

August 15, 2025
Montgomery County Council Infrastructure Funding Workgroup

10:00 AM **Call to Order**

10:05 AM **Action – Review and Approval of Minutes from July 11, 2025**

Attached are the draft minutes from July 11, 2025.

10: 10 AM **Discussion and Action – Stakeholder Engagement**

Attached is a draft approach for stakeholder engagement. The group is expected to discuss each decision point and finalize the approach during the meeting.

11:30 AM **Adjourn**

Montgomery County Council Infrastructure Funding Workgroup

DRAFT MINUTES

Friday, July 11, 2025

9:30 AM to 11:30 AM

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

Present Members

Gene Smith, County Council staff

Livhu Ndou, County Council staff

Bilal Ali, County Council staff

Katie Mencarini, Montgomery County Planning Department

Lisa Govoni, Montgomery County Planning Department

Darcy Buckley, Montgomery County Parks Department

Haley Peckett, Montgomery County Department of Transportation

Gary Nalven, Montgomery County Office of Management and Budget

Adnan Mamoon, Montgomery County Public Schools

Mike Henahan, Bozzuto Development Company

Robert Goldman, Montgomery Housing Partnerships

Absent Members

Todd Fawley-King, Montgomery County Department of Finance

Other County and Agency staff participating

Stephen Kenny, County Council staff

Andrea Swiatocha, Montgomery County Public Schools

Call to Order and Introductions

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 AM and each member introduced themselves.

Briefing – Overview of Council Resolution and Open Meeting Requirements

Mr. Gene Smith presented information about the key elements of the Council Resolution authorizing the creation of this workgroup and its work product. Ms. Livhu Ndou presented key elements of the Open Meetings Act and how the workgroup will operationalize them.

Discussion – Council Resolution and Open Meetings Requirements

The floor was opened for discussion by workgroup members on the Council Resolution and open meetings requirements. Members requested and discussed information about the meeting materials and previous reports on infrastructure funding.

Briefing – Overview of Infrastructure Categories

Mr. Bilal Ali presented information about potential ways to categorize the County's infrastructure needs for the workgroup's discussion.

Discussion – Infrastructure Needs and Future Follow Up

The floor was opened for discussion by workgroup members on the potential ways to categorize the County's infrastructure needs. The workgroup discussed the following topics:

- A request for a future review and discussion of legal requirements for fees vs. taxes, including a review of other jurisdictions funding mechanisms;
- A request about the data sources for the County's infrastructure needs, which will be generated by the respective members of the workgroup from Montgomery County Department of Transportation, Montgomery County Public Schools, and Montgomery County Parks Department.
- The difficulty in categorizing and defining "growth" projects for some or all County agencies;
- A request for a future discussion about the appropriate categories and definitions, including a discussion about the term "adequacy" instead of "growth" and defining and agreeing to terms such as upgrades, repairs, and maintenance;
- A request for a future discussion about how the workgroup will review and consider issues related to racial equity and social justice, including data sources for such an analysis; and
- A request for a future discussion about the workgroup's consideration and role in determining future policy options (e.g., different potential built environments) to estimate the County's infrastructure needs.

The discussion was closed with a request that Montgomery County Department of Transportation, Montgomery County Public Schools, and Montgomery County Parks Department review and compile internal data to categorize and quantify infrastructure needs to be shared for the workgroup's consideration at a future meeting. Mr. Bilal Ali was assigned to work with the different agencies on this task.

Break

Discussion – Draft Project Timeline and Next Steps

The workgroup requested that the discussion on the project timeline be moved after the break. Mr. Gene Smith presented a draft project timeline to the workgroup and opened the floor to discussion.

The workgroup discussed the timing of different agencies' decision points (e.g., when the Board of Education will review funding needs) and the workgroup's decision points. The workgroup was open to meeting about once a month, dependent on decision points for the final work product.

Discussion – Outreach Efforts and Follow Up

The floor was opened to discuss the key stakeholders to include and ways to engage them. The workgroup also discussed public engagement generally.

