

WORKSESSION MINUTES
College Park City Council
Wednesday, October 5, 2022
7:30 p.m. – 11:03 p.m.

This was a hybrid meeting: Online via Zoom;
In-person in the Council Chambers of City Hall.

PRESENT: Mayor Wojahn; Councilmembers Kabir, Kennedy, Esters, Whitney, Adams, Rigg, Mackie and Mitchell.

ABSENT: None.

ALSO PRESENT: Kenneth Young, City Manager; Bill Gardiner, Assistant City Manager; Janeen S. Miller, City Clerk; Suellen Ferguson, City Attorney; Gary Fields, Finance Director; Bob Ryan, Public Services Director; Valerie Graham, Student Liaison and Adrian Andriessens, Deputy Student Liaison.

Mayor Wojahn opened the Worksession at 7:30 p.m.

CITY MANAGER’S REPORT: Mr. Young reported that October 9 – 15 is National Fire Prevention Week.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA:

Add agenda item 22-G-139: A motion was made by Councilmember Whitney and seconded by Councilmember Adams to add to the agenda comments on the Greenhouse Gas Emissions Performance Measure Rule. The motion passed 8-0.

A motion to adopt the agenda as amended was made by Councilmember Mitchell and seconded by Councilmember Esters. The motion passed 8-0.

PROCLAMATIONS: Mayor Wojahn read the Proclamations for Indigenous Peoples’ Day and Breast Cancer Awareness Month.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

- 1. Presentation on the business plan for the Community Preservation Trust and review of the Agreement between the City and the Community Preservation Trust regarding City funding from ARPA:** Councilmember Kate Kennedy; Valerie Woodall, CPCUP Interim Executive Director; Richard Wagner, Chair, CPCUP, and Edward Maginnis, Jr., UMD Assistant Vice President, Real Estate.

Councilmember Kennedy gave an update on the project: They have secured \$13.9M in funding; hired an Executive Director who starts in November; and met with the City’s ARPA consultant

on management of the ARPA funding. They made progress on the legal work, developed a business plan, and initiated a Trust Advisory Committee. They shifted their approach to graduate student housing.

Two agreements will need to be approved: 1) Between the Community Preservation Trust and the City for the \$3M grant to help fund the CPT; 2) A subrecipient agreement about use of ARPA funds between the City and CPCUP.

To agenda next week (Adams).

2. Discussion of a Special Tax District to fund public safety projects in a designated area.

Mr. Ryan and Ms. Ferguson reviewed the staff report. Councilmember Rigg said the issue of City funding for UMD live-monitoring of security cameras has received a mixed response from Council despite the fact that several of our partners have requested this City funding.

Councilmember Rigg brought this discussion forward to provide an alternative means to fund the program if the Council does not support funding from our budget. Ms. Ferguson said you have to identify what the special tax district will receive that is different from what is available in the rest of the City. DCPMA currently provides funding for foot patrols in the downtown area at certain times.

Discussion: Additional areas that would benefit from live camera monitoring; having a broader discussion of public safety; a different tax district/rate depending on different needs; how would this be handled operationally.

- Establish a budget that would support live camera monitoring (including program growth) in the tax district and to fund one 24/7 officer in the special tax district.
- Different tiered options – what would the tax burden be on our small business owners.

3. Follow up discussion of the Report from the Redistricting Commission (RDC).

Mr. Gardiner summarized last night's RDC meeting. The packet material for tonight's Council meeting was prepared last week, prior to last night's RDC meeting. The RDC discussed the feedback received from Council and residents. The RDC voted to finalize their report to the Mayor and Council because they stand behind the work they have done since May. The hard copy will be provided soon. The Commission is willing to remain engaged in the process by providing tweaks to maps previously presented, but requests that Council provide specific direction about what kind of revisions they want to see. The purpose of tonight's discussion is to determine what that specific direction should be.

The RDC has used 2023 population data and wants Council consensus to support that decision.

