

# Report of the Ad Hoc Committee for Future Planning

## *Introduction*

If one word could describe the nature of the Arundel on the Bay community it would be “Diversity.” Grasslands, beach and bulkheads; streets, drives and paths; mansions and cottages; seniors and kids; retired and working; full-time, summer, and absent owners; and all of it crammed into an area six blocks wide and ten blocks long.

While this diversity is a major contributor to our community’s wonderful quality of life, it also presents significant challenges to maintaining our infrastructure. Not only do we have a diverse set of needs, we have substantial disagreement on how they should be met.

Some would like to maintain the relaxed atmosphere of gravel and sand, while others worry about liability and snow removal. Some see beach, pier, and waterfront improvements as community amenities; while others believe they should be paid for by their users. This Report does not resolve these issues.

It does not provide recommendations for what projects should be undertaken, it does not provide a five-year plan, and it does not identify the resources that will be needed to implement them. In those respects, the Committee has failed to achieve the objectives stated in its charter.

The report does provide results of a brief study of Shore Erosion Control – by far the most expensive component of the community’s maintenance responsibilities – and it briefly addresses the other maintenance areas. More importantly, it provides recommendations and a structure for a continued Long Term Planning Committee which we hope will succeed where we have failed.

**Table of Contents**

**REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE FOR FUTURE PLANNING .....1**

INTRODUCTION ..... 1

TABLE OF CONTENTS.....2

COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES .....3

*Shoreline Management Subcommittee* .....3

*Community Recreation Areas Management Subcommittee*.....4

*Non-County Roadway Maintenance Subcommittee* .....4

*Ways and Means Subcommittee* .....4

*Community Relations Subcommittee* .....4

*Results* .....5

APPENDIX A: CHARTER OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE FOR FUTURE PLANNING .....6

APPENDIX B: MINUTES OF LONG RANGE PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING 12/26/06 .....7

APPENDIX C: BAY SHORELINE MANAGEMENT SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT .....9

## ***Committee Activities***

The following persons have contributed their time and energies to the committee:

- Stephen Brennwald
- Wilma Coble
- David Delia
- Wayne Gerrish
- Ken & Vivian Geary
- Monique Langston
- Peggy Payton
- Toni Ray
- Bill Semenuk
- Dave Sullivan

In its organizational meeting in December, the Planning Committee discussed the enabling resolution and how it could best address the long term needs of Arundel on the Bay. These discussions led to following consensus:

- The Long Range Planning functions for AOTB need to be performed by a permanent committee.
- The categories identified by the enabling resolution (which match the funding categories for AOTB's revenue from the County tax collections) are somewhat arbitrary and may not be the best way to breakdown Long Term Planning work.
- Maintenance of private streets, and the development and maintenance of community common areas are functions common to many communities; but the impact of the Chesapeake Bay on AOTB is by far our most serious problem. Understanding how other Bay-front communities try to manage this problem may identify options for AOTB.
- A greater level of community involvement will be required to assure that Long Term projects will be funded and completed. One of our objectives would be to involve more AOTB homeowners over a longer term to create the momentum necessary to approve, fund and accomplish needed projects.

Because of the diversity of the long range planning issues, the committee agreed that a number of subcommittees should be established that would allow each of these issues to be addressed efficiently. The following subcommittees were proposed:

### **Shoreline Management Subcommittee**

#### ISSUES

- What organizations have jurisdiction over potential projects affecting the Bay?
- What organizations have potential funding potential for Bay-related projects and how could it be accessed by AOTB?
- What practical and equitable options for allocating costs of Bay-related projects among AOTB homeowners are available?
- What resources are available to design and implement shoreline management projects and what are their costs?

- Which properties are currently at risk for significant erosion, flooding, or other damage at the shoreline?
- Which areas are currently subject to flooding, either with the Bay as source or rain water runoff as source?

## **Community Recreation Areas Management Subcommittee**

### ISSUES

- What is the ownership status of the various CRAs in the community?
- What legal restrictions affect changes to the various CRAs?
- What is the current condition of each CRA; what improvements are possible; what improvement projects have support of the AOTB community; what are the costs?

