TENTATIVE#5

BALTIMORE COUNTY COUNCIL AGENDA
LEGISLATIVE SESSION 2025, LEGISLATIVE DAY NO. 7
APRIL 7, 2025 6:00 P.M.

CEB = CURRENT EXPENSE BUDGET
BY REQ. = AT REQUEST OF COUNTY EXECUTIVE

A. **MOMENT OF SILENT MEDITATION**
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG

B. **APPROVAL OF JOURNAL** – Meeting of March 17, 2025

C. **ENROLLMENT OF BILLS** – Bills 12-25, 13-25, 14-25 & 15-25

D. **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**

Bill 22-25 – Mr. Ertel(By Req.) – CEB- Long-Term & Dementia Care
Bill 23-25 – Mr. Ertel(By Req.) – CEB – Senior Care
Bill 24-25 – Mr. Ertel(By Req.) – 2025 Basic Services Maps
Bill 25-25 – Mr. Crandell – Restrictions on Parking Commercial Vehicles in the Essex Commercial Revitalization District

E. **CALL OF BILLS FOR FINAL READING AND VOTE**

Bill 16-25 – Mr. Marks – Zoning Regs. – Uses Permitted in the R.C. 5 Zone – Christmas tree Farms and Plumbing, Mechanical, and Utility Companies
Bill 18-25 – Councilmembers Marks & Kach – Zoning Regulations – Solar Facilities
Bill 19-25 – Councilmembers Marks, Kach, Ertel, Patoka & Crandell – County Charter–Baltimore County Farmland Preservation Act

F. **APPROVAL OF FISCAL MATTERS/CONTRACTS**

1. Contracts – (2) – Asbestos abatement and re-insulation services
WITHDRAWN ~~2. Contract – P2 Cleaning Services, LLC – Carpet cleaning, floor cleaning, sealing & finishing services~~
3. Amendment to Contract – Facility Support, Inc. d/b/a FSiEngineers – Decarbonization energy audits – Cost & energy savings
4. Contract – Acquisition of parcels – drainage and utility easements – 9929 Philadelphia Road, 21237 – Mohrs Lane Bridge
5. Contract – Cummins-Wagner Company, Inc. – Maintenance of parts & controls – Sewerage Pumping & Treatment Stations
6. Agreements – (43) – Cooperative Agreements utilizing the State of MD Dept. of Information Technology Consulting and Technical Services+ (CATS+) – Staffing solutions
7. Contract – Optimal Geo, LLC – On-call IT professional services

G. **MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS**

1. Correspondence - (a) (7) - Non-Competitive Awards (March 6, 2025)
2. Reappointment – Mr. Marks – Board of Appeals – William H. Paulshock, Sr.
3. Reappointment – Mr. Patoka – Board of Appeals – Deborah C. Dopkin
4. Appointment – Mr. Crandell – Baltimore County Planning Board – Jessica Lilli
5. Res. 18-25 – Mr. Ertel – Supporting request for the Main Street Maryland designation by the Maryland DHCD
6. Res. 19-25 – Councilmembers Kach & Marks – Adoption/incorporation of the Jacksonville Community Plan – Master Plan 2030
7. Appointment – Mr. Crandell – Fair Election Fund Commission – Stacy McNish
INTRO. ONLY 8. Res. 20-25 – Mr. Ertel(By Req.) - Approval of Maryland Rural Legacy Plan Applications (3)
INTRO. ONLY 9. Res. 21-25 – Mr. Marks – Opposition of overhead transmission lines – Brandon Shores Retirement Mitigation Project

BALTIMORE COUNTY COUNCIL
NOTES TO THE AGENDA
LEGISLATIVE SESSION 2025

Issued: March 27, 2025
Reissued: April 1, 2025
Work Session: April 1, 2025
Legislative Day No.7: April 7, 2025

The accompanying notes are compiled from unaudited information provided by the Administration and other sources.

OFFICE OF THE COUNTY AUDITOR

BALTIMORE COUNTY COUNCIL

April 7, 2025

NOTES TO THE AGENDA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Witnesses ii

BILLS – FINAL READING

Bill 16-25 1
Bill 18-25 2
Bill 19-25 3

BILLS – FOR FIRST CONSIDERATION

Bill 20-25 11
Bill 21-25 12

FISCAL MATTERS

FM-1 14
FM-3 17
FM-4 ..... **21
FM-5 ..... *24
FM-6 ..... *28
FM-7 32

MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS

MB-5 (Res. 18-25) 36
MB-6 (Res. 19-25) 37

APPENDIX

Correspondence (1) (a) 39

* Note included in reissued package.
** Revised note included in reissued package.

AGENDA
BALTIMORE COUNTY COUNCIL
LEGISLATIVE SESSION 2025, LEGISLATIVE DAY NO. 7
April 7, 2025 6:00 P.M.

CEB = CURRENT EXPENSE BUDGET
BY REQ. = AT REQUEST OF COUNTY EXECUTIVE

Page

CALL OF BILLS FOR FINAL READING AND VOTE

COUNCIL

1 Bill 16-25 – Mr. Marks – Zoning Regs. – Uses Permitted in the R.C. 5 Zone – ChristmasTree Farms and Plumbing, Mechanical, and Utility Companies
2 Bill 18-25 – Councilmembers Marks & Kach – Zoning Regulations – Solar Facilities
3 Bill 19-25 – Councilmembers Marks, Kach, Ertel, Patoka & Crandell – County Charter–Baltimore County Farmland Preservation Act

BILLS FOR FIRST CONSIDERATION

COUNCIL

11 Bill 20-25 – Mr. Marks – Parking of Recreational Vehicles on Public Roads
12 Bill 21-25 – Councilmembers Kach & Marks – Zoning Regulations – Solar Facilities – Siting Requirements

APPROVAL OF FISCAL MATTERS/CONTRACTS

DEBRA SHINDLE, CHIEF, PROPERTY MANAGEMENT

14 1. Contracts – (2) – Asbestos abatement and re-insulation services
WITHDRAWN ~~2. Contract – P2 Cleaning Services, LLC – Carpet cleaning, floor cleaning, sealing & finishing services~~

SETH BLUMEN, ENERGY & SUSTAINABILITY COORDINATOR, DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION & SUSTAINABILITY

17 3. Amendment to Contract – Facility Support, Inc. d/b/a FSiEngineers – Decarbonization energy audits – Cost & energy savings

JOSEPH JACKSON, ASSISTANT COUNTY ATTORNEY, REAL ESTATE COMPLIANCE

21 4. Contract – Acquisition of parcels – drainage and utility easements – 9929 Philadelphia Road, 21237 – Mohrs Lane Bridge

LAUREN BUCKLER, DIRECTOR, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS & TRANSPORTATION

24 5. Contract – Cummins-Wagner Company, Inc. – Maintenance of parts & controls – Sewerage Pumping & Treatment Stations

CHRIS MARTIN, DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

28 6. Agreements – (32) – Cooperative Agreements utilizing the State of MD Dept. of Information Technology Consulting and Technical Services+ (CATS+) – Staffing solutions
32 7. Contract – Optimal Geo, LLC – On-call IT professional services

MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS

COUNCIL

39 1. Correspondence - (a) (7) - Non-Competitive Awards (March 6, 2025)
2. Reappointment – Mr. Marks – Board of Appeals – William H. Paulshock, Sr.
3. Reappointment – Mr. Patoka – Board of Appeals – Deborah C. Dopkin
4. Appointment – Mr. Crandell – Baltimore County Planning Board – Jessica Lilli

36 5. Res. 18-25 – Mr. Ertel – Supporting request for the Main Street Maryland designation by the Maryland DHCD

37 6. Res. 19-25 – Councilmembers Kach & Marks – Adoption/incorporation of the Jacksonville Community Plan-Master Plan 2030

7. Appointment – Mr. Crandell – Fair Election Fund Commission – Stacy McNish

Council **Fiscal Note** April 7, 2025

Bill 16-25 **Council District(s) 5**

Mr. Marks

Zoning Regs. – Uses Permitted in the R.C. 5 Zone –
Christmas Tree Farms and Plumbing, Mechanical, and Utility Companies

Bill 16-25 permits by-right certain combinations of Christmas tree farms and plumbing, mechanical, and utility companies in certain areas of the Resource Conservation 5 (R.C. 5) Zone. The bill also permits certain additional related uses if the area is screened and lighted.

The bill permits a combination of a Christmas tree farm and a plumbing, mechanical, and utility company in the R.C. 5 Zone. However, the use must be located:

- on a combination of lots that together are greater than 15 acres in size;
- within the Kingsville regional planning district; and
- east of I-95.

