stakeholders and methodology in addition to the factors to be considered, our next step is to reach out to the stakeholders beyond those represented on the committee. To date only members of the community, traffic department and the school board, who are members of the subcommittee, in

addition to Providence Point property owners have either provided feedback or identified issues. Additional stakeholder feedback is expected to be received primarily through focused outreach by subcommittee members or from feedback received during the scheduled public hearing.

III. What are the issues that require stakeholder feedback?

The subcommittee endeavors to compare;

- a) Impact on traffic for all modes at each location
- b) Feasibility of road improvements proposed for the Forest Drive DPW site
- c) Impact on areas of review with respect to plans for DPW growth over the life of the facility
- d) Feasibility of improvements planned for recreation facilities identified in the swap proposal
- e) Feasibility of pedestrian bridges and the ped/bike networks they would connect to
- f) Safety considerations
- g) Benefits of improved pedestrian and bike connections to key destinations
- h) Others as identified

IV. What was your research methodology?

The Subcommittee has compiled a list of questions that will be used to help answer many of the questions above. Additionally, these questions will serve as a basis for conversations with other stakeholders to solicit feedback based on the factual findings of the questions. Ultimately we expect to create a matrix identifying a list of factors analyzed and a comparison of the benefits and detriments for each factor for the two DPW site options. Where possible the data will be quantitative to support the findings reported in the matrix.

Example Matrix, Factors Analyzed:

Traffic	
	Traffic Impact Study
	Major Artery Congestion
	Neighborhood Road Congestion
	Ingress/Egress
	Other plan development on the corridor
	Skipper Lane Extension
	Alternate fueling site impact

	Access to service locations
	DPW Long-Term Expansion
Recreation	
	Trail
	Parks
	Fields
	Funding
	Lights
	Additional Parking
	Fencing
Connectivity	
	Transit plan
	Sidewalks
	Share use path
	Pedestrian Bridges
	Community access
	Ped/Bike to Destinations
Safety	
	Total Crash
	Pedestrian
	Bikes
	Vehicle

V. What does the data show?

No conclusions have been reached at this point.

VI. Did survey participants have other concerns?

Nothing currently to report.

VII. Questions submitted and answer received for using in analysis

[Traffic Subcommittee Questions \(PDF\)](#)

In summary, after working for less than one month, the Task Force and Subcommittees are off to a great start. They have asked meaningful questions, sought detailed and useful information, and will continue to collect and use data and information to make good recommendations to the City Council. Many questions have been answered but many significant questions remain.

To provide you, the Mayor and Council with a meaningful final report, the Subcommittee's questions posed in the above-referenced reports need to be answered thoroughly and quickly. At a high level, they include:

1. Are there businesses on Spa Road and the surrounding area that would be impacted by the decision? Only businesses on Forest Drive are addressed.
2. What is needed to immediately improve conditions for the PW employees until the new facility is completed?
3. If the City is to rebuild at Spa Road, what is the City's plan for stormwater management and at what percent would it plan for? Given the increased acreage at the Spa Road site and its proximity to Spa Creek, would the City commit to treating 100% of the stormwater rather than the minimum 50%?
4. If the City is to build at Forest Drive, what is the City's plan for stormwater management given that there is far less space on which to plan?
5. At the August 13 meeting, Mr. Baum got cut off from explaining his view of the calculation of "the asphalt to be left untreated for stormwater at the Spa Road site if the City were to rebuild there. What is his completed thought to this question? What is the City's view to this question? Please provide the City's approved site plan showing the reconstruction limits.
6. If the City is to build on Forest Drive, will it install sound barriers? If so, please provide that design information including linear feet at ground level, height, and location, and answer at what cost, the source of the funding, when they would be installed, and where they would be installed?
7. Identify the decision making authority for determining if remediation of Weems-Whalen Field is required if PW stays at the Spa Road site and provide that entity's response to that question. If the City is not be required to conduct that remediation if it rebuilds at that site, would the City do this remediation anyway? If remediation is required or would be voluntarily done, what is the expected cost and timeframe for the work?
8. If the City rebuilds on Spa Road: will it refurbish the refueling station; are the underground tanks at the end of their life; would the City abandon those tanks; what kind of tanks would the City replace them with; at what cost and what would be the source of funding?
9. What are the added project costs for the Forest Drive site? Examples may include a new salt storage facility, sound walls, parking lot, etc.
10. What was the basis and arithmetic used to arrive at the values given in the appraisals and who paid for them? Has the proposed developer performed a discounted cash flow analysis for its envisioned development, and if so, will it be provided to the Task Force?
11. Is the five-year history of fuel usage (provided by the City and reflected in the second table in the Finances Subcommittee section) indicative of the annual growth of in/out PW facility vehicular traffic that will occur over the next 20 years regardless of location? If not, please provide alternate growth indicators and basis.

12. What estimates and sources of funds could the Task Force rely upon for available grant or outside funding for the bike and pedestrian bridges and playing field improvements?
13. What amenities, if any, other than pedestrian bridges would improve how the land swap serves the Forest Drive area?
14. If the facility is built on Forest Drive, how will the City address the desire for increased greenery along Forest Drive?
15. If the facility is built on Forest Drive, what site conditions exist at the Forest Drive site (e.g., soil contamination, surface water, old growth trees) that would have to be addressed? How would they be addressed, when, at what cost, with what source of funding?
16. Do the bike and pedestrian plans require State and County support or approval? If so, will they provide the necessary support and approval?
17. For questions that can't be answered substantively now, what is needed to furnish an answer and when will those answers be available?

Please note that this is a summary of questions remaining to be answered. Attention must be paid to all of the questions raised and pending by the subcommittees.

The following are questions raised by the Subcommittees for consideration by other Subcommittees:

1. Will the Community or Housing Subcommittees reach out to the Housing Authority of the City of Annapolis, which manages the Newtowne 20 community, for consideration of impacts felt by that community?
2. Will the Traffic Subcommittee examine if traffic lights at the intersection of Hilltop and Forest Drive could be changed into a four-way intersection? If so, could the traffic lights be synchronized with traffic lights at Cherry Grove to reduce traffic delays?