



Our wAater | Public Advisory Group Virtual Meeting #14

Date: December 16, 2025

Time: 4:30 – 6:30 p.m.

MS Teams: [Join the meeting now](#), Meeting ID: 226 829 950 668 6, Passcode: HL9FQ3Po

MS Teams Call-In Info: +1 402-513-9026, Phone conference ID: 221 457 493#

Attendees

Anne Arundel County, Department of Public Works (DPW)

George Heiner
Jimmy Howard
Karen Henry
Erin Dey
Chris Murphy
Noelle Anuszkiewicz

HDR

Ed Shea
Ziwei He
Meghan Robinson
Sophia Fox
Brian Balchunas

Public Advisory Group (PAG) Members

Elle Bassett
Tammy Domanski
Sally Hornor
Lloyd Lewis
Craig Myers
Jerry Pesterfield
Elizabeth Rosborg
Tim Williams

Agenda

Topic	Time	Speaker
Introductions & Agenda	5 minutes	George Heiner Meghan Robinson
Large CIP Program Options <ul style="list-style-type: none">Existing Approach and RevisionsFuture Options	50 minutes	George Heiner
<i>Break</i>		<i>5 minutes</i>
PAG Debrief & Discussion	50 minutes	All
Closing Remarks	10 minutes	George Heiner Karen Henry

Introductions & Agenda (slide 1 – slide 3)

George Heiner opened the meeting by thanking everyone for their active participation and for joining the last meeting of 2025. He noted that a PAG member had requested an update on the Summerhill mobile home water/wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) in Crownsville, MD. To



address this, the meeting began with a brief update before moving on to the planned agenda.

Mayo Beach Park and Summerhill Mobile Home WWTP Updates

Mayo Beach Park

Chris Murphy provided an update on the Mayo Beach Park project, which is a County Parks and Recreation initiative supported through the General Fund. The project involves replacing an existing park structure while maintaining the same number of bathrooms. Due to this, the septic system was originally not planned for an upgrade.

The County is currently evaluating wastewater treatment options for the site, including a potential sewer extension or the installation of a Best Available Technology (BAT) system. The sewer extension option is more costly, and all alternatives are still under review as part of an ongoing study being conducted. Lisa Deanes was identified as the primary County contact and Project Manager for the project and will serve as the point of contact for any follow-up questions.

Questions and Open Discussion

Q: A member shared that while cost is always a consideration this is a public park and not pursuing a sewer connection could be a missed opportunity. It was also noted that nearby residents have been requesting a sewer connection for some time. Ongoing bacterial testing in the area has shown events occurring after dry periods, which could indicate that a septic solution may be more appropriate. There are currently two to three septic systems in the area, and the member offered to share study results if helpful.

Q: Has the County conducted dye testing in the area?

A: The County has not conducted dye testing. Staff indicated that this information would be shared with the project team for awareness and follow-up.

Summerhill WWTP

Jimmy Howard gave an update on the Summerhill wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) project, including recent coordination with the Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE) regarding potential Bay Restoration Fund (BRF) financing. To be eligible for 100% BRF funding, the County would need to own the portion of the Summerhill property where a new pumping station would be constructed. This would require purchasing that section of the site prior to construction. Once the pumping station becomes operational, the County would assume responsibility for ongoing operations and maintenance. Finalizing ownership, operational responsibilities, and funding agreements would take time, and additional coordination with MDE's Compliance Office will be required.

The County has been coordinating with the Planning and Zoning Department to assess land use and funding eligibility requirements. Currently, Summerhill is not located within a Priority Funding Area (PFA). To qualify for state funding, the site would need to be added to a PFA or receive a Special Exception. The location would also need to be incorporated into the County's General Development Plan, which would require a Master Plan amendment. This process would involve County Council approval followed by review by the Maryland Department of Planning. As part of this process, the site would also need to be redesignated under the Neighborhood Preservation category.



Maintaining affordable housing at the Summerhill location is a key priority. The County is reviewing the criteria related to PFAs and evaluating potential pathways forward. In parallel, the County is working to understand and address liability related to past compliance issues at the site. Next steps include meetings with County representatives and MDE compliance staff to clarify regulatory requirements and determine what actions are necessary to move the project forward.

Questions and Open Discussion

Q: Concern was raised that similar wastewater challenges exist in other parts of the County, particularly in South County mobile home parks. How is the County addressing this broader issue?

A: The County acknowledged that this is a continued problem and part of a broader, long-term challenge.

Q: Is the County prioritizing the Summerhill project while delaying consideration of South County projects for five years or more?

A: The County noted that Summerhill is being addressed since it can be connected into the County system. The site only requires a pump station whereas in the south County mobile home parks, wastewater treatment plants are required. A formal petition was submitted by the owner of Summerhill WWTP to begin this process. Other areas will be evaluated in the future, and many of the discussions with MDE regarding funding and ownership are similar to issues that will need to be addressed at locations in the southern part of the County.

Q: What is the project schedule?

A: The pump station takeover could take approximately 5.5 years, assuming funding issues are resolved. The County is working to maximize state funding opportunities. Privately-owned facilities may qualify for up to 50% funding, while County-owned facilities may qualify for up to 100% funding. Any costs not covered by state funding would be assessed to the property owner.

Q: Are all of these steps required to obtain BRF funding?

A: Yes. These requirements apply broadly, including to private property owners seeking BRF funding.