If the property on which the combined use is located has been lighted and screened according to an approved landscape and lighting plan that meets or exceeds County requirements, the following related accessory uses are also permitted:

- warehousing;
- storage, including the outside storage of necessary materials, equipment, and supplies;
- administrative offices; and
- parking of business equipment and vehicles associated with the business.

At the request of the bill's sponsor, the Council voted at its March 17, 2025 legislative session to extend the vote on Bill 16-25 until its legislative session on April 7, 2025. With the affirmative vote of five members of the County Council, Bill 16-25 will take effect 14 days after its enactment.

Bill 18-25 **Council District(s) All**

Mr. Marks

Zoning Regulations – Solar Facilities

Bill 18-25 amends the Baltimore County Zoning Regulations to add a proximity restriction to certain solar facilities. Currently, the County regulates the location of solar facilities that produce no more than two megawatts of alternating current of electricity. Local regulation of solar facilities that produce more electricity than two megawatts is pre-empted by State law and regulations set by the Maryland Public Service Commission.

The Zoning Regulations permit a solar facility only by special exception in the Resource Conservation (R.C.) 2, R.C. 3, R.C. 4, R.C. 5, R.C. 6, R.C. 7, R.C. 8, Business Local (B.L.), Business Major (B.M.), Manufacturing Restricted (M.R.), Manufacturing Light Restricted (M.L.R.), and Manufacturing Heavy (M.H.) Zones. Also, no more than ten solar facilities may be located in a councilmanic district. Bill 18-25 would add an additional requirement that a solar facility shall not be located within 1,000 feet of another property with an existing solar facility or another property for which a petition for special exception has been filed for a solar facility.

With the affirmative vote of five members of the County Council, Bill 18-25 will take effect 14 days after its enactment and shall apply to any project that has not received final, non-appealable approval as of the effective date of Bill 18-25.

Bill 19-25 **Council District(s) All**

Councilmembers Marks, Kach, Ertel, Patoka & Crandell

County Charter – Baltimore County Farmland Preservation Act

Bill 19-25 amends the Baltimore County Charter to revise the process for updating the County's Urban-Rural Demarcation Line (URDL). Today, the area designated as "within" the URDL includes about 90% of the population in the southern third of the County's land, while designating the northern two-thirds "outside" the URDL as rural.

The Baltimore County Planning Board officially adopted the URDL in 1967. The URDL was developed primarily as a growth management tool, providing context for zoning, land-use, and infrastructure decisions.

Definition and Origins of the URDL

The boundaries of the URDL are not formally established in the County Code or the Zoning Regulations. The URDL was adopted by the Planning Board in October 1967 as part of a series of community plans. Formal implementation of the URDL was achieved later in 1967 when the Council enacted Bill 40-67.

Bill 40-67 established a definition of the URDL in the Zoning Regulations, which remains the current definition. The URDL is defined as "a boundary line established by the Planning Board, dividing that portion of Baltimore County considered as 'urban' from that portion of the county considered as 'rural.' In establishing or relocating such line, the Planning Board shall consider population density, existing public water supply and sewerage facilities, other existing public facilities and public facilities scheduled for planning or construction in the capital budget and five-year capital program." In a historical quirk, the main content of Bill 40-67 was the creation of a gas station overlay district, intended to limit the proliferation of gas stations and guide their development throughout the County.

In the years leading to the enactment of Bill 40-67, the County's Office of Planning and Zoning (OPZ) and community groups were grappling with the County's explosive population growth that had occurred throughout the 1950s and 60s. As its definition suggests, the URDL was drawn to mostly coincide with the already established Metropolitan line (the Metro line), the official area

where public water and sewer service was available at cost from Baltimore City. The Metro line and the original URDL generally followed the natural topography of County watersheds and included the lowest elevations in the service area.

Greenbelt – Urban Service Area – Urban Growth Boundary

Understanding why the County implemented the URDL in the first place requires an understanding of three major growth management concepts – the greenbelt, the urban service area, and the urban growth boundary. These concepts are relevant to the history and development of the County's URDL.

A greenbelt is a physical area of open or green space which encircles growth in an urban area. These swaths of conserved open space are intended to be permanent fixtures on the landscape and utilized as accessible park and recreation space for urban dwellers, and are typically created by non-profits or the public through outright purchase of land or development rights.

An urban service area (USA) is a line which limits the extent of public services like water and sewer. Also commonly called a service boundary, this policy tool is committed to providing efficient public services by controlling the timing of development. Jurisdictions can use service boundaries to discourage sprawling development outside of the established limits of these services and encourage infill development where the services already exist.

An urban growth boundary (UGB) is not a preserved physical space like the greenbelt, but a political line which guides growth by separating urban and rural land uses. This policy tool may incorporate or bound an urban service area, but an urban growth boundary typically has more policy objectives than to simply provide efficient services. While they can be used like a USA to provide efficient public services, they are also commonly charged with discouraging sprawl, increasing urban densities, managing the timing of development, and protecting valuable natural resource areas like farmlands, wildlife habitats, and important watershed areas.

Early Years of the URDL

As the above definitions suggest, the URDL is an early example of an urban growth boundary – UGB. However, it is critical to recognize that the URDL was initially drawn to delineate the extent of water and sewer, and guide gas station overlay districts, but had no powers to preserve rural areas of the County. In the first few years of the URDL's existence, developers faced little resistance to build on small lots (as small as ½ acre) outside the new URDL as long as they stuck to private sewerage and water systems. Suburban-style growth was still possible, even with the

1967 URDL. Essentially, without policy beyond the extent of services, the URDL was initially more of a redundant USA tool (considering the Metro line governed the actual provision of water and sewer service) than a traditional UGB.

In 1968, just one year after the creation of the URDL, OPZ began the process of compiling its very first comprehensive master plan. This plan, called the 1980 Guideplan, experienced a preliminary release in 1969, but was not completely adopted until 1972. The plan's purpose was to compile the efforts of the sector plans and significantly update the oldest versions which dated to the 1950s. The Guideplan is the first plan to make use of the URDL and illustrate its importance for planning efforts.

This Guideplan is a great example of the "pull" factors of a USA whereby development is "pulled" to places where public infrastructure already exists and "fills in" these areas. However, a true UGB has not only "pull" pressures from limiting the extent of infrastructure, but "push" forces that deter growth away from rural lands and place them "out of bounds" for development.

Rural Conservation Zones and the URDL

Beginning in 1970, the County established new rural zones that began to remedy the lack of "push" force for the URDL. However, these rural zones did very little to push growth, permitting uses that a modern planner might consider "urban" land uses outside the URDL. Among the reasons for this was that actual permitted land use has always been governed by the zoning map. Since neither the URDL nor the Guideplan themselves had the power to change the zoning map, contradictions often occurred.

In 1974, upon the recommendation of the North County Advisory Group, the County enacted the modern rural conservation zoning classifications to provide the effective "push" needed to deter rural growth and make the URDL a useful UGB. The rural conservation zones were primarily established to address the concerns of rural and farmland preservation that were not being effectively managed outside the URDL under the 1-acre lot scheme. When they came online in 1976, the rural conservation zones finally provided an effective "push" force that could successfully deflect sprawling development away from rural areas to within the confines of the URDL. With the stronger zoning in place, the URDL had transitioned from a simple USA to a more complex and useful UGB tool.

Changes to the URDL

As mentioned above, the URDL as it was originally conceived was intended to fluctuate according to changes in zoning, service capacity, and comprehensive plans. Indeed, the URDL was revised in 1969, 1970, 1972, and 1974 as a result of the above issues. The URDL was again revised in 1975 with the County's next Master Plan, simply called the 1975 Comprehensive Plan. This plan responded to slower growth rates by shrinking the URDL and shifting 58,500 acres of urban land into rural conservation designation. The next major revision of the URDL came in 1984 in response to the State's Chesapeake Bay Critical Area Act. The Planning Board revised the URDL to comply with the Act's 1,000-foot setback of tidal waters. In addition, two new rural conservation zones were established to further implement the URDL revision.

Throughout the 1980s and 1990s, the County's master plans continued to emphasize the importance of the URDL. The 1989-2000 Master Plan, adopted in 1990, stated "in order to retain the county's current structure, the URDL should not be significantly moved. … When it is the only alternative to resolve a clear and present threat to the public health, the URDL should be adjusted to limit service to the existing problem area, and scattered individual instances of sewage system failure should be corrected with on-site technologies."

Smart Growth and the URDL

One of the major events for the URDL occurred with the appearance of state "Smart Growth" legislation in 1997. The Smart Growth and Neighborhood Conservation Act established a number of Smart Growth principles to guide planning at the State and local levels. Among other provisions, this Act required communities to designate Priority Funding Areas (PFAs). The PFAs would guide State funding and subsidies for transportation, infrastructure, and housing. By locating these areas in urban communities, the PFAs were the State's attempt to provide targeted incentives to support redevelopment and revitalization. Balancing the efforts of urban endorsement was a complementary designation called Rural Legacy Areas (RLAs). RLAs were created to receive State grants to support the conservation efforts of local land trusts and county governments. This State money would be used for the purchase of land parcels, as well as the purchase or transfer of development rights to a more urban area.