Esters: The data show we are not the same City we were 10 years ago. With growth there will be change; at times change is difficult. A certain neighborhood moving from one district to another should not be seen as punishment; it is just change. It is fundamentally unfair for the focus to be

on maintaining neighborhoods in only 2 of the Districts. Supports using 2023 data. In some of the maps, D2 there will represent 6 civic associations which will be challenging. We may need to reconsider the structure of the council in the future.

Kabir: Overwhelming comment to the Council that the community will be divided. We should change the guidance to the RDC to keep the characteristics of the neighborhood together. Meet the criterion to keep the population variance to the federal guidelines and put emphasis on the goal to keep the current neighborhood boundaries. Give the RDC more flexibility in the other criterion. He wants a map that keeps the current neighborhood boundaries in D1 as close to current as possible, and still meets the criteria. He prefers 2020 data without the new construction. He would like to see a map without the active voter data.

Clarification: “Substantially equal” for “population” is defined by the U.S. Constitution as +/- 5%. “Substantially equal” for actual voters can be interpreted by the City differently. Determine what is and is not acceptable.

Adams: The current D 3 councilmembers are not mandating that the new D3 include CP Estates and Yarrow as long as there is a clear rationale for the change that helps achieve the other criteria. Elevate B to a higher priority, “Preservation of the core of existing council districts.” Use 2023 data. There is no perfect answer that will appease everyone.

Mitchell: D4 will be a team player. Use 2023 data. Hopes we will collectively move forward as one body. Contain your personal feelings when we are presenting maps to the community. Would prefer to keep Crystal Springs and Patricia Court in D4.

Graham: Reported on the RDC meeting last night. The criterion was very limiting; use the relaxed criterion of actual voters to 7.5%.

Kennedy: D2 would have six associations to manage; that lopsidedness should be considered. Prefers straight boundary lines rather than jogs up and down. Prefers 2023 data. The population growth is the greatest factor. What would the map look like without the voter data. We may want to discuss eliminating the voter data in the future.

Wojahn: It wouldn't be good to draw districts with a disparate number of voters; some would have very engaged populations with high voter turnout, and in others you would struggle to find people to run for office.

Mackie: Would like to focus on population and area, rather than voters. Keep the districts as close to current as possible and distribute the new housing among them. We won't make everyone happy.

Rigg: Concurs with using 2023 data. Steer clear of “picking our voters.” The more we mess around with criteria the more we look like we are indulging in the same behavior we saw recently from the County Council that we called out. Resistance to change is normal. We selected a RDC and gave them a charge. They did what we told them to do. We requested 3 maps, they presented 5. We owe them an acknowledgement of gratitude and due consideration of their maps. We should vote their maps either up or down.

[At 10:34 p.m. a motion to extend the meeting was made by Councilmember Rigg and seconded by Councilmember Esters, motion passed 8-0.]

Whitney: Why would a neighborhood working toward a common goal not want more representation to achieve those goals. This body is working toward being less parochial and working toward the greater good. We would be going against our Charter if we disregarded actual voters. Agrees to use 2023 data.

Request to RDC:

1. ArcBridge Draft Map B – shift as much of blue area into D1 and shift some of the yellow stuff on campus into D 2. Using data on page 14, what does it look like at 5% and 7.5%.
2. Keep at least one of the RDC maps on the table – 3A.
Provide this direction via Council action at next week’s meeting.

At 10:25 p.m., Council entered Special Session to take action on two items. See Special Session minutes for:

22-G-133 Consideration of a sponsorship request from Holy Redeemer School’s Home and School Association for the Monster Dash 5k and 1K Trick or Trot in the amount of \$2,500.

22-G-139 Submit comments in support of proposed rulemaking from the Federal Highway Administration that would establish performance measure requirements regarding greenhouse gas emissions from the National Highway System

4. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS:

Review the Charter Criteria in C2-2 regarding redistricting, Kabir/Adams. Wait until after this process, return later, broaden the scope to include change in the configuration of the body. No vote; bring back later.

Adjourn: Mitchell/Rigg, 11:03 p.m., passed 8-0.