## **Non-County Roadway Maintenance Subcommittee**

### ISSUES

- What are the pros and cons of having private streets?
- What would be required to have the County assume maintenance of these roads?
- What are the projected costs of “normal” maintenance of private roads?

## **Ways and Means Subcommittee**

### TASKS

- Liaise with other Bay front community organizations to learn how they address problems faced by AOTB. If possible, acquire past budgets, tax rates, tax rate distributions among waterfront and non-waterfront properties. Acquire knowledge of their experience with federal, state, county, and NGO funding sources.
- Liaise with federal, state, county, and NGOs sources of both funding of and constraints on AOTB maintenance activities.
- Identify and establish relationships with organizations and persons who can affect AOTB’s ability to accomplish projects.

## **Community Relations Subcommittee**

### TASKS

- Solicit ideas & suggestions from the AOTB community.
- Encourage owners to become involved with the Planning Committee

The committee established three subcommittees which matched the interests of the initial committee members; these were Shoreline Management (David Delia), Community Recreation Area Management (Monique Langston), and Ways and Means (Peggy Peyton). The Shoreline Management subcommittee was intended to deal with all of the water-related issues, including non-shore erosion and drainage ditch repair, in the context of our relationship with the Bay.

The group agreed that road maintenance was of a different character than the other areas, and believed that it would be useful to determine the pros and cons of private roads and the impediments to having the County take over responsibility for them. At that time, however, no one was available to assume this responsibility.

## **Results**

The Subcommittees have operated independently with each achieving some positive results. It is evident, however, that in order to develop and then execute long range plans for maintenance of our community infrastructure more time and resources are needed.

It has been suggested that there is not adequate interest in the community to sustain a permanent, Long Range Planning Committee. We disagree. Many of our newer homeowners are eager to get involved in the community; and many of the older ones would like to pass on the knowledge they have acquired so it won't be lost. The key is to raise awareness in Arundel on the Bay of the opportunities to participate.

It is the committee's recommendation that the Board of Directors of the Property Owners Association of Arundel-On-The-Bay establish a permanent Long Range Planning Committee (LRPC) with the following structure:

- The chairman of the LRPC shall be appointed by the Board of the Association
- Members of the LRPC shall serve for multi-year terms
- The LRPC shall have permanent Subcommittees – the ones identified earlier are proposed as an initial set
- The LRPC shall report to the Board of Directors
- The LRPC shall provide recommendations for the disposition of special tax district funds that are allocated to shore erosion control, non-shore erosion control, maintenance of non-county roads, maintenance of recreational areas, maintenance of real property, and repair of drainage ditches
- The LRPC shall establish Project Teams to implement plans that are adopted by the Association
- The LRPC shall provide oversight of Project Teams and Contractors in their implementation of long range plan items

## ***Appendix A: Charter of the Ad Hoc Committee for Future Planning***

WHEREAS The Property Owners Association of Arundel-On-The-Bay holds primary responsibility for shore erosion control, non-shore erosion control, maintenance of non-county roads, maintenance of recreational areas, maintenance of real property, and repair of drainage ditches; and

WHEREAS The Property Owners Association of Arundel-On-The-Bay needs to plan for future improvements in each of these areas to the peninsula; and

WHEREAS the Association must manage the resources necessary to provide all of the above services;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that an Ad Hoc Committee, as authorized by the POA-AOTB Constitution, Article IX, Section 2, shall be formed to study each of the above mentioned areas; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Ad Hoc Committee shall develop recommendations for a minimum five-year plan addressing each of the areas listed, namely shore erosion control, non-shore erosion control, maintenance of non-county roads, maintenance of recreational areas, maintenance of real property, and repair of drainage ditches; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Ad Hoc Committee shall identify the resources necessary to implement the recommendations; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Ad Hoc Committee shall present its findings in a final report to the President and to the Board of Directors not later than Saturday, June 16, 2007; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Ad Hoc Committee shall not be authorized to obligate funds without the written consent of the President in accordance with standard Association practice; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Ad Hoc Committee shall cease operation and disband once the final report has been presented or June 30, 2007, whichever occurs first.