Due to the URDL framework, Baltimore County had a relatively seamless effort designating its PFAs and RLAs. The PFA became, for the most part, the urban area inside the URDL, and four RLAs were established in areas outside the URDL. Thanks to its historic pattern of urban and rural development reinforced by the URDL, Baltimore County was found to be one of the most successful Smart Growth counties.

The URDL and the Metro Line

The provision of public water and sewer service are governed by the Metro line. While the URDL initially followed the Metro line, there have been several deviations, the most notable of which came in the late 1990s as a result of Chesapeake Bay pollution. OPZ realized the “shore shacks” along the Lower Back River coast could no longer be permitted to retain private septic systems. The coastal location and poor infiltration capabilities of the peninsula soils meant that onsite treatment was incapable of preventing water pollution in the Back and Middle Rivers. Thus, in 1999, the County took steps to install limited water and sewer service in this area outside of the URDL. The URDL was not redrawn to include this area, which retains rural conservation zoning and the Rural Coastal Legacy designation.

While this is the largest single example, the County has periodically extended the Metro line for other projects. The County also continues to extend the Metro line for public health and safety reasons, similar to the above situation.

The URDL Today

In the past two decades, very little about the URDL has changed. OPZ transitioned into the Office and now the Department of Planning, which has continued an unofficial policy that recommends no net-change for the URDL. The idea stipulates that the URDL can “slip” and expand to include a few acres of urban development, as long as it contracts the same acreage in another area. This tradeoff will likely present planners with difficult management issues, not unlike the quality problems experienced in the process of wetland “banking” and construction. The rural quality of one parcel “lost” to urban development may not match the quality of the parcel placed in rural conservation outside the URDL in its stead.

Perhaps the largest recent change to the URDL is the updates in Geographic Information System (GIS) technology. When computerized GIS became widespread in the late-1990s and 2000s, the County initially struggled to digitize the URDL, which began as a simple hand-drawn line across the County. Until the advent of GIS imaging, determining a property's status near the boundary line as either urban or rural was of a highly interpretative nature. As GIS technology allowed for greater resolution, the URDL was revised and developed to more accurately match the County’s GIS standards. This new URDL removes much of the old one's ambiguity while keeping its original intent. The new URDL was reviewed, modified, and subsequently approved by the Planning Board on June 19, 2003. Minor revisions were adopted as follows: September 2, 2004, near Hintzewater Road and Bauers Farm Road; October 21, 2004, near Nicodemus Road;

September 4, 2007, near Vincent Farm Lane and Ebenezer Road; May 21, 2009, near Thornton Mill Road and York Road; and October 1, 2009, near Johnnycake Road and Woodlands Road.

On November 15, 2012, the Planning Board unanimously approved shifting the URDL so that designation of 195 acres adjacent to Gun Road near Patapsco Valley State Park changed from the urban to rural. This URDL adjustment was appropriate since the land was recently zoned for rural residential use. With the Board's vote on the URDL adjustment, development on the affected land would also depend upon passing the County's test for septic systems.

Since then, two changes to the URDL have been considered but not adopted. In 2013, the Department recommended moving the URDL for the Oheb Shalom Cemetery in response to a change in zoning. However, the Council denied a subsequent change to the property's water and sewer designation, negating the need to change the URDL. In 2016, a property owner (Hilltop Residential, LLC) requested a change to the URDL to correspond to their request for a change in their water/sewer designation. The Department recommended waiting until the conclusion of the 2016 Comprehensive Zoning Map Process (CZMP) since the property was subject to a CZMP issue. The Council subsequently did not change the zoning, negating the need for a change to the URDL and the water/sewer designation.

Addressing Misconceptions about the URDL

The following questions and answers are meant to address some common misconceptions about the URDL.

Does the URDL control where water or sewer service may go in the County?

No. The provision of public water and sewer to a property is governed by the Metro line and its boundary. Article 20 of the County Code establishes the process for amending the Metro line boundaries. Further, the level of public water and sewer service a particular property may receive – which is a key aspect of development – is governed by the County's Water and Sewerage Plan.

Does the URDL control whether an undeveloped property may be developed?

No. Every property in the County is assigned a zone which is governed by the County's Zoning Regulations and may be changed every four years during CZMP. These regulations set the specific uses, densities, and other development factors for each zone or overlay district. There are specific rural conservation zones that may only be applied outside of the URDL and prohibit most forms of urban development. In addition, for rural property, particularly farmland, the County

and State have a variety of programs to purchase development rights or that impose easements – both agricultural and environmental – that effectively prohibit development on untouched green space or farmland.

Does the URDL control the provisioning of transportation resources, like road resurfacing, street widening, traffic lights, sidewalks, or traffic calming devices?

No. These are all governed by a combination of laws, regulations, and polices set by the State and County. Where the URDL is mentioned or used in these processes, it is in the context of priority and projects and funding. However, these are not explicitly tied to the URDL itself – they are tied to designations of State-based priority funding areas.

Does the URDL control the provisioning of quasi-public services like power, landlines, cable television, or internet?

No. The Maryland Public Service Commission regulates where utilities must provide service. Cable TV and internet locations are governed by agreements between those service providers and the County.

Does the URDL control the location or type of public safety services in the County?

No. The County's Police and Fire Departments have a duty to respond to any and all calls for service, regardless of location. However, the Fire Department does rely on volunteer fire companies to service certain rural areas.

Bill 19-25

Bill 19-25 adds a new section to the Miscellaneous Article of the County Charter. This new section will state "any changes, revisions, or amendments to the boundaries of the Urban-Rural Demarcation Line (URDL) shall require the recommendation of the Planning Board and approval by the affirmative vote of a majority plus one of the total number of county council members established by this charter, including the affirmative vote of the county council member or members in whose district the change, revision, or amendment is located."

As the historical content herein suggests, requiring approval of the Council will permit the Council to exercise direct decision-making over proposed changes or amendments to the URDL, rather than its current indirect involvement such as with requested changes to zoning during CZMP or water/sewer designations on specific properties.

If passed by the affirmative vote of five Councilmembers and approved by County voters on November 3, 2026, the amendment shall stand adopted and become a part of the Charter from and after the thirtieth day following said election.

Acknowledgement

Much of the content of this note was adapted from The Historic Roots of Green Urban Policy in Baltimore County, Maryland, by Erin E. Pierce, June 2010. Additional content was sourced from Pioneer on the Frontier of Smart Growth: the Baltimore County, MD Experience, by Donald C. Outen, Oct. 2007. Additional content regarding recent changes to the URDL was provided by the Baltimore County Department of Planning.

Bill 20-25 **Council District(s) __All__**

Mr. Marks

Parking of Recreational Vehicles on Public Roads

Bill 20-25 transfers a prohibition on parking a recreational vehicle on public roads from the Baltimore County Zoning Regulations to the County Code.

Currently, the parking or storing of recreational vehicles (RVs) on residential lots is governed by Section 415A.1 of the Zoning Regulations. Among other requirements and prohibitions, Section 415A.1.D states that a person may not park or store an RV on any street in a residential zone except during a 24-hour period for the purpose of loading and unloading.

Enforcement of the Zoning Regulations is carried out by Code Enforcement. However, Code Enforcement has limited abilities to enforce Section 415A.1.D when an RV is not parked directly outside of the owner's residence. In such a circumstance, the parking of an RV in a residential zone is more akin to the parking of a commercial vehicle in a residential zone, which is prohibited under Section 18-2-206 of the County Code and enforced by the County Police Department.

Accordingly, Bill 20-25 transfers the prohibition against parking an RV on a public road in a residential zone to Section 18-2-206 of the Code. The 24-hour exception for loading and unloading is also transferred. This also transfers enforcement authority from Code Enforcement to the Police Department.

With the affirmative vote of five members of the County Council, Bill 20-25 will take effect 14 days after its enactment.

Bill 21-25 **Council District(s) __All__**

Councilmembers Kach & Marks

Zoning Regulations – Solar Facilities – Siting Requirements

Bill 21-25 amends the Baltimore County Zoning Regulations to prohibit certain solar facilities on land that constitutes prime farmland. Currently, the County regulates the location of solar facilities that produce no more than two megawatts of alternating current of electricity. Local regulation of solar facilities that produce more electricity than two megawatts is pre-empted by State law and regulations set by the Maryland Public Service Commission.

