
CONCURRENCY MANAGEMENT REPORT FISCAL YEAR 2015 (July 1, 2014 – June 30, 2015)



*Carroll County Department of Land & Resource Management
Bureau of Development Review*

OVERVIEW ... 3

CHAPTER ONE: DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY 5

CHAPTER TWO: BUILDING PERMIT INFORMATION 11

CHAPTER THREE: SCHOOLS 13

CHAPTER FOUR: ROADS 17

CHAPTER FIVE: FIRE AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES 19

CHAPTER SIX: POLICE SERVICES 27

CHAPTER SEVEN: WATER AND SEWER SERVICE 29

**CHAPTER EIGHT: AVAILABLE THRESHOLD CAPACITY
RECOMMENDATIONS 34**

OVERVIEW

The stated purpose of Adequate Public Facilities and Concurrency Management (Chapter 156 of the Carroll County Code of Public Local Laws and Ordinances) is to ensure that proposed or planned residential growth proceeds at a rate that will not unduly strain public facilities, including schools, roads, public water and sewer facilities, and police, fire, and emergency medical services. The Code established minimum adequacy standards or thresholds for those facilities and services and mandates that the cumulative impacts of proposed or planned residential growth within the incorporated municipalities and the County be considered in testing for adequacy under these standards. Concurrency management was initially adopted in 1998.

The ordinance defines Available Threshold Capacity (ATC) as “The amount of capacity available for future development under this chapter determined by balancing the county’s ability to pay for infrastructure, schools, and police, fire, and emergency medical services with building permit reservations and phasing of projects. Capacity of a facility is determined by the county or the incorporated municipality, if applicable.” Major residential subdivision and residential site plan projects, located in the unincorporated areas of Carroll County, are reviewed and evaluated for ATC while considering the cumulative impact of all residential projects located in all areas of the County. When a facility or service becomes inadequate in accordance with the standards, the Board of County Commissioners (the Board) can adopt specific geographical area restrictions on the issuance of building permits.

A development project’s ATC is tentatively determined when a developer submits a concept plan. This tentative determination expires six months after issuance unless a preliminary plan is submitted. The ATC for a development project is officially reviewed prior to presentation of the preliminary plan to the Carroll County Planning and Zoning Commission (the Commission). If all public facilities and services are adequate during the current Community Investment Plan (CIP), the Commission may approve the plan to proceed to the final plan stage and issue a recordation schedule and building permit reservations. When a development plan is presented to the Commission regarding the adequacy of public facilities and services for projects subject to this chapter, the Commission shall consider the cumulative impacts of the development pipeline in both the county and in the incorporated municipalities.

Where ATC does not exist or is projected to be inadequate at the preliminary plan stage and no relief facility or service is planned in the six-year CIP that addresses the inadequacy, the plan shall be denied by the Commission and assigned a place in a queue and re-tested annually. If a relief facility or service is planned in the six-year CIP to address the inadequacy or if the public facility or service is approaching inadequacy during the current CIP, the Commission may conditionally approve the plan to proceed to the final plan stage and issue a tentative recordation schedule and tentative building permit reservations, which are subject to modification at the final plan stage. If the public facility or service is considered inadequate during the current CIP, the developer may propose mitigation to alleviate the inadequacy; however, the Board would determine the acceptability of the mitigation.

Concurrency testing does not apply to projects in any of the municipalities, off-conveyances, commercial and industrial projects, minor residential subdivisions, and attached/detached accessory dwelling units. Retirement homes that are located within a public water and a public sewer service area do not require adequacy approval as to schools but shall meet all other requirements of the Chapter.

As required by the Code (§156.07B), an annual report is to be prepared for the Board and the Commission to assist in the CIP planning process, to recommend possible building permit caps for areas of the County where facilities or services are not adequate to serve proposed residential development, and to identify issues regarding implementation of concurrency management. This report was developed by

the Bureau of Development Review for the period July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2015, i.e. fiscal year (FY) 2015.

The following is a summary of the report:

Residential Development Activity

- 388 residential building permits were issued; 298 of those were for single-family units.
- 1,927 residential unit building permits were issued for the six-year reporting period of FY 2010-2015.
- 113 new residential lots were recorded; 38 of those were in the municipalities.

Actions by the Planning Commission

- The Commission approved no residential site plans.
- The Commission approved seven minor residential subdivisions comprising 9 lots. Minor residential subdivisions are not subject to the testing requirements of Chapter 156.
- The Commission approved three major preliminary subdivision plans comprising 17 lots.

Available Capacity of Public Facilities and Services

- Police meet or exceed the adequate standard of 1.3 officers per 1,000 population.
- No fire stations were rated 'inadequate' by either the average response time or late/no response criteria. Several were rated as 'approaching inadequate' as indicated by the average response time measure.
- All emergency medical service stations were rated 'adequate' by the late and no response criteria.
- Improvements are planned in the six-year CIP for 3 bridges that are inadequate for certain fire and emergency response apparatus.
- All elementary, middle, and high schools were rated 'adequate'.

Recommendations

- Changes to fire and medical emergency service threshold standards are recommended.

CHAPTER ONE DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY

To provide analysis of the cumulative impact of residential units on the management and capacity of facilities, the monitoring and tracking of residential development includes projects in the development review process. Although the County tracks development projects in the incorporated areas, any required adequate facility review is administered by the applicable municipality.

Division of property typically involves either the off-conveyance procedure or the subdivision process. Unlike the subdivision process which requires the approval of the Commission, the off-conveyance procedure is administered through a staff review and approval process.

Off-conveyances are the first two divisions (lots created) from a parcel that existed as of April 23, 1963. There are a finite number of lots that can be created through the off-conveyance process. Off-conveyances are usually created as residential building lots. Once approved, off-conveyances must be recorded within six months or the approval expires. Lots created through the off-conveyance procedure are not subject to the concurrency testing requirement but are tracked in the concurrency database. The following table shows the number of off-conveyances approved in the past six fiscal years.

Off-conveyances Approved FY 2010 - FY 2015

ELECTION DISTRICT	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	TOTAL
1 – Taneytown	2	3	2	2	0	1	10
2 – Uniontown	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
3 – Myers	2	0	2	0	0	0	4
4 – Woolerys	7	4	0	3	1	0	15
5 – Freedom	3	1	0	0	0	3	7
6 – Manchester	5	1	0	0	1	1	8
7 – Westminster	1	6	0	0	4	0	11
8 – Hampstead	2	0	3	0	2	2	9
9 – Franklin	4	0	1	2	0	0	7
10 – Middleburg	3	0	0	1	0	0	4
11 – New Windsor	2	2	1	0	0	0	5
12 – Union Bridge	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
13 – Mount Airy	0	3	0	0	0	2	5
14 – Berrett	4	2	0	0	0	0	6
TOTAL	35	22	10	8	8	10	93

When compared to the six-year reporting period of FY 1999 to FY 2004 (482 approved off-conveyance lots), the number of approved off-conveyance lots has shown a significant decrease. Since only properties that existed as of April 23, 1963 may be considered for off-conveyances, the number of lots created through this procedure will eventually be exhausted. The locations of the off-conveyance lots are generally spread throughout the County.

Planning Commission Approvals

Minor subdivisions are the first 3 lots taken from a parent parcel after any eligible off-conveyances have occurred. Although they are not subject to concurrency testing, minor subdivisions are included in the concurrency database for tracking purposes. The minor subdivision process allows for the preliminary and final plans to be approved simultaneously.

Major subdivisions are created from the fourth and any additional lots taken from the parent parcel. Once the preliminary plan is approved by the Commission, the final plan review process begins and is reviewed by the Commission.

Multi-family residential developments located on a single property are depicted on a site plan and require approval by the Commission.

The following tables provide a listing of residential subdivision and site plans that were approved by the Commission.