## **Appendix B: Minutes of Long Range Planning Committee Meeting 12/26/06**

A meeting of the Long Range Planning Committee was held at Dave Sullivan's house, 1372 Walnut Ave, at 7PM on Tuesday, December 26, 2006. Although many committee members were unable to attend, we thought it would be useful to have some contact before the end of the year.

Present were Dave Sullivan, David Delia, Peggy Peyton and Monique Langston.

Dave Sullivan provided a handout of the enabling resolution, an outline of possible committee activities, a map of AOTB showing county and private roads and Community Recreation Areas (CRAs), and the cover of a comprehensive report on Shoreline Management for Chesapeake Bay.

The group reviewed the enabling resolution provided by Frank Florentine and agreed that the necessary work could be started under this charter, but that a permanent Long Range Planning Committee was appropriate for Arundel on the Bay. David Delia stated that he believed such a permanent committee had been established by a resolution passed by the AOTB Board last fall.

David Delia provided a map of AOTB with a proposed comprehensive shoreline defense consisting of breakwaters, revetments, bulkheads, and plantings. Discussion of this plan raised the issues of how it could be funded and whether non-shoreline homeowners would be willing to pay for it. All agreed that shoreline management was important to the entire AOTB community, but that bayfront homes might be expected to contribute some greater share of the costs of shoreline management since they received a higher level of economic benefit.

Peggy Peyton suggested that the issues faced by AOTB are common to other communities, and she volunteered to solicit information from other Community Associations to see how they dealt with them. Peggy also suggested that identifying some smaller; more manageable projects that could be completed quickly would serve to heighten interest in the community.

Monique Langston brought pictures of Common Recreation Areas – mostly the beach – that showed a cleanup was needed to make them fully useable. She proposed that we move quickly to identify a beach cleanup project, and get it funded and executed. Dave Sullivan pointed out that Long Range Planning was intended to provide input to future budgets; meaning that we would be providing items for the 2008 – 2009 budget. The group agreed, however, that identifying the need and proposing solutions was within the scope of the committee and that this could be turned over to other committees whose responsibility was for maintenance in the current and next fiscal years.

Dave Sullivan asked all present to solicit interest among their friends and neighbors to see if the Long Range Planning membership could be expanded in view of the amount of work anticipated to be necessary and the permanent nature of the ongoing committee.

Dave Sullivan proposed that three subcommittees be established to match the interests of the three other committee members. These were Bay Shoreline Management (David Delia), Community Recreation Area Management (Monique Langston), and Ways and Means (Peggy Peyton). These subcommittees covered the full scope of Long Range Planning identified in the Resolution with the exception of Non-County Road Maintenance. The group agreed that road maintenance was of a different character than the other areas, and believed that it would be useful to determine the pros and cons of private roads and the impediments to having the County take over responsibility for them.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dave Sullivan  
Chairman

## ***Appendix C: Bay Shoreline Management Subcommittee Report***

### **Background**

Since about 1985, when our community made its last major commitment to erosion control, coastal erosion problems have been handled through land-filling projects, bulkhead repairs, and digging of drainage ditches. These actions have not substantially reduced the danger of losing large parts of our peninsular home to the forceful movement of high water. Although we cannot build a levee and avoid the rising water problem entirely, we can mitigate the destruction of property and erosion of our coastal zones by taking some substantial (and quite likely costly) actions.

An example of successful Shoreline Management is evident in Bay Ridge where, after the destruction wrought by Isabel, the community was able to construct a well-engineered and constructed coastal defense system. This was accomplished at least partially through funding made available for hurricane damage recovery. Arundel on the Bay's attempts to get similar funding after Isabel have been frustrated by the many bureaucratic hurdles that are inherent in this process.

### **Meeting with Department of Natural Resources**

Committee members met with Leonard M. Larese-Casanova, Director, Shore Erosion Control, MD Department of Natural Resources and his Project Manager, Tom Brower on Tuesday, January 30, 2007. We explained our purpose was to formulate and eventually implement a long-range (20+ year) plan to abate and eventually reverse current shore erosion around our entire peninsula.