The Zoning Regulations permit a solar facility only by special exception in the Resource Conservation (R.C.) 2, R.C. 3, R.C. 4, R.C. 5, R.C. 6, R.C. 7, R.C. 8, Business Local (B.L.), Business Major (B.M.), Manufacturing Restricted (M.R.), Manufacturing Light Restricted (M.L.R.), and Manufacturing Heavy (M.H. Zones). Solar facilities located in an R.C. Zone are subject to several siting requirements. These include prohibitions on siting solar facilities on land encumbered by agricultural preservation easement, an environmental preservation easement, or a rural legacy easement, in a County historic district, or on a property that is listed on the Baltimore County Final Landmarks List. Bill 21-25 adds a new prohibition on the siting of a solar facility in an R.C Zone. Such a facility may not be sited on land that constitutes Prime Farmland as that term is defined by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA).

Prime farmland, as defined by the USDA, is land that has the best combination of physical and chemical characteristics for producing food, feed, forage, fiber, and oilseed crops and is available for these uses. It could be cultivated land, pastureland, forestland, or other land, but it is not urban or built-up land or water areas. The soil qualities, growing season, and moisture supply are those needed for the soil to economically produce sustained high yields of crops when proper management, including water management, and acceptable farming methods are applied.

In general, prime farmland has an adequate and dependable supply of moisture from precipitation or irrigation, a favorable temperature and growing season, acceptable acidity or alkalinity, an acceptable salt and sodium content, and few or no rocks. It is permeable to water and air. It is not excessively erodible or saturated with water for long periods, and it either is not frequently flooded during the growing season or is protected from flooding.

With the affirmative vote of five members of the County Council, Bill 21-25 will take effect 14 days after its enactment.

FM-1 (2 Contracts) **Council District(s) All**

Property Management

Asbestos Abatement and Re-insulation Services

The Administration is requesting approval of two contracts, with Islas General Cleaning Services Inc. and SanDow Construction, Inc., to provide on-call asbestos abatement and re-insulation services at various County-owned and/or operated facilities. Each contract commences upon Council approval, continues for 1 year, and will renew automatically for four additional 1-year periods with the option to extend the initial term or any renewal term an additional 120 days. The contracts provide that compensation may not exceed the amount appropriated for these services for the entire contract term. Property Management advised that estimated compensation for both contractors combined totals $561,848 for the entire 5-year and 4-month term, including the renewal and extension periods. See Exhibit A.

Fiscal Summary

Funding Source	Combined Total Compensation	
County (1)	$ 561,848	
State	--	
Federal	--	
Other	--	
Total	$ 561,848	(2)

Notes

(1) General Fund Operating Budget and/or Capital Projects Fund.
(2) Estimate for the entire 5-year and 4-month term.

Analysis

The contractors will furnish all labor, fuel, materials, tools, equipment, and supervision to perform the required asbestos abatement and re-insulation work at various County-owned and/or operated facilities as needed. Property Management advised that the County will assign work to the contractor with the lowest quoted price and/or fastest response time for each project.

Unit prices for commodities to be provided by the contractors range from $1 (per asbestos removal bag) to $85 (per roll of poly sheeting), depending on the contractor. Hourly labor rates range from $30 to $68.25, depending on the type of service (asbestos removal or insulation), the hours worked (regular or overtime), and contractor. Markup on subcontractors and equipment rental costs range from 30% to 90% and 20% to 90%, respectively, depending on the contractor.

Each contract commences upon Council approval, continues for 1 year, and will renew automatically for four additional 1-year periods with the option to extend the initial term or any renewal term an additional 120 days on the same terms and conditions, unless the County provides notice of non-renewal. The contracts provide that compensation may not exceed the amount appropriated for these services for the entire contract term. Property Management advised that estimated compensation for both contractors combined totals $561,848 for the entire 5-year and 4-month term, including the renewal and extension periods

Prior to the commencement of each renewal period, the County may entertain a request for an escalation in unit prices in accordance with the Consumer Price Index – All Urban Consumers – United States Average – All Items (CPI-U), as published by the United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics at the time of the request, or up to a maximum 5% increase on the current pricing, whichever is lower. The County may terminate the agreements by providing 30 days prior written notice.

The County awarded the contracts through a competitive procurement process based on low bid, qualifications, value, and experience from five bids received. The contracts establish a 15% M/WBE participation requirement.

On June 1, 2020, the Council approved two similar 5-year and 4-month contracts not to exceed $1,433,586 combined with Retro Environmental, Inc. (the primary contractor), and Goel Services, Inc. (the secondary contractor). Property Management advised that the County terminated the contract with Goel Services, Inc. on June 30, 2022 before expending any funds. According to the County's financial system, as of March 17, 2025, expenditures/encumbrances under the contract with Retro Environmental, Inc. totaled $234,391.

County Charter, Section 715, requires that "any contract must be approved by the County Council before it is executed if the contract is…for services for a term in excess of two years or involving the expenditure of more than $25,000 per year…."

Executive Summary

Property Management is requesting the approval of contracts with SanDow Construction Inc. and Islas General Cleaning Services Inc. to provide all labor, materials, tools, equipment, supervision and all necessary incidentals to perform Asbestos Abatement and Re-insulation at various locations in Baltimore County on an as-needed basis, in accordance with the bid specifications.

In no event shall the total compensation paid to the Contractors exceed the sum of the County Council approved appropriated amount during the entire term of this Agreement including renewals thereof. The Agreement shall be effective when it has been properly signed by all parties and when executed by the County and shall continue through one year (the “Initial Term”). The County reserves the right to renew this Agreement for four (4) additional one (1) year renewal options on the same terms and conditions. The County shall have the option of extending this Agreement at the end of the Initial Term or any renewal term for an additional 120 days on the same terms and conditions.

This Agreement has a MBE/WBE goal of 15%.

Prior to the commencement of subsequent renewal terms, the County may entertain a request for an escalation in accordance with the current Consumer Price Index – All Urban Consumers – United States Average – All Items (CPI-U), as published by the United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics at the time of the request, or up to a maximum 5% increase on the current pricing, whichever is lower.

Prepared by: Property Management

FM-3 (Contract Amendment) **Council District(s) 6**

Department of Environmental Protection and Sustainability

Decarbonization Energy Audits – Cost & Energy Savings

The Administration is requesting approval of an amendment to a contract with Facility Support, Incorporated dba FSi Engineers for retro-commissioning services for the Eastern Family Resource Center and the Jefferson Building; under the proposed amendment, which commences upon Council approval, the contractor will also conduct comprehensive decarbonization audits of the two facilities. The Department advised that the proposed amendment increases the estimated compensation of the contract by $39,374, from $269,876 to $309,250, for the entire 3-year and 4-month term, including the renewal and extension periods. The contract commenced March 20, 2023. See Exhibit A.

Fiscal Summary

Funding Source	Contract Amendment	Current Estimated Compensation	Amended Estimated Compensation	
County (1)	$ 39,374	$ 269,876	$ 309,250	
State	--	--	--	
Federal	--	--	--	
Other	--	--	--	
Total	$ 39,374	$ 269,876	$ 309,250	(2)

(1) Capital Projects Fund.
(2) Estimate for the entire 3-year and 4-month term.

Analysis

On March 20, 2023, the Council approved the original 3-year and 4-month contract with FSi Engineers for retro-commissioning (RCx) services (i.e., systematic evaluations of facility systems

and implementation of cost-effective measures targeted to reduce energy consumption and improve facility operations). The Executive Office previously advised that as a commercial and natural gas customer of Baltimore Gas and Electric (BGE), the County is eligible to receive financial incentives for energy improvements under several programs, including the BGE Tune-Up program, also known as the RCx program; the program identifies equipment, system, and operational improvements and provides guidance and training on how to operate and maintain facilities optimally. The contractor serves as the County's BGE-approved Resource Service Provider (RSP) and works collaboratively with the County through the program application process and then provides full-service analyses, reporting, and implementation of approved facility improvement measures. The Department advised that the Eastern Family Resource Center and Jefferson Building were accepted into the RCx program. Services under the contract include full-site investigation and review of system performance, developing recommended energy conservation measures through lifecycle assessment and energy modeling, planning and leading the design of upgrades, and design and implementation of measurement and verification. Services were conducted in six phases: application, planning, investigation, implementation, hand-off, and measurement/verification.

The contract provides that the contractor would complete the first three phases at a cost of $43,330, and the County would require a price quote from the contractor for the three remaining phases; the County reserved the right to accept or reject the contractor's quote and solicit quotes from other RSPs. The Department advised that at the time the contract was approved (March 20, 2023), the contractor's initial estimate for the second three phases was $37,800; however, the contractor's final quote for the second three phases, which the County accepted, totaled $226,546 due to the County electing an expanded range of energy efficiency and conservation measures.