Minor Residential Subdivision Plans Approved by the Commission

PROJECT NAME	FILE NUMBER	NUMBER OF NEW LOTS	PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING DATE	ELECTION DISTRICT
Niner Subdivision	M-14-001	1	7/15/2014	4
Arrington Estates Resub. Parcel 2	M-12-007	1	9/23/2014	5
Mary Holland Property	M-14-012	2	11/3/2014	3
Wilhide Acres	M-14-0038	1	12/16/2014	1
Maidens Point 2	M-14-006	1	3/4/2015	1
Ambers Choice	M-06-010	2	3/4/2015	8
Krantz Acres	M-14-0050	1	4/7/2015	2
Arbaugh Flowing Springs Farm	M-14-0058	0(ex. residence)	5/6/2015	2
TOTAL NUMBER OF LOTS		9		

Preliminary Major Subdivision Plans Approved by the Commission

PROJECT NAME	FILE NUMBER	NUMBER OF NEW LOTS	PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING DATE	ELECTION DISTRICT
Hidden Creek	P-02-057	7	8/19/2014	4
Chadwick Court Resub. Lot 1A	P-14-004	1	5/19/2015	7
The Offutt Place	P-14-003	9	6/16/2015	5
TOTAL NUMBER OF LOTS		17		

Final Major Subdivision Plans Approved by the Commission

PROJECT NAME	FILE NUMBER	NUMBER OF NEW LOTS	PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING DATE	ELECTION DISTRICT
Wilson Farms	F-14-007	23	9/16/2014	5
Walnut Ridge, Section 8	F-13-022	5	10/21/2014	7
Carroll Woods Estates Resub. Lot 59	FX-14-0020	1	12/16/2014	9
Rustic Rising	F-14-006	35	12/16/2014	5
Klees Mill Overlook	F-13-017	9	12/16/2014	4
Vangline Acres 3	P-14-0029	4	3/4/2015	6
Hy-Crest, Section 6	P-12-008	1	4/21/2015	3
Chadwick Court Resub. Lot 1A	P-14-004	1	5/19/2015	7
TOTAL NUMBER OF LOTS		79		

Once the final plan is approved by the Commission, the record plat may be recorded and application for building permits can begin.

County Residential Projects Recorded

PROJECT NAME	FILE NUMBER	NEW LOTS	RECORDING REFERENCE	DATE RECORDED	ELECTION DISTRICT
Brotman Property	M-07-026	3	53/201	7/2/2014	13
Stansfield Estates	F-12-021	21	53/205-207	7/15/2014	4
Major Property, Section 2	M-12-005	1	53/221-222	8/21/2014	11
Niner Subdivision	M-14-001	1	53/232	9/25/2014	4
Vista Green	F-10-008	13	53/233-241	10/1/2014	9
Old Farm, Resub. Section 3	M-08-010	1	53/250	10/20/2014	14
Heathers Ridge, Resub. Lot 1A & 6A	M-13-007	1	53/261	10/31/2014	14
Old Mineral Hill Overlook	M-13-001	1	53/280	1/14/2015	5
Mary Holland Property	M-14-012	1	53/297	3/16/2015	3
Coffman Acres	M-09-005	1	53/298-299	3/24/2015	10
Was-Mere Acres	F-07-006	9	53/300-302	3/24/2015	3
Wilhide Acres	M-14-0038	1	53/304	4/2/2015	1
Hewitt's Landing	F-09-007	15	53/316-319	4/24/2015	4
Krantz Acres	M-14-0050	1	53/322	4/30/2015	2
Bull Estates	M-11-016	3	53/324	5/5/2015	5
Arrington Estates, Resub. Parcel 2	M-12-007	1	54/003	5/19/2015	5
Arbaugh's Flowing Springs Farm	M-14-0058	1	54/008	6/10/2015	2
TOTAL		75			

Plats Recorded Not Subject to Chapter 156 (Amended, Non-residential, Condominiums)

PROJECT NAME	FILE NUMBER	RECORDING REFERENCE	DATE RECORDED	ELECTION DISTRICT
Devlin Square, Amended Lot 37	F-14-009	53/204	7/10/2014	7
Suzie's Corner, Amended Section 3	F-14-012	53/208	7/17/2014	4
Greenvale Mews Condo, Units 39-41	n/a	53/209-210	7/17/2014	7
844 Professional Center Condo	n/a	53/211-218	7/23/2014	7
Golden View Senior Condos	n/a	53/219-220	7/30/2014	7
Harvey's Ridge, Amended Lot 3	F-13-021	53/224	9/9/2014	7
Reservoir Ridge Phase 3 Condo	n/a	53/225-227	9/11/2014	5
Golden View Senior Condos	n/a	53/228-229	9/12/2014	7
Greenvale Mews Condo, Units 63-65	n/a	53/243-244	10/10/2014	7
Old Farm, Amended Lot 3	F-14-014	53/245	10/14/2014	14
Reservoir Ridge, Phase 3 Condo	n/a	53/247-249	10/15/2014	5
Cross Country Plaza Amended Lots 1B & 2B	AP-14-0037	53/251	10/24/2014	5
Greenvale Mews Condo, Units 36-38	n/a	53/256-257	10/30/2014	7
Golden View Senior Condos	n/a	53/258-259	10/30/2014	7
Bassler Property Survey	n/a	53/260	10/31/2014	
Sherlock Holmes Estates Amended Lot 101	F-13-010	53/262	11/12/2014	5
Walnut Park Industrial Subdivision Resub. Lot 11	F-12-003	53/263	11/18/2014	4
Bixler Valley Estates Amended Lots 10 & 11	AP-14-0022	53/264	11/18/2014	3
Greenvale Mews Condo, Units 50-52	n/a	53/267-268	12/5/2014	7
Golden View Senior Condos	n/a	53/273-274	1/8/2015	7
Reservoir Ridge Condo, Phase 3	n/a	53/277-279	1/13/2015	5
Life's Dream, 7 th Amended	F-14-002	53-281-284	1/23/2015	7
Greenvale Mews Condo, Units 9-10	n/a	53/285-286	2/4/2015	7
Jacob's Ridge 5, Amended Lot 22	F-14-004	53/287-288	2/6/2015	7
Golden View Senior Condos	n/a	53/290-291	2/11/2015	7
Raspberry Patch 2, Amended Lot 2	AP-14-0064	53/305-306	4/7/2015	1
Beaver Run 2, Amended Remaining Portion	AP-14-0065	53/307-309	4/10/2015	4
Melrose 2, Platting of existing Non- residential Tract 1	M-15-004	53/312	4/20/2015	6
Mountain View Amended Lots 30 & 31	AP-14-0027	53/313	4/22/2015	7
Century Hollow, Phase 1, Special Purpose Plat	AP-14-0049	53/314	4/22/2015	4
Bonnie Brae Plaza	F-14-0062	53/323	5/1/2015	5
Greenvale Mews Condo, Units 56-58	n/a	53-325/326	5/8/2015	7
Greenvale Mews Condo, Units 34-35	n/a	54/001-002	5/11/2015	7
Maidens Point 2 (existing residence)	M-14-006	54/017-019	6/25/2015	1