We gained a number of insights from our discussions and confirmed our suspicions that this would be a multimillion-dollar project. The bottom-line recommendation was that we commission an engineering firm to develop a general plan/study/site analysis that addresses our concerns in a general way. Such a planning document would be just short of design, be conceptual in form, and might be 5-20 pages, include a scope of work, maps, and a cost estimate. The cost of generating this document was estimated at \$30,000 dollars; but without it we would not be able to embark on serious discussion of our project with the governmental agencies and NGOs that we need to participate in its funding and implementation.

Len and Tom were pessimistic about finding grants, but felt there were many sources for no-interest loans. While there were a number of organizations that were theoretical sources of assistance, it was important to assess their track records in completing projects. The Army Corps of Engineers, for example, has promised lots of money for similar projects but so far has backed out of most. Other agencies mentioned were FEMA, the EPA (which cares about pollution from silt and soil erosion), NOAA's Office of Coastal Resources Management, the Chesapeake Bay Foundation, the Chesapeake Bay Trust, the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, Maryland's DNR, Department of Economic and Community Development, and Department of State Planning.

Anne Arundel County may agree to assist in the Magnolia Ave end (it is almost 1/4 of our coastline) since it's a county road connected by another county road (Cohasset). Bay Ridge got money for their erosion control projects from the county because Bay Ridge Road intersected with their coastal road, which is also county owned.

Len and Tom indicated that, politically, environmentally, and financially, less was always preferable to more; but sometimes more was the only realistic option. They suggested that throughout our project we stress environmental protection of the Bay as our primary goal along with preservation of our peninsula; and that we concentrate, at least initially, on State-owned property--the offshore areas.

### **Meeting with Andrews-Miller**

On February 28, 2007, we spent almost two hours with Gary Williams of Andrews-Miller. We related what we learned from DNR and asked for his assistance in planning our course of action. He suggested that we need two plans--a preliminary plan with estimates of cost (which he was willing to provide gratis), then a more detailed plan with specifics on structure locations, rock sizes etc (which would probably cost in the tens of thousands of dollars).

Since Andrews-Miller has done literally thousands of dollars worth of these types of plans and engineering studies/drawings already for AOTB, we may be able to leverage some of them toward this long-term plan. Gary will pull together previous plans his company has done that might be useful as well as open-source (archival) material and will provide an estimate of what the plans would include and how much they would cost. Gary was very responsive and was willing to do some pro bono work for us and indicated we might expect some response by mid-April. As of this date, we have not yet received this response; if Long Range Planning is continued beyond June, 2007, the subcommittee should follow up with Gary.

### **Preliminary Outline of an AOTB Shoreline Project**

The knowledgeable persons we spoke with at DNR and Andrews-Miller agreed on the general parameters of a shoreline protection project for Arundel on the Bay: Our best defense against loss of our land into the Bay is building segmented breakwaters offshore rather than depending on bulkheads. Breakwaters and the imported sand and potentially sea grass plantings behind them may eliminate the need to ever build or repair bulkheads; it might even allow them to be removed some years from now along a newly developed protective and accessible beach.

Offshore breakwaters (separated by small gaps for marine life and small boat traffic) would be about 5 feet above Mean Low Water (MLW), about 200 feet from our coast. These breakwaters would extend the entire approximately 3,000-foot length of the peninsula, pass around the point another 1,000 feet, and end just inside the Creek. Stone is the preferred material -- concrete structures that have been tried in some applications have not yet stood the test of time. These structures cost \$1,000 to \$1,500 per linear foot.



We all lose a degree of protection every time our land mass becomes less. The beneficial effects of marshland in preventing overall inland flooding had been documented well before Katrina. When we lose wetlands our drainage systems and our ecosystems suffer. The lost land goes into the Bay, adding pollutants and eliminating channels and fishing areas. This impacts the usefulness of our waterfront and degrades the value of our community.

It is evident from our experience in seeking public funding after Isabel that a great deal of preparation is needed to be successful. We were not prepared to “take advantage” of the disaster, and we are only a little better off now than we were in 2003.

Bay Shoreline Management must be a permanent, high priority responsibility of our Association. A permanent committee must be established to continue progress toward construction of a comprehensive defense. Adequate monies must be made available to fund plans and studies and to pursue sources of governmental and NGO assistance.