



March 12, 2026

Beachwood Park Soft Launch Facility Meeting Minutes

Project #'s *P567509 - Beachwood Park Boat Ramp - Design
****P567419 - Beachwood Park Sof. Launch Facility - Construction**

For Clarification: The project was presented as the Beachwood Park Soft Launch Facility but referenced project number P567509. P567509 Should reference Beachwood Park Boat Ramp and will hold the design portion of the project. P567419 will reference Beachwood Park Soft Launch Facility and will hold all future construction of the park.

On February 3, 2026, a Public Meeting for the subject project was held at the Riviera Beach Library. Present were:

Kyle Autry (DPW), Fred Cartwright (DPW), Bruce Bruchey (DRP), Rich Lefebure (DRP), Nolley Fisher (DRP), Kyle Collins (DRP), Megan Barniea (BayLand), Nathan Volke (Council Member D3), Jeffrey Gibbs (Guest), Gary Habicht (Guest), Donna Kohl (Guest), Russel Fawthrop (Guest), Robbin Hynson (Guest), Sue Stevens (Guest), Rick Stevens (Guest), Tom Chisholm (Guest), Andrew Janiak (Guest), Carmela Macey (Guest), Eric Macey (Guest), Ray Scriff (Guest), Sue McDonald (Guest), Kory Hartl (Guest), Heidi Schmidt (Guest), Maxine Mead (Guest), and Ralph Smith (Guest).

The purpose of this meeting was to review contract requirements and procedures. The items that were discussed at this meeting were as follows:

1. The meeting was a sanctioned OPZ community meeting, and the meeting was recorded to comply with OPZ community meeting requirements.
2. The meeting introduced the Departments and Consultants involved with the project.
3. DPW provided the agenda for the public meeting.
4. Bayland provided the Project Background and Purpose.
5. Bayland talked about the existing conditions of Beachwood Park.
6. Bayland presented the proposed new design of the parking area on Slide 7.
7. Bayland presented the proposed new design of the ADA accessible Kayak Launch Areas on Slide 8.
8. Bayland discussed the county code features that would have environmental impacts per County Code 17-2-107.
9. DPW and Bayland discussed the scheduled design and construction time frames for the project moving forward.
10. Questions began after the presentation was completed.

QUESTIONS DURING PRESENTATION:

1. Is this project approved for FY27?
 - a. Yes, the project was initially presented as a boat ramp within the Boat Ramp Development budget and with the change in programming, DPW will continue design through this projects budget. Once funding is reallocated to Water Access, all future procurements will be conducted there.
2. What budget is the project in?
 - a. Currently, the budget is in Boat Ramp Development. This will eventually transfer to Water Access in the FY27 budget cycle if approved.
3. There was mention of a moratorium on the property until 2051.
 - a. The county has no knowledge of a moratorium on this property.
4. There was a mention that the park is historical.
 - a. Maryland Historical Trust does not have Beachwood Park listed as a historical site.
5. Who will maintain the park once the improvements are built?
 - a. DRP will maintain the park if the park is rehabilitated.
6. There was discussion that street lights were out along the road.
 - a. BGE operates all the street lights along Beachwood Park Rd.
7. Several members of the audience commented that security was a concern as many people would stop and change cloths in front of existing houses once they got out of the water.
 - a. With added security measures and possible privacy designs, the county feels this would eliminate the possibility of these scenarios.
8. Is it possible to include permanent bathrooms at the park?
 - a. With all the space constraints and steep slopes at this location, a permanent bathroom scenario would not work at this park. The need for the utilities necessary for the bathrooms would not be feasible.
9. Towards the end of the meeting Nathan Volke, the current District 3 Elected Council Member spoke to the residents about the park and the agenda of the current administration. Spoke about helping where he can and was willing to discuss with residents the strategies, processes and general understanding of these types of projects and how they are proposed and funded.

MAJOR THEMES:

Traffic Impacts and Roadway Limitations

- Key Concerns Raised:
 - The narrow width of Beachwood Park Road makes it difficult for 2-way traffic.
 - Vehicles driving to the dead end and turning around on private, residential property, which can damage yards, septic systems, and/or irrigation systems.
 - 40 parking spaces could significantly increase vehicle volume.
 - Risks of traffic congestion and backup at the park gate or onto adjacent roads (Magothy Bridge Road).
 - Trailered boats could become a problem on park roads.
 - Supporters discussed that comparable parks (Homeport Farm and Spriggs Farm Park) typically see low visitation levels, and proper parking areas and signage would reduce roadside parking problems.
- DPW has requested its engineer to begin a traffic study so that DPW Traffic Engineering can analyse all data that will formulate its need for future development of Beachwood Park Road.

Environmental and Ecological Impacts

- Key Concerns Raised:
 - With more paved surfaces, increased stormwater runoff into Magothy River
 - Impacts on wildlife habitats (deer, bald eagles, yellow perch)
 - Potential erosion or shoreline instability from construction
 - Disturbance of steep slopes and trees
 - Supporters discussed similar parks (Homeport Farm and Spriggs Farm Park) being developed with minimal clearing, erosion controls, and reforestation efforts, often benefiting wildlife.
- DPW and its engineer will always strive to protect environmental features of its renovated parks. The project especially will have an extensive permitting phase that will be reviewed by many state and local government review processes, including but not limited to Maryland Department of the Environment, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE, which includes 12 other regulatory agencies DNR, EPA, NOAA, NMF, Coast Guard, MHT, amongst others under the USACE umbrella), OPZ review of Critical Area Consistency Report and Buffer Management Plan, Notice of Intent (NOI) from MDE for Stormwater Associated with Construction Activity, Public Works Engineering Division for Stormwater Management, Soil Conservation District for Erosion and Sediment Control, Inspections & Permits Building and Grading Permits.