Plats Recorded in Municipalities

PROJECT NAME	# OF NEW RES. LOTS	RECORDING REFERENCE	DATE RECORDED	MUNICIPALITY	ELECTION DISTRICT
Amended Plat Lot 1 & 2, Marada and Westminster Tech. Park	0	53/202	7/2/2014	Westminster	7
Village of Meadow Creek, Special Finance Plat	0	53/203	7/3/2014	Westminster	7
Zepp Realty Amended Plat	0	53/223	8/25/2014	Sykesville	5
Carroll Vista Condo Staging Plat	0	53/230-231	9/16/2014	Taneytown	1
Hallie Hill Farms Amended Lots 30 & 31	0	53/242	10/3/2014	Manchester	6
Hallie Hill Farms Amended Lots 30 & 31	0	53/246	10/15/2014	Manchester	6
Castlefield, Condo Phase 10	0	53/252-255	10/28/2014	Manchester	6
Carroll Vista Condo Stage 429	0	53/265-266	11/21/2014	Taneytown	1
Castlefield, Condo Phase 16	0	53/269-272	12/18/2014	Manchester	6
Carroll Vista Condo Staging Plat	0	53/275-276	1/8/2015	Taneytown	1
Village of Meadow Creek	0	53/289	2/10/2015	Westminster	7
North Carroll Farms 5	23	53/292-296	3/13/2015	Hampstead	8
Meadow Branch Relocated	0	53/303	4/2/2015	Westminster	7
Carroll Vista Condo Stage 501	0	53/310-311	4/15/2015	Taneytown	1
Roop's Mill, Special Purpose Plat	0	53/315	4/24/2015	Westminster	7
Carroll Vista Condo Stages 430 & 432	0	53/320-321	4/29/2015	Taneytown	1
Carroll Vista Condo Staging Plat	0	54/004	5/26/2015	Taneytown	1
Carroll Vista Condo Stage 501	0	54/005	5/26/2015	Taneytown	1
Carroll Vista Condo Boundary Plat	0	54/006-007	6/5/2015	Taneytown	1
Westminster Tech Park, Amended Lot 4A	0	54/009	6/18/2015	Westminster	7
Manchester Farms Section 7	15	54/010	6/18/2015	Manchester	6
Castlefield, Condo	0	54/011-014	6/23/2015	Manchester	6

Carroll Vista Condo Staging Plat	0	54/017-019	6/25/2015	Taneytown	1
TOTAL	38				

CHAPTER TWO

BUILDING PERMIT INFORMATION

Once the development review process is complete, a building permit application can occur for construction of the new residential unit. When the building project is complete, a use and occupancy permit is issued indicating the unit is ready for occupancy. Building permit activity indicates the current status of residential growth; whereas, developments in the review process identify planned growth. Although recorded lots are entitled to a building permit, the result of numerous external factors, i.e. mortgage rates, land prices, job security, etc., influence a buyer's decision as to when to purchase a lot or construct a new residence.

The Code (§156.04B) states that the County intends that the number of residential development building permit approvals issued in the County shall not exceed an average of 6,000 during any six-year period. For purposes of counting the 6,000 permits, all building permits issued county-wide, including those issued in municipalities and those issued for projects that are not subject to this chapter, shall be included. In order to achieve this goal, the County may establish a building permit cap prescribing the number of residential building permits to be issued in the County for projects applicable to the chapter.

The following chart tabulates the number of residential permits (including apartments) issued in both the unincorporated and incorporated areas of Carroll County for the six-year period of FY 2010 – FY 2015. The six-year reporting period total of units is substantially below the maximum goal of 6,000 permits. In comparison, there were 7,019 residential permits issued between FY 1998 and FY 2003.

Number of New Residential Units Issued

	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	TOTAL	Six-Year Average
Unincorporated Area by Election District								
1 – Taneytown	0	1	1	0	6	2	10	
2 – Uniontown	3	1	1	2	4	5	16	
3 – Myers	2	4	2	3	6	6	23	
4 – Woolerys	21	17	19	39	45	33	174	
5 – Freedom	54	49	73	54	103	125	458	
6 – Manchester	6	3	6	15	12	3	45	
7 – Westminster	25	27	23	41	46	42	204	
8 – Hampstead	5	7	7	3	10	5	37	
9 – Franklin	4	4	5	10	8	9	40	
10 – Middleburg	1	1	1	3	2	1	9	
11 – New Windsor	2	2	4	2	1	4	15	
12 – Union Bridge	1	1	0	3	0	2	7	
13 – Mount Airy	3	7	4	6	6	10	36	
14 – Berrett	4	9	11	20	25	31	100	
Total Unincorporated	131	133	157	201	274	278	1174	196
Municipality								
1 – Hampstead	2	1	0	0	4	8	15	
2 – Manchester	33	19	41	62	19	12	186	
3 – Mount Airy	26	18	40	38	40	10	172	
4 – New Windsor	0	0	0	0	1	5	6	
5 – Sykesville	8	16	23	19	50	16	132	
6 – Taneytown	5	2	3	17	27	30	84	
7 – Union Bridge	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	
8 – Westminster	34	24	18	29	22	29	156	
Total Incorporated	109	80	125	166	163	110	753	125
County Total	240	213	282	367	437	388	1927	321

CHAPTER THREE SCHOOLS

Threshold: (as defined in Chapter 156)

Adequate: An elementary or high school serving a proposed project is adequate, for the purposes of this chapter, when current or projected enrollment equals or is less than 109% of the state-rated capacity. A middle school serving a proposed project is adequate, for the purposes of this chapter, when current or projected enrollment equals or is less than 109% of the functional capacity.

Approaching inadequate: An elementary or high school serving a proposed project is approaching inadequate, for the purposes of this chapter, when current or projected enrollment is 110% to 119% of the state-rated capacity. A middle school serving a proposed project is approaching inadequate, for the purposes of this chapter, when current or projected enrollment is 110% to 119% of the functional capacity.

Inadequate: An elementary or high school serving a proposed project is inadequate, for the purposes of this chapter, when current or projected enrollment is equal to or greater than 120% of the state-rated capacity. A middle school serving a proposed project is inadequate, for the purposes of this chapter, when current or projected enrollment is equal to or greater than 120% of the functional capacity.

Background

The key difference between functional capacity and state-rated capacity lies in whether all classrooms are counted or only core curriculum teaching stations are counted. Carroll County Board of Education uses functional capacity as the measurement for middle school facilities because it accounts for the team approach that is the foundation of the middle school philosophy. The team approach allows teachers of core curriculum subjects to be organized into blocks and, within each block, share a joint planning period. The non-core curriculum teaching stations, such as gym and media center, do not count towards the measurement of functional capacity. Throughout a school day, as various blocks of students rotate through the non-core teaching stations, one block of core curriculum classrooms and core subject teachers are free, allowing a joint planning period. When functional capacity is used, a middle school has capacity for fewer students than it would under state-rated capacity.

The Carroll County Public Schools Facilities Management Division annually prepares the current enrollment figures and enrollment projections for a ten-year period, the first six years of which are included in the County's CIP. Bureau of Development Review staff routinely provide development projects in the review process and the development pipeline to the Carroll County Public Schools Facility Planner for use in developing the projections. The projections are usually completed by the beginning of December and are used by the County to determine if building permit caps should be utilized. Also, the Bureau transmits one set of plans to the school system for all new residential developments that are submitted to the County.

Facility Capacity and Projections

The following table shows actual enrollment as a percentage of state-rated capacity among elementary schools for FY 2015 and projected enrollment for FY 2016 through FY 2021. All elementary schools are projected to be adequate through FY 2021.

Elementary Schools FY 2015 - 2021 Enrollments as a Percentage of State-Rated Capacity