The proposed amendment, which commences upon Council approval, adds a scope of work that incorporates technical and cost analyses related to decarbonization and electrification of the Eastern Family Resource Center and Jefferson Building. The Department advised that while the contractor has provided preliminary high-level recommendations on changing to electric options in major systems, the County requires detailed audits with specific decarbonization recommendations, including cost and technical analyses for HVAC and water heating systems, for the two facilities. The Department further advised that the proposed amendment increases the estimated compensation by $39,374, from $269,876 to $309,250 for the entire 3-year and 4-month term, including the renewal and extension periods. All other terms and conditions remain the same. The Department advised that as of March 21, 2025, expenditures/encumbrances under the contract totaled $269,876.

The County awarded the original contract through a competitive procurement process based on qualifications and experience from five proposals received (one of which was withdrawn by the respondent). According to the bid documents, there was a 20% M/WBE participation requirement.

The Department advised that the Eastern Family Resource Center and the Jefferson Building are 2 of 26 buildings for which the County intends to obtain decarbonization audits. The Department further advised that as part of the RCx program, BGE will cover 85% of the cost of improvements, up to $100,000 per building. The Department advised that under a separate BGE initiative, audits for six additional major facilities are underway.

County Charter, Section 715, requires that "any contract must be approved by the County Council before it is executed if the contract is…for services for a term in excess of two years or involving the expenditure of more than $25,000 per year…."

Executive Summary

In March 2023, Baltimore County contracted FSi Engineers to retro-commission two major facilities, Jefferson Office Building and Eastern Family Resource Center (EFRC). FSi Engineers conducted retro-commissioning activities according to the requirements of the BGE Smart Energy Savers Retro-Commissioning Program. Retro-commissioning is a systematic assessment process for optimizing the performance of an existing building by identifying and implementing relatively low-cost operational and maintenance improvements.

FSi Engineers completed reports in 2024 with a list of potential energy conservation measures found during the retro-commissioning process and calculated potential energy savings for each potential energy conservation measure. The County elected to contract with FSi Engineers for the implementation phase, and measurement/verification phase services phases, with comprehensive project completion expected in October 2025.

As the County continues to build out strategies and annual cost estimates to meet compliance with the State Building Energy Performance Standards (BEPS) (which currently have certain GHG emissions reductions goals, including net zero direct GHG emissions by 2040), the County seeks to procure consultation services to develop a full decarbonization plan for 26 County buildings subject to BEPS, the main focus of which will be providing technical recommendations and associated annual cost estimates for electrification of major building systems to reduce emissions.

The goal and benefit of adding a scope of services to FSi Engineer's existing contract for retro-commissioning services is to incorporate the required technical and cost analysis for decarbonization/ electrification for the two in-scope facilities. As part of the phase I report delivered during the investigation and planning phase for retro-commissioning, FSi Engineers prepared preliminary high-level recommendations on changing to electric options in major systems, however the County requires a more detailed analysis consisting of:

- Cost and technical analysis for HVAC and domestic water heating systems with specific decarbonization recommendations.
- Cost analysis to include capital costs and operational costs. Identify, recommend and rank, based on lifecycle and initial capital cost up to three (3) electrical equipment options to replace the existing fossil fuel-fired equipment for each facility.
- The technical and cost analyses will include considerations of any required upgrades to the site's electrical infrastructure to install the recommended system(s).
- The technical and cost analyses will include any required adjustments or replacement of the existing heat distribution and/or combustion exhaust systems.
- The portfolio analysis shall include a January 1, 2025, to January 1, 2040, GHG reduction and budget timeline to display a portfolio-wide 20% reduction in direct GHG emissions on or before January 1, 2030, and net-zero direct GHG emissions on or before January 1, 2040.

The County has an existing contract with FSi Engineers (SCON# 10001601) for retro-commissioning services. This addition would be a value-add to the County at fair market pricing that was attained through competitive solicitation, without having to develop and release a new solicitation. As part of the retro-commissioning process, FSi has already done some of the preliminary work required for the decarbonization analysis.

Prepared by: Department of Environmental Protection and Sustainability

FM-4 (Contract) **Council District(s) 5**

Office of Law – Real Estate Compliance Division

Acquisition of Parcels – Drainage and Utility Easements – 9929 Philadelphia Road, 21237 – Mohrs Lane Bridge

The Administration is requesting approval of a contract to acquire land and easement access spanning, in total, approximately 0.791 acre for $246,100 to facilitate roadway improvements needed to accommodate the Mohrs Lane Bridge #143 replacement over the CSX railroad tracks. Ronald L. Davies and Judith P. Davies, Trustees, currently own the property, which is located at 9929 Philadelphia Road in Rosedale. The Office advised that the property is zoned ML-IM (Manufacturing, Light – Industrial, Major District). The acquired land will be used for highway widening areas and the easements will be used for drainage and utility easements, revertible slope easements, and temporary construction areas. See Exhibit A.

Fiscal Summary

Funding Source	Purchase Price		Notes
County	$ 246,100	(1)	(1) Capital Projects Fund.
State	--		
Federal	--		
Other	--		
Total	$ 246,100		

Analysis

The County's appraisal consultant, Peabody Associates, LLC, completed an appraisal of the property effective October 6, 2024, recommending a value of $246,100. After review and analysis, the County's staff review appraiser concurred with the appraisal, recommending the respective amount as just compensation for the acquisition. The Office advised that the property owner accepted the County's offer.

The total 0.791-acre property to be acquired, including the land (0.435 acre), drainage and utility easements (0.087 acre), revertible slope easements (0.088 acre), and the temporary construction area (0.181 acre), is part of a larger 5.607-acre parcel that is improved with a small outbuilding, lawn and landscaping, as well as significant wooded natural vegetation.

The Mohrs Lane roadway improvements will extend approximately 950 ft. toward MD Rt. 7 (Philadelphia Road) and approximately 300 ft. toward US Rt. 40 west of the Mohrs Lane Bridge. The Office advised that, in total, 9 acquisitions are needed for this project, and following approval of the proposed acquisition, approximately 5 remaining acquisitions will require Council approval.

The Council has previously approved contracts for 3 properties totaling $477,212. The Office advised that estimated project costs total $14.4 million for the roadway improvements and bridge replacement on Mohrs Lane, including $10.7 million for construction costs. The Department of Public Works and Transportation advised that this project is part of the larger Campbell Boulevard project; the amount presently earmarked for the larger project totals $30.7 million, including $19.3 million in County bonds, $8.9 million in federal funds, and $2.5 million from developers. The Office further advised that, as of March 13, 2025, $2.0 million has been expended/encumbered for the Mohrs Lane project, excluding the cost of this acquisition. The Office also advised that the County plans to advertise for the construction phase of the project in November 2026; construction will begin in June 2027 and will be completed in June 2029.

County Charter, Section 715, requires Council approval of real property acquisitions where the purchase price exceeds $5,000.

Executive Summary

PROGRAM TITLE:	Bridge #143 Replacement Mohrs Lane (RW13-088)
PROJECT NO.:	210-205-0376-A004
FISCAL MATTER:	Contract of Sale
PROPERTY OWNERS:	Ronald Davies and Judith Davies
Property Interest to be Acquired:	Total Fee Simple Easement = 18,942 SF (14,625 SF – Highway Widening and 4,317 – Area in Paving) Total Revertible Slope Easement = 3,833 SF Total Drainage and Utility Easement = 3,806 SF Total Temporary Construction Easement = 7,895 SF (Temporary Construction Easement (with supporting slopes) = 3,800 SF and Temporary Construction Easement = 4,095 SF)
LOCATION:	9929 Philadelphia Road Rosedale, MD 21237
CONSIDERATION:	$246,100.00
PURPOSE OF PROJECT:	Baltimore County is improving Mohrs Lane to accommodate the proposed Mohrs Lane bridge.
LIMITS OF PROJECT:	Road improvements will extend approximately 950 linear feet towards MD Rt. 7 and approximately 300 linear feet towards US Rt. 40 beyond the bridge.

Prepared by: Office of Law – Real Estate Compliance Division

FM-5 (Contract) **Council District(s) All**

Department of Public Works and Transportation

Maintenance of Parts & Controls – Sewerage Pumping & Treatment Stations

The Administration is requesting approval of a contract with Cummins-Wagner Company, Inc. to fabricate and repair customized machined parts used in the County's sewage pumping and treatment stations. The contract commences upon Council approval, continues for 1 year, and will renew automatically for four additional 1-year periods with the option to extend the initial term or any renewal term an additional 120 days. The contract provides that compensation may not exceed the amount appropriated for these services for the entire contract term. The Department advised that estimated compensation totals $75,000 for the entire 5-year and 4-month term, including the renewal and extension periods. See Exhibit A.

