



Emma Pfefferkorn, Project Manager  
Department of Public Works  
2525 Riva Road  
Annapolis, MD 21401  
443-805-1737  
Pwvpfe00@aacounty.org  
www.dpwandyou.com

September 22, 2023

To: Residents within 300' of Carrs Wharf Pier

September 22, 2023

## MEETING MINUTES & RESPONSES TO IN-MEETING COMMENTS

### CARRS WHARF ACCESS ROAD IMPROVEMENTS – Project# P573300

The Department of Public Works (DPW) and the Department of Recreation and Parks thank you for your interest in and attention to the planned Carrs Wharf Park Access Road Improvements project.

The Department of Public Works (DPW) and the Department of Recreation and Parks (DRP) received questions and comments from approximately 21 citizens regarding the Project's 30% Schematic Design. There was a total of 51 participants that signed in at the August 17, 2023 in-person meeting at Edgewater Library in Edgewater, MD. Comments were received from 11 citizens during the period following the Public Meeting.

The public comment period ended on August 31, 2023. This serves as a summary of those comments. A complete listing of those comments is posted on the DRP website at:

<https://www.aacounty.org/recreation-parks/capital-projects/carrs-wharf>

A recorded copy of the August 17, 2023 Public Meeting is available to view on the County's website at <https://www.aacounty.org/planning-and-zoning/development/community-meetings/community-meeting-calendar/past-meetings-closed>

The responses to the comments received are as follows:

1. Comment 1: It is requested the project be delayed 1 year to address existing operational issues including: extensive waste and refuse, port-o-potty service, people are on the dock after hours and the residents frequently call law enforcement, implement an access control system including gates for the pier and parking area and a pass system.  
*Response: As a result of this meeting the County Departments reviewed the need for the additional widening of the access road and the turnaround to ensure operational compliance with all Code requirements. Should the pier at Carrs Wharf not be used for docking any boats and that the use of the soft launch be limited to only canoes, kayaks and other cartop watercraft, the Fire Department will not require that the planned wider roadway, turnaround area, and other fire protection measures be constructed. The*

*Department of Recreation and Parks (DRP) is adjusting certain operational procedures to ensure compliance with the Fire Department's directives. For that reason the portions of the project related to the additional widening and turnaround improvements at the wharf have been suspended.*

*However, the County does plan on continuing to improve ADA parking and access at the park and to investigate concerns about the condition of the bulkhead on the Rhode River. Because of these significant changes to the project there will be a second public meeting to discuss the bulkhead and the ADA improvements. The project scope has been revised to include the ADA parking space and unloading zone, accessibility route from the space to the pier, pier modifications to meet ADA ramp requirements, bike racks, signage, and stormwater management.*

*The capital project will not be delayed a year in response to operational concerns. Some of the concerns raised during the meeting are being addressed by DRP. The Department will continue to engage the local community to address operational issues.*

Erosion controls are not sufficient for steep slopes.

*Response: The access road widening and turnaround are being removed from the project; therefore, disturbance to the steep slope and removal of trees are not necessary.*

We have not received the environmental report. MDE is not aware of the project per Ms. Rahel Rosner's contacts.

*Response: A formal environmental report is not a requirement of the regulatory agencies. A Natural Resource Inventory (NRI) was completed for the project area. The NRI included identifying and mapping all trees within the Critical Area Buffer and trees larger than six inches outside of the buffer and identifying and mapping any wetlands and their 25-foot buffer within the project area. The trees, wetlands, and buffers are shown on the 30% Schematic Design plans available for download from the links provided above.*

*The project will meet all state and county code requirements for impacts to the natural resources. A pre-application meeting was held at the project site with MDE on May 24, 2023 at 2pm. Mitigation requirements for disturbance of the wetland and its buffer and the application and review processes were discussed. A meeting was also held with AA County OPZ Critical Area Team reviewer. Mitigation requirements for disturbance to the Critical Area Buffer, new impervious surface and lot coverage, and canopy loss from tree removals were discussed. The mitigation requirements and plantings will be reviewed and approved through the Critical Area's Consistency Report for Local Government projects.*

It is requested a traffic study and management plan be performed.

*Response: The proposed improvements do not change the current park use; therefore, a traffic study and management plan are not required.*

There needs to measures to guarantee the soft launch is not used by non-cartop vessels.

*Response: Bollards along the launch entrance will be included on the 60% Design Development plans.*

What measures will be installed to restrict parking in the turnaround.

*Response: Per revised project scope discussed above, the turnaround is being removed from the project.*

2. Comment 2: Multiple residents reiterated the trash and port-o-potty concerns. What can be done now and today to address these issues.

*Response: See Comment #1 response to operational issues.*

Removal of the trees along the slope will create an erosion issue.

*Response: See Comment #1 response to steep slope erosion.*

3. Comment 3: Multiple residents spoke to current parking issues including: parking is not enforced and there is an existing handicap stop that is not enforced; Cars park illegally and the turnaround will result in more illegal parking; the widening of the road is a concern for more illegal parking. There is not enough road safety here and a lack of police response for illegal parking issues; parking has been an issue since 1961 with illegal parking at the marina and along the road; there is illegal parking on private property along Germantown Road that restricts residents' ingress/egress.

*Response: See scope revision response under Comment #1. Additional illegal parking concerns are alleviated since the turnaround and road widening will be removed from the project. The current illegal parking issues are being reviewed.*

4. Comment 4: What is going to be done about the failing bulkhead? There are holes in the bulkhead. Funds should not be allocated to the access improvements with the failing bulkhead that will damage the turnaround when the bulkhead repair will require deadman and tie-backs. Multiple residents reiterated the concern for the failing bulkhead.