Members listed potential stakeholders to include for comment before and after the workgroup's recommendation. The workgroup supported an approach to host a future meeting to invite stakeholders to provide feedback for the workgroup's consideration. The workgroup also discussed ways to engage the public but noted that this engagement would need to occur later in the process.

The discussion closed with a request that the workgroup members review a draft approach for stakeholder engagement that will be considered by the workgroup at a future meeting.

Infrastructure Funding Workgroup

Stakeholder Engagement Approach

Items to be discussed and finalized by Workgroup

- List of stakeholders to invite
- Date(s) to meet with stakeholders
- Stakeholder feedback primer

List of potential stakeholders

Below are the stakeholders shared at the July 11 meeting to meet Action Paragraph 4 of the [Council Resolution](#). As discussed, the public input requirement is separate from stakeholder engagement in the Council Resolution. The public input approach will be discussed and finalized at a future Workgroup meeting. **Decision to be made – are there other stakeholders that must be invited?**

- Maryland State Highway Administration – Ms. Haley Peckett from County DOT offered to coordinate
- Developer round tables or workgroups – Mr. Mike Henahan and Mr. Robert Goldman offered to coordinate and invite their respective groups
- Montgomery County Chapter of the Maryland Municipal League – Mr. Gene Smith offered to coordinate with Councilmembers to invite representatives from MML
- Maryland Building Industry Association
- Maryland Chapter of the Commercial Real Estate Development Association (NAIOP)

Date(s) to meet with stakeholders

The workgroup intends to invite stakeholders to a future workgroup meeting to provide feedback. **Decisions to be made:**

- **Should the Workgroup hold one or more than one meeting for this purpose?**
- **What date(s) does the Workgroup want to offer in September?**

Questions to prime discussion

The workgroup could share a primer when inviting the stakeholders to facilitate feedback. On the next page is a draft primer for the Workgroup's consideration. **Decision to be made – finalize the method to invite and brief stakeholders in advance of the meeting.**

Proposed Stakeholder Feedback Primer

The Montgomery County Council created the Infrastructure Funding Workgroup (the “Workgroup”) by [Council Resolution 20-745](#) on March 18, 2025. A core requirement for the Workgroup is to seek stakeholder feedback before and after it makes any recommendations.

The Workgroup seeks your participation in providing feedback on the County’s approach in identifying and funding infrastructure needs throughout the County. The Workgroup plans to hold a stakeholder engagement meeting on XXX in September. If you or a representative cannot make this date, please contact XXX, so the Workgroup can determine if another date is feasible.

The workgroup’s goal is to recommend strategies to fund infrastructure and growth-related needs for the County’s schools, transportation, and parks. The Montgomery County Council determined that this Workgroup was necessary as it reviewed the 2024-2028 update to the [Growth and Infrastructure Policy \(GIP\)](#) and [Bill 16-24: Development Impact Taxes – Amendments](#). The Workgroup must submit a final report to the County Council by June 30, 2026, that includes all items in 6.a.-6.f. of the attached Council Resolution.

Below are some questions to aid a future discussion with the Workgroup about information and topics relevant to the final work product. We welcome all feedback about the County’s infrastructure needs and funding whether it is related to these questions or not.

- What is your general understanding of the County’s approach to identify current and future infrastructure needs as it relates to schools, transportation, and parks?
- Are there successful approaches you’ve seen in other jurisdictions that the County should consider when identifying infrastructure needs?
- How should the County prioritize infrastructure needs amongst its competing priorities?
- What is your general understanding of the ways the County funds infrastructure needs?
- What is your understanding of the County’s approach to development impact taxes and how these funds are used to fund infrastructure needs?
- How would you change or improve the County’s approach to development impact taxes?
- Are there successful funding mechanisms you’ve seen in other jurisdictions that the County should consider?
- Amongst the following common funding mechanisms, how would you prioritize them to meet the County’s infrastructure needs: 1) maintain status quo; 2) increase borrowing; 3) increase cash by reducing other expenditures; 4) levy a broad ad valorem tax to support needs throughout the County; 5) levy a localized ad valorem tax (e.g., Special Taxing District) to support localized needs; 6) charge a broad-based fee to support needs throughout the County; and 7) charge a localized fee to support localized needs.