Fiscal Summary

Funding Source	Total Compensation	Notes
County (1)	$ 75,000	(1) Metropolitan District Funds.
State	--	(2) Estimate for the entire 5-year and 4-month term.
Federal	--	
Other	--	
Total	$ 75,000 (2)	

Analysis

The contractor will provide all labor, materials, tools, and equipment necessary for the fabrication and repair of customized machined parts used in the County's sewage pumping and treatment stations. The Department advised that typically, the County will deliver a part to the contractor for reproduction; however, on-site fabrication or repairs may be required. Reproduction time will typically be required within 5 days of the request; however, in emergency situations, the contractor

may be required to produce the part within 2 days. Hourly rates for labor are $110 or $165 depending on the time status (regular or overtime). Mobilization charges are $110 for regular time and $165 for overtime. The mark-up on materials and subcontractor labor is 20%.

The contract commences upon Council approval, continues for 1 year, and will renew automatically for four additional 1-year periods with the option to extend the initial term or any renewal term an additional 120 days on the same terms and conditions, unless the County provides notice of non-renewal. The contract provides that compensation may not exceed the amount appropriated for these services for the entire contract term. The Department advised that estimated compensation totals $75,000 for the entire 5-year and 4-month term, including the renewal and extension periods. The County may terminate the agreement by providing 30 days prior written notice.

The Department requested that the proposed contract be designated as a noncompetitive 902(f) award secured in the best interest of the County. The Department advised that the contractor has a long working history with the County and has precise measurements of the County's pumping station parts that enable it to provide services more quickly and at a fraction of the cost of the County purchasing replacement parts from manufacturers or other machine shops. The Department further advised that the contractor's quick turnaround time is essential in emergency situations in which delays could lead to a damaged pumps and pump stations and health and safety concerns related to sanitary sewer overflows.

On January 21, 2020, the Council approved a similar 5-year and 3-month contract (which commenced October 6, 2019), not to exceed $365,000 with Cummins-Wagner Company, Inc. dba EESCO Pump and Valve. According to the County's financial system, as of March 17, 2025, expenditures/encumbrances under the contract totaled $100,426. The contract expired December 3, 2024. The Department advised that to the best of its knowledge, no services have been provided since the contract's expiration.

County Charter, Section 902(f), states that "when… [competitive] bidding is not appropriate, a contract shall be awarded only by competitive negotiations, unless such negotiations are not feasible. When neither competitive bidding nor competitive negotiations are feasible, contracts may be awarded by noncompetitive negotiations."

County Charter, Section 715, requires that “any contract must be approved by the County Council before it is executed if the contract is…for services for a term in excess of two years or involving the expenditure of more than $25,000 per year….”

Executive Summary

Scope of Contract: Contractor shall furnish all labor, materials, tools, and equipment for repairing pump parts for Sewage Pumping and Treatment Stations within The Bureau of Utilities. This will be supplemental support for work beyond the scope of what Pumping and Treatment employees can perform. Work will be performed in the Sewage Pumping and Treatment Stations and offsite.

Purpose: DPWT operates and maintains 120 sewage pump stations throughout the County. These stations operate 24/7 and any downtime can lead to sewage overflows that result is fines from the State to the County. The Bureau of Utilities is always looking for ways to make sure they have access to repair parts in emergency situations. This contract will be used when things break unexpectedly and need to be machined to fit into existing pump systems.

EESCO Pump and Valve is a subsidiary of Cummins Wagner Holdings. They fabricate and repair pump parts such as sleeves, wear rings, impellers, and other parts deemed necessary.

These parts need to be machined precisely down to the thousandth of an inch. If not done correctly the part will not fit or can fail leading to further damage of the pump. EESCO has measurement and calibration records for parts that are used in at least thirty-six (36) sewage pumping stations. Having these records on hand allows EESCO to produce or repair needed parts in a timely manner. If another machine shop were to be used large delays would be incurred while the company takes the precise measurements, they need to be able to replicate parts.

Getting parts directly from the proprietary manufacturers can take several weeks to months for delivery, DPWT has seen EESCO able to machine the part in a fraction of this time leading to faster repairs. Additionally, the County has seen items produced by EESCO also are typically cheaper than buying new stock parts with some items being 50-60% cheaper.

Contract Value: $ 75,000

Term: The County reserves the right to renew this contract for up to four (4) additional one-year renewal options under the same terms and conditions.

Vendor Selection Method: 902(f) non-competitive procurement

MBE/WBE: N/A

Prepared by: The Department of Public Works and Transportation

FM-6 (32 Contracts) **Council District(s) All**

Office of Information Technology

Cooperative Agreements Utilizing the State of MD Dept. of Information Technology Consulting and Technical Services+ (CATS+) – Staffing Solutions

The Administration is requesting approval of 32 contracts (*as amended) to provide the Office of Information Technology with supplemental staffing solutions, as needed. The County solicited bids from the more than 800 contractors who participate in the State of Maryland's Department of Information Technology (DoIT) Consulting and Technical Services+ (CATS+) contract program. The 32 proposed contracts for supplemental staffing solutions on the current agenda reflect the second grouping of contracts awarded under the bid solicitation to be presented to the Council for approval. The Council approved 38 contracts on March 17, 2025, under the first grouping of contracts. The Office advised that up to 47 additional contracts awarded under the same solicitation will be presented to the Council on upcoming agendas. The 32 contracts commence upon Council approval, continue through April 21, 2028, and will automatically renew to match any renewal periods granted by the State, with the option to extend the initial term or any renewal term an additional 120 days. Each contract states that compensation may not exceed the amount appropriated for these services during the entire contract term. The Office advised that estimated compensation for all contracts awarded under the solicitation totals $12.2 million for the entire approximate 3-year and 6-month-plus term, including the renewal and extension periods. See Exhibit A.

Fiscal Summary

Funding Source	Combined Total Compensation	
County (1)	$ 12,200,000	
State	--	
Federal	--	
Other	--	
Total	$ 12,200,000	(2)

Notes

(1) General Fund Operating Budget and/or Capital Projects Fund, (Enhanced Productivity Thru Technology Fund).

(2) Estimated combined compensation for all contracts awarded under the solicitation for the entire 3-year and 6-month-plus term, including the renewal and extension periods.

Analysis

On October 27, 2023, the County issued a request for proposals (RFP) to all 800+ Master Contractors under the State of Maryland CATS+ contract program with the goal of procuring supplemental staffing solutions for Baltimore County. The Office advised that it received 123 responses to its solicitation, and the County plans to award up to 117 contracts. The 32 proposed contracts reflect the second grouping of contracts under the solicitation to be presented to the Council for approval:

1. Applied Technology Services, Inc.
2. Ardent Technologies, Inc.
3. Artisys Corporation-Government Services Division
4. ASR Tech Group Inc.
5. Assyst, Inc.
6. BAC, LLC
7. Barrow Wise Consulting, LLC
8. Birch Advisors, LLC
9. C.A. Systems Company A/K/A Computer Aid, Inc.
10. CAS Severn, Inc.
11. Creative Information Technology Inc. (CITI)
12. Cybernate Technology Solutions, LLC
13. G.R. Patel & Associates, Inc. (GRPA)
14. Hi-Tech Business Systems, Inc.
15. Icube Systems, Inc.
16. JASINT Consulting and Technologies, LLC
17. KCI Technologies, Inc.
18. Lancesoft, Inc.
19. Matrix Systems and Technologies Inc.
20. Navitas Business Consulting, Inc.
21. Netorian Limited Liability Company
22. Oakland Consulting Group, Inc.
23. Powersolv, Inc.
24. Resourcesys Inc.
25. TalTeam, Inc.
26. Triwave Solutions Inc.
27. V Group Inc.
28. Vinsys Information Technology, Inc.
29. Vivsoft Technologies LLC
30. Vtech Solution, Inc.
31. ZC Solutions, LLC
32. ZDAAS LLC

The contractors will provide the County with skilled personnel from 115 wide-ranging labor categories (e.g., systems engineer, computer programmer) for specific projects. The Office advised that when it requires supplemental staff, it will issue a specific request for proposals to all of the qualified CATS+ contractors. The Office's contract management committee will evaluate the proposals and assign the work to the CATS+ contractor whose proposal represents the best value for the County. The Office of Budget and Finance, Purchasing Division previously advised that this second level of competition, which necessitates the large number of contractors, will ensure that the County receives the best value for each required supplemental staffing request.