*Response: Field investigations and concept design to address the failing bulkhead will be added to the project. A pre-application meeting with regulatory agencies to review the concept design is also included. See previous response to Comment #1 that the turnaround is being removed from the project.*

5. Comment 5: Residents around Carrs Wharf could not do what the County is proposing. Blacktop is proposed over wetlands.

*Response: See response under Comment #1. The project will meet all state and county code requirements for impacts to the natural resources.*

6. Comment 6: What is the need for fire trucks to access when there is no buildings or docking of vessels? We understand the need for emergency vehicle access but there are 5 marinas within a ½ mile of Carrs Wharf that could be used for emergency vehicle access and launching of emergency water vessels.

*Response: See scope revision response under Comment #1*

7. Comment 7: What is budget for the project?

*Response: The capital improvement project budget is \$800,000 with construction funds estimated to be approximately \$400,000 based on the initial scope. A new cost estimate will be prepared as part of the revised scope of work.*

8. Comment 8: The 1015 property's pier is directly adjacent to the public pier. The no trespassing sign is no longer there, and the concern is visitors of the Carrs Wharf pier access the 1015 private pier.  
*Response: The Rhode Point Community Association owns a parcel of land between the County Wharf and the pier located on 1015 Carrs Wharf. The DRP of Recreation and Parks is working on installation of the fence and signage on County property to identify the limits of County owned property east of the pier.*
9. Comment 9: The residents support the public water access but safety and hygiene issues need to be addressed. What is the need for this project? There are a lot of environmental impacts. We would like the opportunity to review the environmental reports. What about using pervious materials?  
*Response: See response to Comment #1 regarding the environmental reports. As stated at the meeting, pervious materials are not feasible at the project site. Furthermore, see response to Comment #1 regarding the project scope changes and the removal of the turnaround.*
10. Comment 10: Why do other public facilities have public bathrooms as a standard instead of a port-o-potty. There are not adequate facilities for this project.  
*Response: See Comment #1 response to operational issues Typically, public bathroom buildings are placed in locations where there is either onsite County staff present or a permitted group to operate and maintain them. This location does not have onsite staff to maintain these bathrooms. This is a community amenity and similar to community parks port o pots are used for restroom facilities.*
11. Comment 11: This project is a solution for a problem we do not have. There are plenty of other places close by for emergency access turn around. The project will expand the site and expand the existing issues without increasing the operating budget to fix the current issues.  
*Response: See Comment #1 response concerning the reduced project scope.*
12. Comment 12: The project will increase the number of parking spaces from the existing 10 spaces to 30 or 40 spaces. What about the traffic down the road? There are safety issues with speed, not stopping at signs and there is not traffic calming.  
*Response: See Comment #3 response to parking issues. See previous response that the road widening is being removed from the project. Traffic calming and increased signage, if warranted, will be added to the 60% design development plans.*
13. Comment 13: There is a handicap port-o-potty at the furthest point from the pier. The garbage and bathroom situation are atrocious. Vehicles attempting to launch vessels would prohibit emergency access to the water. Access to the park is dusk-to dawn; when is that? Security to prevent after-hours trespassing is needed. The project will spend money but there are not resources to make the park a clean, safe place for people to visit.  
*Response: See Comment #1 response to operational issues, proposed, bollards, and reduced project scope. Signage at the intersection of Cadle Creek Road and Carrs Wharf Road will be added to the 60% design development plans to discourage non-cartop vessels from driving down the access road.*

14. Comment 14: The pier is not safe. People are drinking and drowning after-hours. There has been 1 drowning multiple people screaming from falling in the water. A gate is needed for safety.  
*Response: See Comment #1 response to operational issues.*
15. Comment 15: There are so many roads in the area that do not have turnarounds for emergency vehicles. Why do the fire trucks need a turnaround here.  
*Response: See response to Comment #1 regarding the project scope changes and the removal of the turnaround.*
16. Comment 16: Access for public water access needs to be rational. The need for the emergency access was reiterated. Money is being wasted. Make the operational corrections so the people that do go down will enjoy it even more.  
*Response: Response: See Comment #1 response to operational issues and reduced project scope.*
17. Comment 17: The community should have the opportunity to speak with the Fire Marshall and other emergency personnel to understand the need. Another public meeting at the 60% design phase is requested. Rec & Parks can be helpful partner and give them the opportunity to response to the operational issues.  
*Response: See Comment #1 response to the reduced project scope. Another public meeting will be conducted at the 60% design phase to give to the community the opportunity to comment the design with the reduced project scope. See Comment #1 response regarding meeting to discuss operational issues.*
18. Comment 18: There are safety, health and emergency issues. Can the project be put on hold while there has been more brainstorming on the proposed improvements without trashing the site.  
*Response: See Comment #1 response to operational issues and reduced project scope.*
19. Comment 19: There was a drowning on July 4<sup>th</sup> in the Rhode River. Emergency vehicles accessed Carrs Wharf for the recovery without the turnaround.  
*Response: See Comment #1 response regarding the reduced project scope.*
20. Comment 20: Maintenance and monitoring are needed. Cars currently pass each other at 14' wide so widening to 20', cars will park there. Without monitoring or maintenance, cars will illegally park and more trash will accumulate.  
*Response: See Comment #1 response to operational issues and reduced project scope.*
21. Comment 21: Beverly Triton Beach had a group of people and worked out the plans and issues. This project needs a group to sit down and figure out what the community wants and propose a plan that works for the County and community.  
*Response: Currently there is a community group that represents the community in this area that meets regularly with the DRP. Those meetings are a great format to discuss this operational changes. In addition to that ongoing meeting, and in response to comment expressed during tis meeting, the County had additional meetings to discuss the code requirements and operational needs for the park and that resulted in a reduced project scope and operational changes to the amenity.*