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	STATE RATED CAPACITY			ACTUAL FY 2015	PROJECTED					
	K - 5	Pre K	Spec Ed		FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021
Carrolltowne	548	0	50	87.0%	82.3%	78.3%	76.3%	75.6%	73.9%	72.9%
Charles Carroll	320	0	0	84.7%	81.9%	76.3%	75.0%	72.8%	70.9%	72.5%
Cranberry Station	550	20	0	83.9%	85.1%	86.8%	85.6%	86.7%	83.3%	81.8%
Ebb Valley	571	20	0	79.5%	76.8%	76.3%	74.6%	73.6%	71.6%	73.9%
Eldersburg	570	0	0	81.9%	81.6%	79.5%	77.5%	75.8%	74.9%	75.1%
Elmer Wolfe	548	0	0	69.2%	68.4%	66.6%	65.3%	63.5%	62.6%	62.6%
Freedom	525	0	0	93.0%	87.0%	83.8%	83.2%	80.4%	82.5%	78.9%
Friendship Valley	527	0	0	92.8%	91.8%	90.3%	91.1%	88.2%	85.8%	86.0%
Hampstead	526	0	50	58.9%	54.7%	52.1%	50.2%	49.5%	50.5%	48.6%
Linton Springs	731	0	0	80.7%	79.6%	78.2%	76.7%	74.3%	74.3%	75.0%
Manchester	707	20	0	81.6%	82.1%	80.2%	81.4%	78.3%	78.7%	75.0%
Mechanicsville	616	0	0	85.6%	81.2%	77.4%	73.7%	74.8%	72.9%	71.9%
Mount Airy (3-5)	598	0	0	85.3%	81.4%	80.9%	75.4%	74.6%	72.9%	71.1%
Parr's Ridge (K-2)	590	20	0	71.1%	70.7%	69.0%	67.2%	66.7%	66.9%	67.5%
Piney Ridge	571	0	0	104.7%	104.9%	101.1%	102.8%	98.8%	95.3%	94.6%
Robert Moton	548	20	40	66.0%	62.3%	59.9%	57.4%	53.9%	53.0%	54.3%
Runnymede	594	20	40	80.9%	77.8%	78.7%	77.4%	74.6%	74.0%	74.3%
Sandymount	527	0	0	85.4%	85.0%	84.8%	84.6%	81.6%	81.0%	79.5%
Spring Garden	593	0	0	92.9%	92.2%	91.1%	89.5%	86.0%	83.5%	84.8%
Taneytown	550	20	0	72.8%	71.6%	70.2%	69.5%	65.8%	66.3%	67.0%
Westminster	593	0	0	79.6%	75.9%	72.3%	71.5%	69.5%	65.9%	69.3%
Wm. Winchester	571	20	0	105.9%	105.6%	106.1%	104.9%	103.9%	100.0%	99.2%
Winfield	662	0	60	71.9%	67.7%	66.8%	64.7%	64.5%	63.4%	62.0%

Source: Carroll County Public Schools (enrollment projections 2015-16 to 2024-25, Department of Facilities Management)

To correspond with the adequacy threshold for middle schools, functional capacity rather than state-rated capacity for each facility is identified. All middle schools are projected to be adequate through FY 2021.

Middle Schools FY 2015 - 2021 Enrollments as a Percentage of Functional Capacity

MIDDLE SCHOOL	FUNCTIONAL CAPACITY		ACTUAL FY 2015	PROJECTED					
	6 - 8	Spec Ed		FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021
Mount Airy	750	20	78.8%	83.4%	78.1%	80.3%	76.0%	75.6%	70.9%
New Windsor	400	30	92.1%	90.0%	83.7%	81.6%	78.1%	77.7%	75.8%
North Carroll	750	20	75.7%	77.1%	74.5%	74.4%	75.1%	73.8%	76.1%
Northwest	750	20	62.9%	64.4%	59.2%	61.0%	62.6%	62.5%	60.6%
Oklahoma Road	825	20	92.2%	89.7%	86.3%	84.3%	79.2%	73.5%	74.3%
Shiloh	825	20	76.0%	77.5%	77.4%	76.9%	78.1%	76.9%	76.4%
Sykesville	725	20	109.4%	106.2%	105.6%	98.4%	101.6%	99.7%	99.5%
Westminster East	750	40	92.4%	90.5%	90.8%	89.5%	87.7%	91.9%	90.1%
Westminster West	1025	20	94.4%	96.7%	98.5%	92.8%	88.8%	88.3%	83.8%

Source: Carroll County Public Schools (enrollment projections 2015-16 to 2024-25, Department of Facilities Management)

The following table shows actual enrollment as a percentage of state-rated capacity among high schools for FY 2015 and projected enrollment for FY 2016 through FY 2021. All high schools are projected to be adequate through FY 2021.

High Schools FY 2015 - 2021 Enrollments as a Percentage of State-Rated Capacity

HIGH SCHOOL	STATE RATED CAPACITY		ACTUAL FY 2015	PROJECTED					
	9 - 12	Spec Ed		FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021
Century	1267	30	86.7%	84.3%	83.0%	86.0%	84.7%	84.3%	81.7%
Francis Scott Key	1224	30	76.4%	75.9%	73.7%	71.6%	72.4%	70.3%	67.5%
Liberty	1118	20	94.6%	97.3%	98.6%	98.3%	95.5%	92.2%	87.4%
Manchester Valley	1267	30	61.0%	59.8%	57.7%	56.5%	56.3%	56.8%	54.4%
North Carroll	1139	20	62.1%	61.5%	61.4%	61.6%	61.1%	61.6%	60.8%
South Carroll	1309	30	80.0%	77.1%	79.2%	78.9%	78.7%	78.4%	77.5%
Westminster	1798	40	84.2%	82.8%	79.2%	80.7%	80.8%	81.8%	81.3%
Winters Mill	1267	30	84.2%	86.4%	83.2%	86.4%	87.1%	85.0%	86.1%

Source: Carroll County Public Schools (enrollment projections 2015-16 to 2024-25, Department of Facilities Management)

Based on current population and projected growth:

Recommended Capital Improvements (§156.07(B))

No capital improvements are recommended.

Recommended Building Permit Caps (§156.07(B))

No building permit cap is recommended.

Proposed Changes to the Boundaries of Impact Areas (§156.07(B)(11))

The review of development proposals uses the enrollment districts for each school as established by the Carroll County Board of Education.

Proposed Changes to Existing or Adopted Threshold Standards (§156.07(B)(12))

No changes are recommended.

Proposed Changes in Concurrency Analysis Methodology (§156.07(B)(13))

No changes are recommended.

Proposed Amendments to Chapter 156 (§156.07(B)(14))

No changes are recommended.

CHAPTER FOUR ROADS

Threshold: (as defined in Chapter 156)

Adequate: Projected level of service for road segments and intersections within the traffic impact study area for the proposed project is rated Level of Service C or better, according to the Department of Public Works or by the State of Maryland, as applicable.

Approaching inadequate: Projected level of service for road segments and intersections within the traffic impact study area for the proposed project is rated Level of Service D, according to the Department of Public Works or by the State of Maryland, as applicable.

Inadequate: Projected level of service for road segments and intersections within the traffic impact study area for the proposed project is Level of Service E or F, according to the Department of Public Works or by the State of Maryland, as applicable.

Administrative Procedures

The Department of Public Works (DPW) Roads and Storm Drain Design Manual (5.1.1) states a traffic impact study shall be required for any proposed development that will generate 50 or more peak hour trips. For developments generating less than 25 peak hour trips, a traffic study will not be required. For developments generating between 25 and 50 peak hour trips, based on site specific intersection concerns, a traffic impact study may be required. The traffic impact study determines the level of service (LOS) that exists on any affected road intersection and the LOS that would result if the proposed development were built. The results of the traffic impact study are checked against the threshold to determine adequacy. As part of the Commission's approval process, the development will then be responsible to address any deficiencies identified in the traffic study.

The LOS assigns a grade of A through F to a road segment or intersection to describe and define the level of congestion. A LOS A indicates few vehicles relative to the design capacity of the road or intersection. A LOS F indicates a volume of traffic that chokes traffic flow. Carroll County does not have a comprehensive LOS analysis of all existing roads and intersections, nor does the County project future LOS.

Functional classification – The process by which streets and highways are grouped into classes, or systems, according to the type of service the roads are intended to provide (Roads and Storm Drain Manual, 1994). An inventory of functional classification designations for County roads was updated in 2007 (Carroll County Functional Classification, July 2007, Department of Public Works).

Study Area – The amount of area to be studied which is determined by an appropriate analysis which is based upon local or site specific issues, development size and reviewing agency policy. The area is established during the pre-application conference by representatives from the Departments of Planning and Public Works (Roads and Storm Drain Manual, 1994).

Traffic counts – a measurement of the number of vehicles passing a point on a road during certain times of day.

Trip generation – Projected number of trips produced by a type of land use or building. Based upon statistical analysis of existing land uses and building types. (Roads and Storm Drain Manual, 1994).

By adding the trip generation factor to existing traffic count data, the projected traffic volume on a roadway or at an intersection can be estimated. The projected traffic volume is then compared with standards for the volume of traffic that the various functional classifications of roadway are designed to carry. The result is a projected level of service that is checked against the threshold for roads to determine adequacy.

Based on current population and projected growth:

Recommended Capital Improvements (§156.07(B))

No capital improvements are recommended.

