

Answers from the Administration CR125-2014

1. Is the appraised value you provided based on a single appraisal or is the average (or perhaps the highest) of multiple appraisals?

The appraised value of the site is based upon a single appraisal.

2. If the County only has one current appraisal for the property, would you be willing to conduct two more appraisals? Some Council Members have expressed that they may feel more comfortable waiving the bidding process if they could see three independent appraisals confirming that the County would be receiving a fair market value for the property.

We believe that the current appraisal is a fair assessment of the property. Appraisals of this nature cost approximately \$3,500. While the County is facing a budget shortfall and we believe this funding could be better used elsewhere, we will agree to conduct another appraisal. Please advise if you would like us to conduct another appraisal.

3. Did the appraisal which valued the property at \$867,800.00 take into account the upcoming completion of Dorsey Run Road? Please ensure that any additional appraisals conducted will include this in their assumptions as Council Members expect this significant public investment will increase the value of the property.

The appraised value does take into account the upcoming completion of Dorsey Run Road.

4. Please provide some additional context regarding the history of this property and its use as a yard waste processing facility: How long was it used for yard waste processing? Which jurisdictions and entities participated in the operation and what was each party's role? How much yard waste was processed there and from what areas? How and why was this use phased out?

The property was used for a regional yard waste composting facility for approximately one year in 1996. The property was owned by Maryland Environmental Service in trust for Baltimore County, Anne Arundel County, and Howard County. The project was initially operated by a private operator who quickly ran into difficulties in the daily operations. MES took over the operation but could not overcome the operating problems.

In order to solve this problem, a significant additional capital investment would have been needed. This would have required a raise in the tipping fees to a level that was not acceptable to the three jurisdictions.

A decision was made to close the project and sell most of the land. The remaining land would be used as a transfer station for yard waste.

The transfer station was operated for a number of years. This operation was stopped because reliable processing sites became very difficult to find.

The site was 55 acres of which 28 acres were used for processing. The site was designed to handle 30,000 tons per year of yard waste.