The County's RFP required that each respondent's maximum labor rates be equal to or less than those stated in its respective State CATS+ contract. Upon selection by the Office's contract management committee, contractors will be paid hourly rates in accordance with the prices set forth in their respective County-specific proposals; prices typically vary depending on the job classification. For the 32 proposed contracts presented on this agenda, hourly compensation ranges from $31.01 to $798.16 (through April 21, 2025), depending on the contractor and labor

category, and labor rates increase annually (each April 22nd) for new assignments based on each contractor's escalation rate. The Office advised that because the solicitation required that each contractor bid for all 115 labor categories, a contractor's unusually high hourly labor rate for any given category would imply that the contractor is not interested in competing against other bidders for that particular labor category. The County Attorney and the Council's Legislative Counsel/Secretary have advised that County Charter Section 801(5) and County Code Section 4-6-101, which divide County government employees into the classified and exempt services and set forth pay ranges for employees in the exempt service (including consultants), are not applicable to the proposed contracts because the contractors "are not 'employees' of Baltimore County as contemplated by those sections, and therefore…not covered under the requirements and limitations of those sections."

The contracts commence upon Council approval, continue through April 21, 2028, and will automatically renew to match any renewal periods granted by the State, with the option to extend the initial term or any renewal term an additional 120 days on the same terms and conditions, unless the County provides notice of non-renewal. The Office of Law advised that the County may not utilize the contracts until all potential 117 contracts that may be awarded under the same solicitation have been considered for Council approval. Each contract states that compensation may not exceed the amount appropriated for these services during the entire contract term. The Office advised that estimated combined compensation for all contractors awarded a contract under the solicitation totals $12.2 million for the entire approximate 3-year and 6-month-plus term, including the renewal and extension periods. The County may terminate the agreements by providing 30 days prior written notice.

The Office advised that the State's RFP associated with the CATS+ contract program closed on August 12, 2012 with a term of April 22, 2013 through April 21, 2028. The Office advised that the State CATS+ program has a 20% M/WBE participation requirement, with sub-requirements for women-owned businesses of 8%, African American-owned businesses of 7%, and Hispanic American-owned businesses of 2% for the aggregate of all tasks awarded.

County Charter, Section 715, requires that "any contract must be approved by the County Council before it is executed if the contract is…for services for a term in excess of two years or involving the expenditure of more than $25,000 per year…."

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Summary: This fiscal matter is for the County to establish Cooperative Agreements utilizing the State of Maryland Department of Information Technology (DoIT) Consulting and Technical Services+ (CATS+) for staffing solutions, as needed. The Contractors shall provide these services for supplemental staff engagements using one or more of the 115 labor categories.

DoIT RFP 060B2490023 closed on August 12, 2012 with a current contract term of April 22, 2013 through April 21, 2028. To date the state has awarded 827 CATS+ Master Contractors through competitive solicitation. The solicitation is re-opened every 3 years to allow new vendors the chance to submit a proposal to become a Master Contractor under the CATS+ program.

The overall CATS+ Master Contract MBE subcontractor participation goal is 20% with sub-goals for Women-owned of 8 %, African American-owned of 7% and Hispanic American-owned of 2% for the aggregate of all task orders awarded. Each task will be reviewed and assigned a goal prior to soliciting based on the Procurement Review Group (PRG).

The County solicited a TORFP (23-005-TSP) to all the Master Contractors under the State of Maryland CATSPlus Master Contract incorporating additional requirements as required Baltimore County, Maryland.

History In 2016, the County issued RFP No. P-145 for Information Technology Consulting and Technical Services. Twenty-four contracts were awarded, all of which had a seven-year term with one 120-day period renewal option.

Purpose The purpose of awarding contracts is to provide the County the ability to procure IT technical and consulting services in a timely and cost-effective manner for supplemental staffing by issuing task orders specific to the needs.

Fiscal Impact The contracts will become effective when executed by the County and shall continue through April 21, 2028 the Initial Term. Encumbrances will be made whenever staffing solution services are procured as part of a TORFP. A Purchase Order will be issued to the awarded Contractor at that time with the funding information.

Prepared by: Office of Information Technology

FM-7 (Contract) **Council District(s) All**

Office of Information Technology

On-Call IT Professional Services

The Administration is requesting approval of contract with Optimal GEO, LLC d/b/a Optimal Geo Inc., a Woolpert Company, to assist the County with its efforts to define best practices and to design software and process standards associated with the planning, development, implementation, and post-implementation of a strategic asset management system (AMS) for the Department of Public Works and Transportation. The contract commences upon Council approval, continues through January 3, 2028, and will automatically renew to match any renewal periods granted under the U.S. General Services Administration (GSA) contract (from which the proposed contract was cooperatively procured); the Office advised that the GSA has added renewals through January 3, 2038 but is unable to confirm how the renewals will be structured (e.g., ten 1-year renewals, two 5-year renewals). The contract includes the option to extend the initial term or any renewal term an additional 120 days. Compensation may not exceed $5,000,000 for the entire approximate 13-year and 1-month term, including the renewal and extension periods. See Exhibit A.

Fiscal Summary

Funding Source	Maximum Compensation	
County (1)	$ 5,000,000	
State	--	
Federal	--	
Other	--	
Total	$ 5,000,000	(2)

Notes

(1) Capital Projects Fund (Enhanced Productivity Thru Technology Fund).

(2) For the entire approximate 13-year and 1-month term, including the renewal and extension periods.

Analysis

The proposed contractor (formerly d/b/a Woolpert, Inc.– Woolpert, Inc. acquired Optimal Geo, Inc. in 2021) has worked with the County since 2016 to define best practices and to design software and process standards to assist the County in its efforts to move toward delivering improved and advanced technology on a consolidated enterprise platform. OIT advised that through the prior contract with Woolpert, Inc./Optimal Geo, the Department of Public Works and Transportation adopted an industry-standard, asset management-based approach to maintaining and replacing major public works such as utilities, road surfaces, and solid waste facilities. To support that approach, the County has deployed enterprise management technology, including the Cityworks work order system and ESRI GIS, to each of the work units supporting those assets. OIT advised that under the proposed contract, the contractor will help to deploy the enterprise asset management system to traffic engineering, signs and signals, and other structures (e.g., bridges).

The contract commences upon Council approval, continues through January 3, 2028, and will renew automatically to match any renewal periods granted under the U.S. General Services Administration (GSA) contract (from which the proposed contract has been cooperatively procured); the Office advised that the GSA has added renewals through January 3, 2038 but is unable to confirm how the renewals will be structured (e.g., ten 1-year renewals, two 5-year renewals). The contract includes the option to extend the initial term or any renewal term an additional 120 days on the same terms and conditions, unless the County provides notice of non-renewal. Compensation may not exceed $5,000,000 for the entire approximate 13-year and 1-month term, including the renewal and extension periods. The County may terminate the agreement by providing 30 days prior written notice.

The contract states that the contractor will provide the County with personnel at the authorized GSA pricing or better. Authorized hourly labor rates range from $48.34 to $193.88 (through January 3, 2026) depending on the labor category (e.g., survey technician, program manager), and labor rates increase annually (each January 4th) by 2.5% (through the initial term) for new assignments.

The County awarded the contract as a cooperative procurement of a competitively bid GSA contract. The Office advised that there is not an M/WBE participation requirement.

On June 6, 2016, the Council approved the similar 3-year and 2-month contract (including an optional 120 day extension) with Woolpert, Inc. with compensation not to exceed $3,960,000. On

August 5, 2019, during the 120-day extension period, the Council approved an amendment to extend the contract term through April 6, 2024 with an additional 120-day extension option. The contract expired April 6, 2024; the Office advised that the County did not exercise the second 120-day extension. The County's financial system indicated that as of March 18, 2025, expenditures under the contract totaled $1,619,702, including $6,965 for services provided after the contract's expiration.

County Charter, Section 715, requires that "any contract must be approved by the County Council before it is executed if the contract is…for services for a term in excess of two years or involving the expenditure of more than $25,000 per year…."

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

History – The Office of Information Technology continues to support and maintain multiple applications, many of which support Baltimore County Government services provided to County citizens. Woolpert Inc has provided Information Technology Professional Services since 2016 to plan, develop and implement a strategic asset management system (AMS). In 2021, Woolpert Inc acquired Optimal Geo, Inc.

Purpose –Department of Public Works and Transportation is in its final phase of the AMS project. The GSA with Woolpert Inc has expired and the new agreement was awarded to Optimal Geo, Inc. Optimal Geo will continue to assist the County with its efforts to define best practices, and design software and process standards. They will also provide post-implementation support for AMS projects.

Fiscal – The County will use Optimal Geo's GSA Contract no. 47QTCA18D004M. The term is effective upon execution by the County and shall continue until January 3, 2028, with an ultimate contract end date of January 3, 2038.

Prepared by: Office of Information Technology

MB-5 (Res. 18-25) **Council District(s) 6**

Mr. Ertel

Supporting Request for the Main Street Maryland Designation by the Maryland DHCD

Resolution 18-25 expresses the Council's support for Baltimore County's request to the Maryland Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) for Towson to receive the Main Street Maryland designation and for the Towson Main Street Collaborative, Inc. to locally administer the Main Street Maryland program.

