



HEARING NOTES

Bill: 23-0385

Crime Reduction & Violence Prevention Legislative Oversight

Committee: Public Safety and Government Operations

Chaired by: Mark Conway

Hearing Date: June 28, 2023

Time (Beginning): 1:05 PM

Time (Ending): 1:55 PM

Location: Du Burns Council Chamber / Webex Virtual Hearing

Total Attendance: Approximately 22 people

Committee Members in Attendance:

Mark Conway Odette Ramos Antonio Glover

Bill Synopsis in the file? YES NO N/A

Attendance sheet in the file? YES NO N/A

Agency reports read? YES NO N/A

Hearing televised or audio-digitally recorded? YES NO N/A

Certification of advertising/posting notices in the file? YES NO N/A

Evidence of notification to property owners? YES NO N/A

Final vote taken at this hearing? YES NO N/A

Motioned by:

Seconded by:.....

Final Vote:

Major Speakers

(This is not an attendance record.)

Ava Richardson – Department of Planning and Office of Sustainability.

Bob Cennane– Department of Finance.

Marcia Collins - Department of Public Works

Brittany Vendryes- Environmental Control Board

James Turner Department of Transportation

Jeff Hochstetler City Solicitor’s Office

Major Issues Discussed

1. Chairman Conway called the hearing to order.
2. Chairman Conway gave opening remarks on the bill as the sponsor.
3. Chairman Conway recognized Agencies for their reports on the bill.
 - a. City Solicitor's Office – Approved for form and consistency.
 - b. Department of Finance – Does not object
 - i. Noted that a Climate Resilience Authority's (CRA) ability to issue bonds relies on the City and that the department is working on a debt capacity study.
 - ii. Noted that they were willing to commit some funds to a study.
 - c. Department of Public Works – Favorable with amendments – deferring to Office of Sustainability for amendments.
 - i. Noted that DPW capital projects incorporate resilience but that there may be gaps in their holistic view of the City.
 - ii. Suggested that the time of the study be extended to one year.
 - d. Department of Planning and the Office of Sustainability Favorable with amendments
 - i. Suggesting amendments be added to increase the study period to one year – noting that the Climate Action Plan (CAP) and Disaster Preparedness Planning Project (DP3) are currently being updated and that these studies could help inform a CRA.
 - e. Environmental Control Board – Favorable.
 - f. Department of Transportation – No Objection
4. The agencies took questions from the committee. Topics included:
 - a. What would it take to complete the report – could it be done in six months?
 - i. Office of Sustainability noted that several other projects such as the DP3, CAP, and Nuisance Flood Plan could inform the study. There is also a concern about the resources available to conduct the study.
 - b. Why would we need to extend the study period to wait for DP3, CAP, and other reports to be completed? Chairman Conway noted that the CRA's role would be to help pay for the goals outlined in those reports.
 - i. Chairman Conway also noted his concern that a delay in the report may affect the option to work with Baltimore County which is also conducting its own study on a CRA.
 - ii. Agencies (DPW and the Office of Sustainability) noted that a shorter study may not be as comprehensive as a longer one.
 - c. What would an interaction with the CRA would be like to work on projects such as the flooding at 35th and Hillen?
 - i. Chairman Conway noted that a dedicated Authority would be able to help prioritize and raise funds for such infrastructure projects.
 - d. Would a CRA be able to leverage the state's borrowing authority when creating bonds to pay for projects?
 - i. The current understanding is that a CRA would not be able to do that – but questions around funding and structure are goals of the study.
 - e. Could it be possible to give some additional time without giving a full year to the study?
 - i. Chairman Conway reiterated concerns that a delay may prove detrimental to the potential creation of a CRA and the ability to work jointly with the county.

- 5. Chairman Conway opened the hearing to public testimony.
 - a. One speaker – Laurie Schwartz representing the Waterfront Partnership came forward in support of the bill.
- 6. Chairman Conway recessed the hearing.

Further Study

Was further study requested?

Yes No

If yes, describe.

.

Committee Vote:

M. Conway:
K. Burnett:
Z. Cohen:
E. Costello:
A. Glover:
P. Porter:
O. Ramos:

Anthony Leva, Committee Staff

Date: June 28, 2023

Cc: Bill File
OCS Chrono File