Q: Given the complexity of the process relative to the number of residents served, is closure or relocation of the mobile home park being considered?

A: The County reiterated its commitment to preserving affordable housing and stated that closure or relocation is not under consideration. It was also noted that identifying suitable, appropriately zoned locations in the Crownsville area would be challenging.

Large CIP Program and Options (slide 4 – slide 12)

George Heiner provided an overview of the Large CIP Septic Connections program, beginning with a recap of the 2019 program and its original funding commitments. Proposed program revisions outlined in the March 2025 Policy Update Memorandum were reviewed, including changes to subsidies and deferment approaches. Findings from a recent workshop on Large CIP options show that the current nutrient management strategy defers full-scale infrastructure improvements until the next round of nutrient reduction requirements are issued by MDE.

Proposed Large CIP Program policy revisions are aiming to maintain the overall financial commitment established in 2019 while improving participation. Key changes under consideration



include:

- Targeting approximately 40 to 60 homes per year
- Increasing the subsidy to 50 percent
- Revising the subsidy calculation and deferment structure
- Eliminating the application process

Three program options were presented:

- Option 1 - would use directed outreach to target specific neighborhoods with tailored incentives and would be the easiest option to implement.
- Option 2 - would involve County-led sewer expansions with voluntary homeowner connections, while lower cost for residents. This option presents higher financial risk to the County due to uncertain participation.
- Option 3 - would have the County fund select infrastructure components, such as pumping stations and force mains, while homeowners would pay for individual connections, reducing costs in higher-cost neighborhoods and limiting the County's risk.

All options would be implemented at the neighborhood level, include prioritization and directed outreach, and carry inherent risks. A final decision has not been made at this time.

Questions and Open Discussion

Q: Were any communities close to moving forward under the existing CIP program?

A: One community came close but is unlikely to proceed due to its small size and the need for costly grinder pumps. Another community has expressed interest and may be able to move forward under the proposed program changes. It was also noted that the communities that have progressed the furthest to date tend to have higher overall project costs.

Q: What impact would Options 2 and 3 have on individual homeowner costs?

A: Under Option 2, the County would construct the sewer infrastructure, and residents would pay a minimum assessment to connect. Under Option 3, the County would fund larger infrastructure components, such as pumping stations and force mains, while homeowners would pay for the collection system. An example from Gingerville Manor was shared to illustrate how this approach could lower overall costs for residents while presenting less financial risk to the County than Option 2.

Q: Is funding available to support Options 2 and 3?

A: Funding would need to be allocated in smaller annual increments. The original program assumed the County would absorb approximately \$4 million per year in subsidy costs, and the revised approach continues to assume a similar annual investment to address cost concerns discussed when the program was established in 2019.

Q: How should the County approach prioritization when community needs and incentive levels differ?

A: Several participants agreed that prioritizing communities with the greatest needs is the fairest approach, particularly when public health impacts are considered. Onsite Wastewater Management Problem Areas were noted as an important factor in prioritization.

Q: How does policy encourage homeowners to connect once infrastructure is in place?



A: Most policy considerations related to this question fall under Option 2. Discussion focused on whether homeowners should be charged a minimum assessment while connections remain voluntary and whether voluntary connections should be considered at all. It was noted that making connections mandatory would require demonstrating an emergency or significant public health concern to the County Council. It was also acknowledged that some residents are opposed to sewer connections.

Break

PAG Debrief and Discussion (slide 13 – slide 16)

Reflections

During the reflection portion of the meeting, PAG members shared positive feedback about their experience serving and working with the County. Several members expressed appreciation for DPW's transparency, responsiveness, and willingness to engage with the public and incorporate feedback. Participants noted that this openness has made the group productive and meaningful, and that hearing perspectives outside of technical and engineering disciplines adds significant value to decision-making.

At the same time, members acknowledged frustration with the pace of progress and emphasized a desire for more action-oriented outcomes. Suggestions included taking a more aggressive or creative approach to problem-solving, learning from programs implemented in other regions, and providing clearer pathways for policy or legislative input. Members encouraged DPW to leverage the PAG more strategically, including asking the group to advocate for changes or support efforts.

Discussion also focused on how the PAG could be more effective in driving results. Members emphasized the importance of maintaining momentum between meetings, increasing clarity around how PAG input is used, and ensuring the group remains aligned with County goals related to water quality and public health. Some participants suggested involving policy or legislative expertise when discussions shift toward regulatory or funding constraints.

Engagement and Meeting Structure

Members expressed a strong preference for more flexible, issue-driven meetings rather than limiting meetings to quarterly, particularly when timely input could help advance decisions. There was broad agreement that virtual meetings remain valuable, with a preference for Zoom as the meeting platform. Opinions varied on interim communications, with some members favoring concise follow-up emails or easily accessible meeting materials over formal newsletters. Timely distribution of meeting notes and clear summaries of action items were identified as important for maintaining engagement.

Members expressed interest in expanding participation to include more homeowners and community members, noting that lived experience provides critical insight. There were mixed views on involving elected officials, with some concern that their presence could influence open dialogue, while others felt there could be value in keeping them informed through indirect updates rather than direct participation. Overall, members emphasized the importance of preserving the PAG as a space for candid discussion while strengthening its role in advancing practical solutions.



Closing Remarks

Karen Henry thanked the group for all of their participation and feedback.