Through the state, federal, and local permitting processes, any necessary time-of-year restrictions for construction will be determined to prevent impacts to flora and fauna during critical spawning and growing seasons, including but not limited to wintering waterfowl, FIDS, fish, etc.

Critical Area code allows for development of water-dependent activities with the appropriate approvals. Mitigation requirements for all tree removals and new lot coverage will be determined per Critical Area requirements. A proposed mitigation planting plan (buffer management plan) will be developed to meet the requirement. The buffer management plan will be developed during the 60% design phase and will be reviewed and approved by the Office of Planning and Zoning and the Critical Area Commission as part of the grading permit review.

A modification per County Code § 17-6-403&404 will be applied for disturbance to steep slopes and specimen trees. Erosion and sediment control (ESC) measures are installed prior to disturbance of the steep slopes and will remain in place until the disturbed area is stabilized. The ESC plan is reviewed and approved by the Anne Arundel Soil Conservation District and the Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE) General Permit for Discharges of Stormwater Associated with Construction Activity.

As part of the design criteria and meeting stormwater management requirements, all of the rainwater will be captured and treated before it enters the waterway. The Project will address stormwater management requirements through Environmental Site Design. Conceptual footprints that meet preliminary SWM requirements are shown on the enclosed concept plans. A stormwater report with detailed computations will be developed as the project progresses from concept design. The SWM computations and plans will be reviewed by DPW Engineering Division through the grading permit review process.

Maintenance and Management Capacity

- Key Concerns Raised:
 - County currently struggles to maintain existing park, and a larger park could exacerbate the problems.
 - Current Poor Maintenance examples: overflowing trash cans, yard waste and debris dumping, fallen trees & unmanaged runoff, and a lack of consistent maintenance crews.
- DRP notes that Park Maintenance staff visit Beachwood Park at least once per week. Staff changes at Lake Waterford Park have resulted in more frequent patrols of Beachwood Park. The limited existing amenities at Beachwood Park limit the number of park visitors. In prioritizing maintenance efforts, busier parks do receive more attention. The expanded use, especially with the adaptive recreation programs, will bring increased attention to Beachwood Park. DRP does not address downed trees in natural areas within parks unless they are a hazard or are blocking access to park amenities. The portable toilet vendor servicing Beachwood Park was changed as the result of poor performance. DRP continues to work with County Police to address unauthorised park use. Residents are encouraged to report maintenance concerns using the County's 311 telephone or See Click Fix online systems. You can visit: <https://www.aacounty.org/contact/report-concern> for more information.

Safety, Security, and Crime Concerns

- Key Concerns Raised:
 - Increased foot traffic near residential areas
 - Trespassing onto private property
 - After hours, drug activity and people sleeping in parks
 - Limited park ranger presence due to budget cuts
 - Installation of fencing around parking lot or along Beachwood Park Rd. is noted.
 - Lack of response after placing calls to local police, DNR and County
 - Supporters cite similar parks where crime did not increase. Controlled access with gates, fences, and signage help prevent problems.
- DPW and DRP will strategize all necessary components into the design to deter citizens from inappropriate behavior. The county does not have the resources to provide constant monitoring of the site with personnel. The county can brainstorm installation of security measures that will help the outcome of security for the park.

Impacts on Adjacent Private Properties

- Key Concerns Raised:
 - Loss of privacy for local homeowners
 - Risk of trespassing onto private piers or shorelines
 - Possible structural impacts to bulkheads and shoreline protections
 - Liability concerns if visitors enter private property
- Fencing and landscaping will enclose the park to screen local homeowners. Additional fencing with trespassing signs can be installed along the adjacent property line perpendicular to the shoreline to prevent park users from entering private property along the shoreline. During the 60% design phase, another visual assessment and desktop analysis of the shoreline will be performed to determine if it is recommended for the County to pursue detailed investigations, analyses and concept design for shoreline

stabilization.

Public Water Access

- Key Concerns Raised:
 - Supporters note the lack of free public water access in the County, particularly for small boats and kayaks. The park improvements would allow for more access to the County's 533 miles of shoreline.
 - Kayakers and many people who would enjoy the park would require minimal additional infrastructure and are generally environmentally responsible.
- DPW and DRP note the need for water access facilities but also understand the more local concerns of citizens living adjacent to the park and will work with both to satisfy the needs for all effected by the development.
- Anne Arundel County has an ongoing program to improve water access throughout the County. Numerous studies and Capital Projects have been performed to ensure widespread access for cartop vessels including kayaks and stand-up paddle boards. The primary purpose of this project is to increase free County public water access to the Magothy River.

Park Design and Accessibility

- Key Concerns:
 - There is a great distance and steep slope from the parking lot to the water, which can severely limit water access. There is a need for ADA-accessible pathways and launch facilities.
 - Debate over parking lot size, fencing, and the addition of restroom facilities (porta-johns).
- The county with its designer will work with DRP to adequately size the parking lots for the use.

Public Access vs Local Residents:

- Key Concerns Raised:
 - The proposed scale of development prioritizes outside visitors over the local community, potentially changing the neighborhood environment.
 - Supporters mentioned that because the land was purchased with county, state, and federal funds, it should serve all residents, not only nearby homeowners.
- Please review response to the Public Access section of this document.

Maryland PIA

- The comments note a request for information from a local resident -Public Information Act (MPIA), Md. Code, General Provisions Article § 4-101
 - The proper process of requesting information pertaining to the above provision is to visit: <https://www.aacounty.org/pia>