Recommended Building Permit Caps (§156.07(B))

No building permit cap is recommended.

Proposed Changes to the Boundaries of Impact Areas (§156.07(B)(11))

Study areas are determined on a case by case basis when a proposed project is tested for adequacy.

Proposed Changes to Existing or Adopted Threshold Standards (§156.07(B)(12))

No changes are recommended.

Proposed Changes in Concurrency Analysis Methodology (§156.07(B)(13))

No changes are recommended.

Proposed Amendments to Chapter 156 (§156.07(B)(14))

No changes are recommended.

CHAPTER FIVE

FIRE AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES

Threshold: (as defined in Chapter 156)

Adequate:

1. Total number of late and no responses is less than 15%, and the total number of no responses is less than 4% measured on a 24-month basis, updated monthly;
2. Using an average over the previous 24 months, response time is eight minutes or less from time of dispatch to on-scene arrival with adequate apparatus and personnel; and
3. All bridges and roads for the most direct route or acceptable secondary route to the project site are adequate to support fire and emergency response apparatus.

Approaching inadequate:

1. Either the total number of late and no responses equals or exceeds 15%, or the total number of no responses equals or exceeds 4% measured on a 24-month basis, updated monthly, but not both; or
2. Using an average over the previous 24 months, response time is between eight and ten minutes from time of dispatch to on-scene arrival with adequate apparatus and personnel.

Inadequate:

1. Total number of late and no responses equals or exceeds 15%, and the total number of no responses equals or exceeds 4% measured on a 24-month basis, updated monthly;
2. Using an average over the previous 24 months, response time exceeds ten minutes from time of dispatch to on-scene arrival with adequate apparatus and personnel; or
3. A bridge or road is inadequate to support fire and emergency response apparatus for the most direct route and a bridge or road is inadequate to support fire and emergency response apparatus for the acceptable secondary route to the project site.

Administrative Procedures

ATC certificates for fire and emergency medical services (EMS) are distributed to the Department of Public Safety for completion and signatures. The statistical data used to evaluate the first and second threshold determining criterion is maintained by the County's 911 Center. Data is maintained separately for each of the County's fourteen fire districts. This data is further subcategorized as either a fire or EMS incident. Separate calculations are made for both Fire and Emergency Medical Services, allowing each to be evaluated independently. Testing for the third criterion is achieved by identifying the primary and secondary routes that the first-due fire company would travel from their station to the location of the proposed development during an emergency response. All bridges along these routes are identified and the Department of Public Safety compares with the list of inadequate bridges (as determined jointly between the Departments of Public Safety and Public Works)..

Late and No Response Criteria

The first criterion is the percentage of calls that result in either a late or no response. The data used to determine these percentages, including the actual calculations, is a function within the County's 911 Center. As previously noted, incidents are classified as either fire or EMS in nature. A dispatched unit is given five minutes to respond, once it has been alerted. If the due unit has not responded by the time the allotted five minutes has elapsed, the next due unit is alerted. If the first-due unit responds after the initial five minutes has elapsed, the incident is categorized as a 'late response' for the first-due unit. If the first-due unit never responds, the incident is categorized as a 'no response'.

Late and no response statistics are maintained separately for each respective fire district, for both fire and EMS incidents. Based on these statistics, the late and no response percentages are calculated and the applicable rating assigned.

In FY 2014, the Commission requested that staff initiate the review of concurrency standards for fire and EMS. During FY 2014 and 2015, staff from the Department of Public Safety and Bureau of Development Review met several times with Carroll County Volunteer Emergency Services Association (CCVESA) representatives. Those meetings resulted in a recommendation that the threshold standards for average response time for fire be revised in recognition of the presence of automatic sprinkler protection in all new one and two family dwelling units and the threshold standards for late and no response percentages for EMS be revised in recognition of the utilization of paid personnel in staffing the majority of EMS units. The meetings also resulted in a recommendation to replace the “most direct route of travel” with “primary route of travel”.

Monthly report information, supplied by the Department of Public Safety, is not available for the months of April, May, and June. Except for two months in the Taneytown district, all fire stations were rated adequate for the reporting period through 3/31/2015. All EMS stations were rated adequate by the late and no response measure for the reporting period through 3/31/2015.

First-Due late/No Response by Station – Fire

<u>FIRE</u>	FY 2015 8/1/12 – 7/31/14 % First Due		FY 2015 9/1/12 – 8/31/14 % First Due		FY 2015 10/1/12 – 9/30/14 % First Due		FY 2015 11/1/12 – 10/31/14 % First Due	
	Station	Late/Fail	Fail	Late/Fail	Fail	Late/Fail	Fail	Late/Fail
Mount Airy	2.0%	1.0%	2.0%	1.0%	2.0%	1.0%	2.0%	1.0%
Hampstead	6.0%	3.0%	5.0%	3.0%	6.0%	3.0%	5.0%	2.0%
Westminster	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%
Manchester	5.0%	3.0%	5.0%	3.0%	5.0%	2.0%	5.0%	2.0%
Taneytown	8.0%	4.0%	8.0%	4.0%	7.0%	3.0%	7.0%	3.0%
Pleasant Valley	1.0%	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%
Lineboro	3.0%	0.0%	3.0%	0.0%	4.0%	0.0%	4.0%	0.0%
Union Bridge	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Reese	8.0%	3.0%	7.0%	3.0%	7.0%	3.0%	7.0%	3.0%
New Windsor	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Harney	3.0%	2.0%	2.0%	0.0%	2.0%	0.0%	2.0%	0.0%
Sykesville	1.0%	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%
Gamber	5.0%	1.0%	5.0%	1.0%	5.0%	1.0%	4.0%	1.0%
Winfield	5.0%	3.0%	5.0%	3.0%	4.0%	2.0%	4.0%	2.0%

<u>FIRE</u>	FY 2015 12/1/12 – 11/30/14 % First Due		FY 2015 1/1/13 – 12/31/14 % First Due		FY 2015 2/1/13 – 1/31/15 % First Due		FY 2015 3/1/13 – 2/28/15 % First Due	
	Station	Late/Fail	Fail	Late/Fail	Fail	Late/Fail	Fail	Late/Fail
Mount Airy	2.0%	1.0%	2.0%	1.0%	2.0%	1.0%	2.0%	1.0%
Hampstead	5.0%	2.0%	5.0%	2.0%	4.0%	2.0%	4.0%	2.0%
Westminster	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%
Manchester	5.0%	2.0%	4.0%	2.0%	5.0%	2.0%	4.0%	2.0%
Taneytown	7.0%	3.0%	8.0%	3.0%	7.0%	3.0%	7.0%	3.0%
Pleasant Valley	1.0%	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%
Lineboro	4.0%	0.0%	3.0%	0.0%	3.0%	0.0%	3.0%	0.0%
Union Bridge	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Reese	7.0%	3.0%	6.0%	2.0%	5.0%	2.0%	5.0%	2.0%
New Windsor	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Harney	2.0%	0.0%	2.0%	0.0%	2.0%	0.0%	2.0%	0.0%
Sykesville	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Gamber	4.0%	1.0%	4.0%	0.0%	3.0%	0.0%	3.0%	0.0%
Winfield	4.0%	2.0%	4.0%	2.0%	3.0%	2.0%	3.0%	2.0%

<u>FIRE</u>	FY 2015 4/1/13 – 3/31/15 % First Due		FY 2015 5/1/13 – 4/30/15 % First Due		FY 2015 6/1/13 – 5/31/15 % First Due		FY 2015 7/1/13 – 6/30/15 % First Due	
	Station	Late/Fail	Fail	Late/Fail	Fail	Late/Fail	Fail	Late/Fail
Mount Airy	2.0%	1.0%						
Hampstead	4.0%	1.0%						
Westminster	1.0%	0.0%						
Manchester	4.0%	1.0%						
Taneytown	7.0%	3.0%						
Pleasant Valley	1.0%	0.0%						
Lineboro	4.0%	0.0%						
Union Bridge	0.0%	0.0%						
Reese	5.0%	2.0%						
New Windsor	0.0%	0.0%						
Harney	2.0%	0.0%						
Sykesville	0.0%	0.0%						
Gamber	3.0%	0.0%						
Winfield	3.0%	2.0%						

