COUNTY COUNCIL
FOR MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MARYLAND

By: Council President at the Request of the County Executive

SUBJECT: Amendment to the FY07-12 Capital Improvements Program and Supplemental Appropriation 14-S07-CMCG-11 to the FY07 Capital Budget Montgomery County Government Department of Public Works & Transportation Facility Planning: Bridges (No. 509132), $1,160,000

Background

1. Section 307 of the Montgomery County Charter provides that any supplemental appropriation shall be recommended by the County Executive who shall specify the source of funds to finance it. The Council shall hold a public hearing on each proposed supplemental appropriation after at least one week’s notice. A supplemental appropriation that would comply with, avail the County of, or put into effect a grant or a Federal, State or County law or regulation, or one that is approved after January 1 of any fiscal year, requires an affirmative vote of five Councilmembers. A supplemental appropriation for any other purpose that is approved before January 1 of any fiscal year requires an affirmative vote of six Councilmembers. The Council may, in a single action, approve more than one supplemental appropriation. The Executive may disapprove or reduce a supplemental appropriation, and the Council may reapprove the appropriation, as if it were an item in the annual budget.

2. Section 302 of the Montgomery County Charter provides that the Council may amend an approved capital improvements program at any time by an affirmative vote of no fewer than six members of the Council.

3. The Department of Public Works and Transportation has requested the following capital project appropriation increases:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Cost Element</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Source of Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facility Planning: Bridges</td>
<td>509132</td>
<td>PDS</td>
<td>$1,160,000</td>
<td>State Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,160,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. This increase is needed because the latest consultant cost estimates to proceed with the design of the five bridges are higher than programmed. The higher cost estimates are attributed to the extensive environmental impacts that need to be considered during the design of the bridges as well as the complex geometrical design elements identified by the consultant. However, the State has remaining unobligated funds for bridges in the current year, which will be made available to the County. Therefore, the project cost increase will be fully offset through State Aid reimbursements.

5. The County Executive has requested a supplemental appropriation in the amount of $1,160,000 for Facility Planning: Bridges (No. 509132), and specifies that the source of funds will be State Aid.

6. Notice of public hearing was given and a public hearing was held.

**Action**

The County Council for Montgomery County, Maryland, approves the following action:

The FY07-12 Capital Improvements Program of the Montgomery County Government is amended as reflected on the attached project description form and a supplemental appropriation to the FY07 Capital Budget is approved as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Cost Element</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Source of Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facility Planning:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,160,000</td>
<td>State Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridges</td>
<td>509132</td>
<td>PDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,160,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is a correct copy of Council action.

Linda M. Lauer, Clerk of the Council
Facility Planning: Bridges -- No. 509132

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Date Last Modified</th>
<th>Required Adequate Public Facility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Public Works &amp; Transportation</td>
<td>March 19, 2007</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Area</td>
<td>Countywide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocation Impact</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EXPENDITURE SCHEDULE ($000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Element</th>
<th>Total FY06</th>
<th>Thru FY06</th>
<th>Rem. FY06</th>
<th>Total 6 Years</th>
<th>FY07</th>
<th>FY08</th>
<th>FY09</th>
<th>FY10</th>
<th>FY11</th>
<th>FY12</th>
<th>Beyond 6 Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning, Design and Supervision</td>
<td>9,648</td>
<td>6,004</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>3,460</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Improvements and Utilities</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9,875</td>
<td>6,222</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>3,460</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FUNDING SCHEDULE ($000)

| PAYGO | 340 | 340 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| G.O. Bonds | 2,549 | 5,956 | 193 | 2,300 | 723 | 449 | 251 | 377 | 250 | 250 | 0 | 0 |
| Federal Aid | 811 | 811 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Land Sale | 15 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| State Aid | 1,160 | 0 | 1,160 | 0 | 300 | 620 | 240 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

### ANNUAL OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT ($000)

**DESCRIPTION**

This ongoing project provides studies for bridge projects under consideration for inclusion in the CIP. Facility Planning serves as a transition stage for a project between identification of need and its inclusion as a stand-alone project in the CIP. Prior to the establishment of a stand-alone project, DPWHT will complete a design which outlines the general and specific features required on the project. Selected projects range in type, but typically consist of upgrading deficient bridges so that they can safely carry all legal loads which must be accommodated while providing a minimum of two travel lanes. Facility Planning is a decision-making process to design bridges which are already identified as deficient. For a full description of the Facility Planning process, see the CIP Planning Section. Candidate projects currently included are listed in the “Other” section below.

**Service Area**

Countywide

**JUSTIFICATION**

There is continuing need for the development of accurate cost estimates and an exploration of alternatives for proposed projects. Facility planning costs for all projects which ultimately become stand-alone PDFs are included here. These costs will not be reflected in the resulting individual project. Future individual CIP projects which result from facility planning will each benefit from reduced planning and design costs.

**Plans and Studies**

Biennial inspections performed since 1987 have consistently shown that the bridges currently included in the project for design studies are in need of major rehabilitation or replacement. Pedestrian safety is considered during design of individual bridge projects.

**Cost Change**

Increase cost due to higher than budgeted cost estimates based on actual bids received. The higher cost estimates are attributed to the extensive environmental impacts that need to be considered during the design as well as the complex geometrical design elements identified by the consultant. The cost increase will be fully offset by State Aid that will be made available to the County.

**STATUS**

Ongoing

**OTHER**

Candidates for this program are identified through the County Biennial Bridge Inspection Program as being deficient, load restricted, or geometrically substandard. The Planning, Design, and Supervision costs for all bridge designs include all costs up to contract preparation. At that point, future costs and Federal aid will be included in stand-alone PDFs. Expenditures will continue indefinitely.

**Candidate Projects:**

- Piney Meaford Road Bridge #M-0021
- Whites Ferry Bridge #M-0187
- Whites Ferry Bridge #M-0189
- Cedar Lane Bridge #M-0074
- Talbot Avenue Bridge #M-0085 (Starting in FY08)

### APPROPRIATION AND EXPENDITURE DATA

- Date First Appropriation: FY91 ($000)
- Actual Cost Estimate: 124
- First Cost Estimate: 9,875
- Last FY's Cost Estimate: 8,715
- Present Cost Estimate: 9,875
- Appropriation Request: FY08, 1,609
- Supplemental Appropriation Request: FY07, 0
- Transfer: 0
- Cumulative Appropriation: 7,138
- Expenditures: 6,556
- Unencumbered Balance: 582
- Partial Closeout Thru: FY05, 0
- New Partial Closeout: FY06, 0
- Total Partial Closeout: 0

### COORDINATION

- Maryland-Department of the Environment
- Maryland-Department of Natural Resources
- Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission
- Montgomery County Department of Permitting Services
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
- Maryland State Highway Administration
- Federal Highway Administration
- Utility Companies
- Maryland Historic Trust
- CSX Transportation
- Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority
- Rural/Rustic Roads Legislation

**MAP**

[Map of Montgomery County, MD]