

## Montgomery County Council Infrastructure Funding Workgroup

### APPROVED MINUTES

Friday, January 23, 2026

9:00 AM to 12:00 PM

Council Office Building, Capital Crescent Trail Conference Room, 4th Floor

#### Present Members

- Gene Smith, County Council Staff
- Livhu Ndou, County Council Staff
- Bilal Ali, County Council Staff
- Lisa Govoni, Montgomery County Planning Department
- Darcy Buckley, Montgomery County Parks Department
- Andrea Swiatocha, Deputy Chief, Division of Facilities Management (MCPS)
- Gary Nalven, Montgomery County Office of Management and Budget
- Todd Fawley-King, Montgomery County Department of Finance
- Haley Peckett, Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MCDOT)
- Katie Mencarini, Montgomery County Planning Department
- Robert Goldman, Montgomery Housing Partnerships
- Mike Henehan, Bozzuto Development Company

#### Other County and Agency Staff Participating

- Stephen Kenny, County Council Staff

#### **Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 AM.

#### **Action – Approval of December 12 Minutes**

The minutes from the December 12, 2025 meeting were reviewed and approved without objection.

#### **Discussion – Findings and Observations**

The Workgroup reviewed draft findings and observations related to its work.

The Workgroup generally supported that the current approved County Capital Improvement Program (CIP) funding focuses on life cycle replacement or upgrades, not net new projects. The Workgroup requested the following updates for future consideration:

- Use a different word than “shift” or show more details about how the CIP has shifted its funding priorities.
- Provide greater context on why the CIP has more funding for these purposes, including for safety, infill development, and policy decisions.
- Provide a clear understanding of the definitions with this observation.
- Include population and enrollment statistics for the County.

The Workgroup requested that the final draft regarding net new projects and non-County funding more accurately reflect the landscape. The following reflects the Workgroup's discussion for this topic:

- All jurisdictions rely on non-local funding for significant infrastructure projects. The County is no different and that is OK.
- Reliance on outside funding does place the County at the policy decision for the source of funding (e.g., additional requirements for State or Federal funding).

The Workgroup offered additional observations for consideration at a future meeting. Those observations included:

- CIP funding should be diversified (i.e., there is no one source of funding that will address the funding needs of the CIP).
- Policy makers should consider a suite of projects tied to a new funding source to offer as a decision to the residents of the County (i.e., the County will increase taxes/fees, but this is what you will get for it).
- Piecemeal development results in piecemeal improvements.

The Workgroup discussed observations about impact taxes for future consideration. The points discussed included:

- Market rate housing is not returning to the County quickly, which lowers the likelihood of increase in impact taxes collected.
- Many of the projects moving forward in the County are already exempt.
- There is a limited nexus between impact taxes on specific projects and improvements in that area that benefit the residents impacted by the project.
- There is not enough funding from impact taxes to address the adequacy standards required.

The Workgroup generally supported that level of effort projects are underfunded but supported avoiding the term backlog; rather, the Workgroup preferred the term acceptable replacement cost or similar.

The Workgroup generally supported that construction costs have increased but requested that the final draft show the increase in inflation, construction costs index, and similar metrics.

### **Discussion – Estimates for Unconstrained Policy Investments**

The Workgroup reviewed the updated tables for deferred maintenance. Minor updates were requested, including a column detailing the percent funded for the annual replacement costs based on the approved CIP.

The Workgroup reviewed the estimates for unconstrained policy investments. All agencies highlighted that these estimates were only for capital costs, not operating expenditures. The Workgroup requested draft estimates for operating expenditures, too, to include as background in the report.

### **Discussion – Funding Options**

The Workgroup reviewed the funding options and discussed opportunities and challenges for each.

**Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 PM.