Source: Carroll County Office of Public Safety

First-Due Late/No Response by Station – EMS

EMS	FY 2015 8/1/12 – 7/31/14 % First Due		FY 2015 9/1/12 – 8/31/14 % First Due		FY 2015 10/1/12 – 9/30/14 % First Due		FY 2015 11/1/12 – 10/31/14 % First Due	
	Station	Late/Fail	Fail	Late/Fail	Fail	Late/Fail	Fail	Late/Fail
Mount Airy	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	2.0%	1.0%	2.0%	1.0%
Hampstead	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Westminster	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Manchester	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%
Taneytown	4.0%	3.0%	4.0%	3.0%	4.0%	3.0%	4.0%	3.0%
Pleasant Valley	1.0%	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%
Lineboro	1.0%	0.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%
Union Bridge	1.0%	0.0%	1.0%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Reese	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%
New Windsor	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Harney	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Sykesville	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Gamber	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Winfield	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

EMS	FY 2015 12/1/12 – 11/30/14 % First Due		FY 2015 1/1/13 – 12/31/14 % First Due		FY 2015 2/1/13 – 1/31/15 % First Due		FY 2015 3/1/13 – 2/28/15 % First Due	
	Station	Late/Fail	Fail	Late/Fail	Fail	Late/Fail	Fail	Late/Fail
Mount Airy	2.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	2.0%	1.0%
Hampstead	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Westminster	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Manchester	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%
Taneytown	5.0%	4.0%	5.0%	4.0%	5.0%	4.0%	5.0%	4.0%
Pleasant Valley	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Lineboro	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%
Union Bridge	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Reese	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%
New Windsor	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Harney	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Sykesville	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Gamber	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Winfield	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

<u>EMS</u>	FY 2015 4/1/13 – 3/31/15 % First Due		FY 2015 5/1/13 – 4/30/15 % First Due		FY 2015 6/1/13 – 5/31/15 % First Due		FY 2015 7/1/13 – 6/30/15 % First Due	
	Late/Fail	Fail	Late/Fail	Fail	Late/Fail	Fail	Late/Fail	Fail
Mount Airy	2.0%	1.0%						
Hampstead	0.0%	0.0%						
Westminster	0.0%	0.0%						
Manchester	1.0%	1.0%						
Taneytown	5.0%	4.0%						
Pleasant Valley	0.0%	0.0%						
Lineboro	1.0%	1.0%						
Union Bridge	0.0%	0.0%						
Reese	1.0%	1.0%						
New Windsor	0.0%	0.0%						
Harney	0.0%	0.0%						
Sykesville	0.0%	0.0%						
Gamber	0.0%	0.0%						
Winfield	0.0%	0.0%						

Source: Carroll County Office of Public Safety

Average Response Time

The second criterion is “Average Response Time”. Similar to the late and no response percentages, the data and subsequent calculations for this criterion is also a function of the County’s 911 Center.

Response time to a given incident is measured from the time the first-due unit is initially dispatched until on-scene arrival of adequate apparatus and personnel. An “Average Response Time” is determined monthly for each respective fire district, for both fire and EMS, using the data collected during the previous 24-month period.

During the FY 2015 reporting period through 3/31/2015, Westminster, Union Bridge, and Sykesville maintained adequate average response times for fire. The remaining fire companies had months that were rated ‘approaching inadequate’. In accordance with the Code, if a public facility or service is approaching inadequate, the Commission may approve the final subdivision plan subject to a phasing plan for recordation or may defer the project and place the plan in a queue to be retested on an annual basis. No projects were placed in a queue.

During the FY 2015 reporting period through 3/31/2015, no EMS station had an inadequate rating; however, Lineboro, Pleasant Valley, and Winfield were in the ‘approaching inadequate’ category for the entire period. In accordance with the Code, if a public facility or service is approaching inadequate, the Commission may approve the final subdivision plan subject to a phasing plan for recordation or may defer the project and place the plan in a queue to be retested on an annual basis. No projects were placed in a queue.

Average Response Time by Station – Fire

		<u>8/1/12 - 7/31/14</u>	<u>9/1/12 - 8/31/14</u>	<u>10/1/12 - 9/30/14</u>	<u>11/1/12 - 10/31/14</u>	<u>12/1/12 - 11/30/14</u>	<u>1/1/13 - 12/31/14</u>	<u>2/1/13 - 1/31/15</u>	<u>3/1/13 - 2/28/15</u>	<u>4/1/13 - 3/31/15</u>	<u>5/1/13 - 4/30/15</u>	<u>6/1/13 - 5/31/15</u>	<u>7/1/13 - 6/30/15</u>
1	Mount Airy	8:01	8:08	8:11	8:16	8:22	8:17	8:20	8:17	8:15			
2	Hampstead	9:03	9:09	9:00	8:59	9:01	9:14	9:09	9:04	9:04			
3	Westminster	7:31	7:29	7:28	7:29	7:29	7:49	7:53	7:48	7:51			
4	Manchester	9:09	9:10	9:03	9:08	9:12	8:58	8:55	8:59	9:04			
5	Taneytown	8:26	8:21	8:23	8:20	8:13	8:08	8:02	8:09	8:16			
6	Pleasant Valley	9:18	9:25	9:26	9:31	9:22	9:34	9:31	9:27	9:20			
7	Lineboro	8:47	8:41	8:32	8:38	8:32	8:43	8:35	8:31	8:36			
8	Union Bridge	7:38	7:45	7:36	7:40	7:36	7:28	7:27	7:32	7:27			
9	Reese	9:31	9:24	9:24	9:18	9:14	9:13	9:12	9:09	9:13			
10	New Windsor	8:01	7:53	7:49	7:41	7:37	7:49	7:39	7:42	7:39			
11	Harney	8:41	8:41	8:41	7:41	7:37	7:23	8:07	8:07	8:07			
12	Sykesville	7:51	7:52	7:49	7:50	7:47	7:48	7:50	7:46	7:48			
13	Gamber	8:29	8:37	8:39	8:44	8:38	8:48	8:50	8:47	8:44			
14	Winfield	8:38	8:43	8:43	8:37	8:43	8:51	8:54	8:51	8:48			

Average Response Time by Station – EMS

		<u>8/1/12 - 7/31/14</u>	<u>9/1/12 - 8/31/14</u>	<u>10/1/12 - 9/30/14</u>	<u>11/1/12 - 10/31/14</u>	<u>12/1/12 - 11/30/14</u>	<u>1/1/13 - 12/31/14</u>	<u>2/1/13 - 1/31/15</u>	<u>3/1/13 - 2/28/15</u>	<u>4/1/13 - 3/31/15</u>	<u>5/1/13 - 4/30/15</u>	<u>6/1/13 - 5/31/15</u>	<u>7/1/13 - 6/30/15</u>
1	Mount Airy	7:06	7:07	7:06	7:05	7:06	7:01	7:02	7:04	7:08			
2	Hampstead	6:35	6:34	6:34	6:38	6:37	6:38	6:40	6:42	6:50			
3	Westminster	6:48	6:45	6:36	6:36	6:34	6:33	6:35	6:36	6:39			
4	Manchester	6:48	6:52	6:57	6:54	6:53	6:51	6:56	6:52	6:54			
5	Taneytown	7:40	7:25	7:13	7:09	7:12	7:11	7:12	7:13	7:10			
6	Pleasant Valley	9:46	9:42	9:36	9:43	9:41	9:33	9:33	9:28	9:23			
7	Lineboro	8:34	8:24	8:14	8:17	8:09	8:10	8:21	8:15	8:21			
8	Union Bridge	6:24	6:26	6:23	6:18	6:18	6:15	6:13	6:15	6:19			
9	Reese	7:54	7:49	7:50	7:55	7:50	7:47	7:47	7:49	7:43			
10	New Windsor	7:12	7:05	7:02	7:11	7:03	6:58	6:57	7:01	7:10			
11	Harney	7:57	7:57	7:38	7:54	7:53	7:54	8:01	7:56	7:58			
12	Sykesville	7:14	7:12	7:14	7:17	7:12	7:10	7:12	7:10	7:13			
13	Gamber	7:09	7:05	7:07	7:07	7:08	7:06	7:10	7:11	7:03			
14	Winfield	8:58	8:55	8:57	9:01	8:59	8:49	8:55	8:49	8:43			

Route of Travel

The third criterion reflects the capacity of bridges and roads located along the primary and secondary route of travel between the respective fire station and the location of the proposed development. In the spring of 2006, the County commissioned an analysis of posted bridges to determine their adequacy relative to supporting fire and EMS apparatus. This analysis was based on information submitted by each individual fire company, which detailed the weight and axle characteristics of the various vehicles each department operated. To complete the analysis, a computer program was developed capable of modeling the structure type of each bridge, as well as both the axle loads and axle spacing of the various emergency apparatus. Using this program to model the stress and pressures exerted as a vehicle passes over a given bridge, inadequate structures were identified.