In recognition that there is a significant need for continued reinvestment and revitalization of Towson, the County has requested that DHCD grant Towson the Main Street Maryland designation. The Towson Main Street Collaborative, Inc., a local organization, has volunteered to implement a comprehensive revitalization strategy based on the DHCD's Main Street Maryland program, which utilizes the National Main Street Center's Main Street Approach, to strengthen the economic potential of the historic downtown and neighborhood business district of Towson. Through this resolution and other actions, the Council has made a commitment to improve the economy, appearance, and image of the traditional downtown business districts in the County, including Towson.

Resolution 18-25 also requests that County Executive Katherine Klausmeier endorse the resolution, thereby indicating approval thereof, and authorizes the County Executive to execute documents and take any action necessary to carry out the intent of the resolution.

This resolution shall take effect from the date of its passage by the County Council and copies shall be sent to DHCD.

MB-6 (Res. 19-25) **Council District(s) 3**

Councilmembers Kach & Marks

Adoption/Incorporation of the Jacksonville Community Plan – Master Plan 2030

Resolution 19-25 adopts the Jacksonville Community Plan (the Plan) and incorporates it as an amendment to Master Plan 2030. With the enactment of Resolution 35-23, the Council endorsed the community planning process undertaken by the Greater Jacksonville Association, Inc., in conjunction with the Department of Planning, to update the Plan and requested that the Planning Board review the completed Plan and submit to the Council a recommendation to adopt the Plan as an amendment to Master Plan 2030.

The Plan was introduced to the Planning Board for review on February 6, 2025 and at its regular meeting on February 20, 2025, the Planning Board held a public hearing on the Plan. At that same meeting, the Board voted to approve the Plan and recommend the Plan to the Council for adoption as an amendment to Master Plan 2030.

This resolution shall take effect from the date of its passage by the County Council.

BALTIMORE COUNTY COUNCIL
NOTES TO THE AGENDA
APPENDIX A

BALTIMORE COUNTY, MARYLAND
INTER-OFFICE CORRESPONDENCE

TO: County Administrative Officer **DATE:** 3/6/25

FROM: Kevin D. Reed, Director **COUNCIL MEETING**
Office of Budget & Finance **DATE:** 4/7/25

SUBJECT: Public Recordation of Announcement
of Non-Competitive Commodity Awards Charter Sec. 902(f)

Whenever a commodity Supplier Contract / Purchase Order over $25,000 is awarded by a process other than a formal competitive bid, a copy of the Supplier Contract / Purchase Order must be provided to the Administrative Office for placement on the County Council agenda for announcement at the next session following the award of the Supplier Contract / Purchase Order. The announcement shall be recorded in the minutes of the County Council meeting, and shall be available for inspection by the public. In compliance with this procedure, supporting documentation of the awards are included and will be forwarded to the County Council.

Award Document

SCON 10002695 A/C Service and Repair, Inc.

This Supplier Contract is for the purchase of proprietary sewage pumping parts through A/C Service and Repair, Inc.

As detailed in the 902(f) Justification signed by Lauren Buckler, the Department of Public Works and Transportation, A/C Service and Repair, Inc. is the manufacturer of cone valves which are used in sewage pumping stations to prevent backflow of sewage from the force main, and other parts needed for maintenance as exiting valves wear out.

Failure to replace these valves could result in overflow issues. DPWT is requesting a five (5) year term of these products as stated in the justification.

5 Year Estimated Award Total: $4,550,000.00
Award Date: 2/27/25

PO 10021744 Med-Eng., LLC

This Purchase Order is for the purchase of 4 bomb suits and helmets through Med-Eng, LLC for the Baltimore County Police Department Hazardous Devices Team (HDT).

As detailed in the 902(f) Justification signed by Chief Robert McCullough, these bomb suits are replacing suits purchased in 2016 that have exceeded their 7 year life expectancy. They need to be replaced to ensure officer safety.

The County HDT members are accredited by the FBI's Hazardous Devices School using these suits. The County has been accredited through the FBI since 1999.

Award Total: $160,777.00
Award Date 2/27/25

PO 10022174 Wellsky Corporation

This Purchase Order is for the purchase of Licenses for Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) software for the period of 09/01/2024 to 08/31/2025 for the Department of Housing and Community Development.

As detailed in the 902(f) Justification signed by Terry Hickey, Baltimore County has a 20-year service partnership with Wellsky (formerly Bowman Systems and Mediware) for the hosting and supporting of its Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) client database. Beginning in 2004, the federal Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) required all 392 Continuums of Care (CoC) in the United States and its territories to enter client and project level data into a local CoC HMIS database for homeless and homeless prevention services.

Maintaining an HMIS and providing service level licenses will keep Baltimore County in compliance with federal and state funding. WellSky is the nationwide industry leader for HMIS, and currently has over 65% of the market share. WellSky is the only HMIS vendor with an actual Compliance Department that maintains and updates all federal HUD HMIS Data Guidelines. WellSky is also the leader in HMIS support staff and has been responsive to our technical assistance needs. All of HMIS data (since the HUD requirement in 2004) has always been hosted by WellSky, therefore, maintaining continuity with the same provider is helpful. Stability in data management is critical to our CoC program's success. If our CoC were to partner with another HMIS vendor would set us back at least two to three years with data migration, mapping, custom programming, trainings, etc. Also, our CoC would not be assured that another HMIS vendor would be able to meet and maintain federal guidelines, which would jeopardize funding for our programs. A consistent and stable HMIS is crucial for our federal, state, and local funding.

This cost has remained fairly consistent throughout our professional relationship with Wellsky. The cost for services from the last billing period (09/01/2023-08/30/2024) was $41,806. This renewal will provide us with more reporting licenses which is crucial to accommodate the growing number of homeless service providers in the County.

Award Total: $41,503.50
Award Date: 2/27/25

SCON 10002947 Idexx Distribution, Inc.

This Supplier Contract is for the purchase of SNAP Veterinary test through Idexx Distribution, Inc for Baltimore County Department of Animal Services.

As detailed in the 902(f) Justification signed by Della J. Leister, Idexx, Distribution, Inc. is the sole manufacturer of SNAP Heartworm, SNAP Parvo and SNAP Felv/FIV tests. These products are used on a routine basis for testing of contagious diseases in animals within the care of Baltimore County Department of Animal Services, to prevent the spread of these dangerous and highly contagious diseases.

5 Year Estimated Award Total: $85,000.00
Award Date: 2/24/25

SCON 10002704 Johnson & Towers, Inc.

This Supplier Contract is for the purchase of Detroit Engine and Allison Transmission parts and labor through Johnson & Towers, Inc.

As detailed in the Sole Source Justification signed by Lauren Buckler, parts and labor purchased through this Supplier Contract will be utilized to maintain and repair existing heavy-duty trucks and fire apparatus in the Baltimore County's fleet. Johnson & Towers, Inc. is the only manufacturer that has the Detroit & Allison Transmission parts and service in the State of Maryland to maintain the fleet.

5 Year Estimated Award Total: $750,000.00
Award Date: 3/7/25

PO 10024020 Environmental Systems Research Institute, Inc. (Esri)

This Purchase Order is for the purchase of redistricting Solution software/license for the Office of Information.

As detailed in the 902(f) Justification signed by Christopher Martin, the County's GIS systems has been built on Esri technology. In the most recent election, Baltimore County citizens voted to expand the County Council from 7 to 9 seats, requiring redrawing council districts and proposing changes to the makeup of the County School Board. To complete the Council redistricting exercise will necessitate the use of Esri's seamless and integrated support. The Esri redistricting software will interface with the County's existing software architecture.

Award Total: $74,200.00
Award Date: 3/7/25

PO 10022573 Aramark Services, Inc.

This Purchase Order is for the purchase of food preparation and delivery of prepared meals for Baltimore County's vulnerable population during Freezing Weather Shelter activation.

As detailed in the 902(f) Justification signed by Lawrence Richardson, Aramark Services, Inc has been able to service expanded needs and locations of Baltimore County since 2020. The locations are needed to continue adherence to safe distancing within congregate settings as recommended by the Health Officer, although we are no longer in a state of emergency. The threat of spreading pathogens and/or viruses are still high which leads to the County seeking other locations outside of the residential shelters. The additional locations aren't able to provide the vulnerable population with ready to eat meals and this is where the County benefits from the services being provided by Aramark who is able to provide the meals on short notice.

Award Total: $60,123.00
Award Date: 2/24/25

cc: J. Benjamin Jr.,
T. Bostwick
Elizabeth Irwin, Acting Council Auditor