Bridges on state highways, with a few exceptions, are designed for all legal loads and are assumed to be adequate. The three exceptions, two on MD Route 86 and one on MD Route 832, have posted weight limits.

Bridges on county-maintained roads, with a few exceptions, are also designed for all legal loads. The County uses a consultant to perform annual/biennial inspections of bridges on county roads.

As part of the 2013 bridge inspection cycle, new structural load ratings were completed for all the county-maintained bridges. Two bridge projects are included in the CIP. The Department of Public Works will monitor all bridges in cooperation with the Department of Public Safety.

Structure	First 3 responders*	Restricted vehicle/s	Status
CL269 Babylon Road over Silver Run	Pleasant Valley, Taneytown, Westminster	Taneytown Rescue 5	In CIP
CL363 Stone Chapel over Little Pipe Creek	Westminster, New Windsor, Pleasant Valley	Westminster Tower 3	In CIP request

*First 3 responders determined by Public Safety

Based on current population and projected growth:

Recommended Capital Improvements (§156.07(B))

The adopted CIP includes a replacement of bridge CL269 on Babylon Road over Silver Run. Bridge CL363 is included in the CIP request.

Recommended Building Permit Caps (§156.07(B))

No building permit cap is recommended.

Proposed Changes to the Boundaries of Impact Areas (§156.07(B)(11))

The review of development proposals uses the first-due district as cooperatively established by the respective fire/emergency medical stations.

.

Proposed Changes to Existing or Adopted Threshold Standards (§156.07(B)(12))

Changes to fire standards to recognize the presence of automatic sprinklers and changes to EMS standards to recognize the utilization of paid personnel.

Proposed Changes in Concurrency Analysis Methodology (§156.07(B)(13))

No changes are recommended.

Proposed Amendments to Chapter 156 (§156.07(B)(14))

No changes are recommended.

CHAPTER SIX

POLICE SERVICES

Threshold: (as defined in Chapter 156)

Adequate: Services are adequate if the projected ratio of sworn law enforcement officers to population is 1.3:1,000. The ratio shall be calculated by counting all sworn officers with law enforcement responsibility in an incorporated municipality or within the County and by counting the total population within the incorporated municipalities and within the unincorporated County.

Approaching inadequate: Services are approaching inadequate if the projected ratio of sworn law enforcement officers to population is between 1.2-1.3:1,000.

Inadequate: Services are inadequate if the projected ratio of sworn law enforcement officers to population is anything less than 1.2:1,000.

Administrative Procedures

The number of sworn law enforcement officers is provided monthly by the Carroll County Sheriff's Department. Population estimates are provided by the Bureau of Comprehensive Planning. The monthly population is estimated by multiplying the number of use and occupancy permits issued since the last census by the average household size in the County and adding the result to the population in the most recent census. Law enforcement officer counts include sworn officers from the Sheriff's Office, Maryland State Police, and the various municipal police departments. Sworn positions include personnel currently in academy or training.

Projected number of sworn law enforcement officers for the Sheriff's Office and municipal police departments includes the number of funded positions in the annual budget of the appropriate jurisdiction. The staffing level at the Maryland State Police is subject in part to the number of officers from a statewide police force assigned to the Westminster barracks at any given time.

Future threshold capacity is calculated by adding the projected population from developments in the pipeline to the latest population estimate and sheriff's deputy positions planned for each year in the current adopted Operating Plan to the latest total of funded positions. The Operating Plan is a companion document to the CIP that is adopted annually by the Commissioners as part of the budgeting process.

Development Projections

The number of county-wide sworn law enforcement officer positions at the beginning of FY 2015 was 232 and the number of sworn law enforcement officer positions at the end of FY 2015 was 231. The estimated county-wide population as of July 1, 2014 was 170,643 and at June 30, 2015 was 171,702 (50,659 in the unincorporated area and 121,043 in the incorporated area). The ratio of sworn officer positions per 1,000 citizens remained over the adequate threshold of 1.30 through the entire FY 2015 reporting period. Including developments in the pipeline, the projected ratio for FY 2016 and 2017 will remain at or above the 1.3 threshold.

The standard is calculated by including those sworn officers in a municipality. Those municipalities have adopted individual budgets which could impact the total number of county-wide law enforcement positions used in determining rating levels for County projects subject to Concurrency Management.

The following chart indicates the number of positions at the beginning of the fiscal year and at the end of the fiscal year.

	July 1, 2014			June 30, 2015		
	Sworn	Vacant	Total Authorized	Sworn	Vacant	Total Authorized
Carroll County Sheriff's Office	113	1	114	112	2	114
Maryland State Police	41	N/A	41	41	N/A	41
Westminster Police	44	0	44	41	3	44
Hampstead Police	9	0	9	10	0	10
Manchester Police	6	0	6	6	0	6
Sykesville Police	5	3	8	7	1	8
Taneytown Police	14	0	14	14	0	14
TOTAL	232	4	236	231	6	237

Based on current population and projected growth:

Recommended Capital Improvements (§156.07(B))

No capital improvements are recommended.

Recommended Building Permit Caps (§156.07(B))

No building permit cap is recommended.

Proposed Changes to the Boundaries of Impact Areas (§156.07(B)(11))

No changes are recommended.

Proposed Changes to Existing or Adopted Threshold Standards (§156.07(B)(12))

No changes are recommended.

Proposed Changes in Concurrency Analysis Methodology (§156.07(B)(13))

No changes are recommended.

Proposed Amendments to Chapter 156 (§156.07(B)(14))

No changes are recommended.

CHAPTER SEVEN

WATER AND SEWER SERVICE

Threshold: (as defined in Chapter 156)

Adequate: Water and sewer services. For water services, the facility is adequate if the maximum day demand is less than 85% of the total system production capacity. For sewer services, the facility is adequate if the projected annual average daily flow is less than 85% of the wastewater treatment facility permitted capacity.

Approaching inadequate: For water services, the facility is approaching inadequate if the projected maximum day demand is equal to or greater than 85% but less than 95% of the total system production capacity. For sewer services, the facility is approaching inadequate if the projected annual average daily flow is greater than or equal to 85% but less than 95% of the wastewater treatment facility permitted capacity.

Inadequate: For water services, the facility is inadequate if the projected maximum day demand is equal to or greater than 95% of the total system production capacity. For sewer services, the facility is inadequate if the projected annual average daily flow is greater than or equal to 95% of the wastewater treatment facility permitted capacity.

PROJECTED ANNUAL AVERAGE DAILY FLOW. The annual average daily flow for sewerage plus the projected flow for the proposed use.

Administrative procedures

Carroll County operates several public utility facilities: Hampstead Sewer System, Freedom District Sewer System, Freedom District Water System, Bark Hill Water System, Pleasant Valley Water System, and Pleasant Valley Sewer Service. The ATC certificates for water and/or sewer service in the Freedom area and sewer service in the Hampstead area are completed and signed by the Bureau of Utilities in the Department of Public Works. For projects in unincorporated areas of the County that are planned to connect to a municipally-owned water or sewer system, the ATC certificates are completed and signed by the municipality.

The adequacy thresholds for water and sewer are based on measurement of flows, but they are handled differently. The adequacy threshold for water requires that the County compare the projected maximum day demand for water with the total production capacity of the system (TSPC). The TSPC is the amount of water flow the system can provide. It is typically measured in million gallons per day (mgd). The maximum day demand is calculated by applying a factor of 1.75 to the projected annual average day demand which consists of three components:

- the existing demand for water of all users hooked up to the system;
- the total projected demand of any developments that have received preliminary or final approval from the Commission but have not yet hooked up to the system; and
- the projected demand for water that the proposed development currently undergoing testing for adequacy would generate.

For the projections, the County uses the Maryland Department of Environment (MDE) standard which is to multiply the number of proposed residential units by 250 gallons per day (gpd). The resulting number, expressed in gpd, represents the amount of water flow that the proposed development would draw from the system if it were connected, i.e. the projected demand of the development. As proposed developments go through the approval process, the Bureau of Utilities is responsible for monitoring the status of all projects that would connect to County water, including those not subject to Chapter 156, and

the impact the projected demand would have on capacity in the water system.

The adequacy threshold for sewer requires that the County compare the projected annual average daily flow of wastewater with the wastewater treatment facility permitted capacity. The wastewater treatment facility is permitted and monitored by MDE and its capacity is expressed in mgd. For the purpose of testing the projected adequacy of sewer service capacity, the projected average daily flow consists of three components:

- the existing usage by all connections to the system;
- the total projected usage by any developments that have received preliminary or final approval from the Commission but have not yet hooked up to the system; and
- the projected usage by the proposed development currently undergoing testing for adequacy.

For the usage projections, the County uses the MDE standard which is to multiply the number of proposed residential units by 250 gpd. The resulting number, expressed in gpd, represents the amount of wastewater treatment capacity the proposed development would use if it was connected, i.e. the projected usage by the development. As with water service, the Bureau of Utilities monitors the status of all projects that would connect to a County sewer system, including those not subject to Chapter 156.

Freedom Water Supply

Freedom Water Plant	6.000 mgd
Fairhaven Well	0.340 mgd
Raincliffe Well	<u>0.381 mgd</u>
Total System Production Capacity (TSPC)	6.721 mgd

85% of TSPC $6.721 \times .85 = 5.713$ mgd

95% of TSPC $6.721 \times .95 = 6.385$ mgd

Chapter 156 states that maximum day demand is calculated by multiplying the annual average day demand for water by 1.75. For the purpose of determining the annual average day demand for water, the Bureau of Utilities reviews the annual average daily flows from the five preceding years and uses the five-year average or the preceding year, whichever is higher.

2014 Annual Average Day Demand	2.008 mgd
Five-Year Average Day Demand	2.121 mgd
Projected Annual Average Day Demand	2.121 mgd
Calculated Maximum Day Demand (1.75 x 2.121)	3.712 mgd
Calculated % of TSPC ($3.712 \div 6.721$)	55%

The projected maximum daily demand for the Freedom Water System is less than 85% of the total system production capacity. The service meets the adequate threshold standard.

Freedom Sewer

Design Capacity	3.500 mgd
Permitted Capacity	3.500 mgd

85% Permitted Flow ($3.50 \times .85$) = 2.975 mgd

95% Permitted Flow ($3.50 \times .95$) = 3.325 mgd

2012 Average Daily Flow	2.051 mgd
2013 Average Daily Flow	2.117 mgd

2014 Average Daily Flow	2.204 mgd
Three-Year Average	2.124 mgd
Projected Annual Average Daily Flow	2.204 mgd

The standard for sewer in Chapter 156 is based on the projected annual average daily flow. For the purpose of determining the projected annual average daily flow for sewer, the higher of the three-year average or the preceding year is used. The County and state share the use of the wastewater treatment facility. Of the 3.5 mgd capacity, the County can allocate 2.6 mgd and the state can allocate 0.9 mgd.

Using only the 2.204 mgd average daily flow, the Freedom Sewer Plant is operating at 63% of total capacity. Including residential projects in the development pipeline with sewer allocations; the percentage increases to 65% of total capacity.

Measuring the 2.204 mgd average daily flow with the County's allocation (2.6 mgd) the percentage is near 75%. Staff should review the current allocation list and determine the number of vacant lots in the Freedom sewer district to determine if any changes are needed.

Hampstead Sewer

Design Capacity	0.900 mgd
Permitted Capacity	0.900 mgd
85% Permitted Flow (0.9 x .85) =	.765 mgd
95% Permitted Flow (0.9 x .95) =	.855 mgd
2012 Average Daily Flow	0.572 mgd
2013 Average Daily Flow	0.553 mgd
2014 Average Daily Flow	0.631 mgd
Three-Year Average	0.585 mgd
Projected Annual Average Daily Flow	0.631 mgd

The Hampstead Sewer Plant is operating at 70% of permitted capacity and thus meets the adequate threshold standard, which is less than 85%.

Bark Hill Water

Bark Hill Water Plant (TSPC)

Water Appropriation and Use Permit = 20,000 gpd daily average on yearly basis.

85% of TSPC 20,000 x .85 = 17,000 gpd

95% of TSPC 20,000 x .95 = 19,000 gpd

2013 Annual Average Day Demand	19,500 gpd
Five-Year Average Day Demand	17,834 gpd
Projected Annual Average Day Demand	19,500 gpd
Percent of total capacity	97.5%.

Percent of remaining capacity 2.5%

The service area for the Bark Hill Water System is not intended to expand. A review of the demand and available lots in the service area should occur to determine if the appropriation permit needs to be adjusted.

Pleasant Valley Water

Pleasant Valley Water Plant (TSPC)

Water Appropriation and Use Permit = 10,100 GPD daily average on yearly basis.

85% of TSPC $10,100 \times .85 = 8,585$ gpd

95% of TSPC $10,100 \times .95 = 9,595$ gpd

2013 Annual Average Day Demand	6,332 gpd
Five-Year Average Day Demand	6,124 gpd
Projected Annual Average Day Demand	6,332 gpd
Percent of Total Capacity	62.69%
Percent of Remaining Capacity	37.31%

Pleasant Valley Sewer

State Discharge Permit = 19,000 gpd Annual Average

85% Permitted Flow $(19,000 \times .85) = 16,150$ gpd

95% Permitted Flow $(19,000 \times .95) = 18,050$ gpd

Three-Year Average	4,000 gpd
Projected Annual Average Daily Flow	4,000 gpd

Percent of Total Capacity = 20.03%

Percent of Remaining Capacity = 79.97%

Based on current population and projected growth:

Recommended Capital Improvements (§156.07(B))

No capital improvements are recommended.

Recommended Building Permit Caps (§156.07(B))

No building permit cap is recommended.

Proposed Changes to the Boundaries of Impact Areas (§156.07(B)(11))

No changes are recommended.

Proposed Changes to Existing or Adopted Threshold Standards (§156.07(B)(12))

No changes are recommended.

Proposed Changes in Concurrency Analysis Methodology (§156.07(B)(13))

No changes are recommended.

Proposed Amendments to Chapter 156 (§156.07(B)(14))

No changes are recommended.

CHAPTER EIGHT

AVAILABLE THRESHOLD CAPACITY RECOMMENDATIONS

The ATC is reviewed and adopted each year for the six-year planning cycle, and it is based on the yearly Concurrency Management Report. Facility capacity, level of service information, and adopted thresholds are balanced with fiscal considerations in setting the ATC. Growth is timed and phased through the setting of ATC limits to reduce the impact on the facility, which is inadequate, while providing other needed infrastructure.

The recommendations are as follows:

1. Review the threshold standard changes for Emergency and Medical Services as recommended by the workgroup.
-
- September 15, 2015: Carroll County Planning and Zoning Commission approved report
 - January 7, 2016: report presented to Carroll County Board of Commissioners