



RESOLUTION

**IN SUPPORT OF BALLOT “QUESTION A” & OPPOSITION TO BALLOT “QUESTION B”
FOR THE 2020 GENERAL ELECTION IN MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MARYLAND**

WHEREAS, the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (the “**Commission**”) hereby takes administrative notice that the voters of Montgomery County, Maryland, will consider two ballot questions relating to County property tax limits, as described further below, in the upcoming general election that culminates on November 3, 2020; and

WHEREAS, under existing law, Section 305 of the Charter of Montgomery County, Maryland (“**Section 305**”), any imposition of County real property taxes requires a unanimous vote by the County Council if the imposition would yield more revenue than the amount generated in the preceding fiscal year (calculated with certain allowances in the tax base and after adjustment for annual consumer inflation); and


WHEREAS, one deleterious effect of Section 305, among others, is that it precludes the Montgomery County Government from capturing fully the natural growth in revenue that would otherwise inure to benefit local service delivery from the growth in property values attributable to the County’s successful planning initiatives and policy outcomes; and

WHEREAS, ballot “**Question A**” (attached hereto as Exhibit 1) would amend Section 305 to allow the Montgomery County Council to establish a tax rate for County real property taxes that exceeds the rate approved for the previous year – but only with a unanimous council vote in favor of any such rate increase; and

WHEREAS, upon passage, the effect of Question A will be to correct the impact of Section 305 by providing greater flexibility and allowing the Montgomery County Government to capture fully the revenue enhancement available from rising property values in the ordinary course; and

WHEREAS, by contrast to the ameliorative effect of Question A, ballot “**Question B**” (attached hereto as Exhibit 2) would amend Section 305 to fully prohibit the County Council – notwithstanding even a unanimous desire otherwise – from imposing a County real property tax that yields more revenue than the amount generated in the preceding fiscal year (calculated with the same allowances in the tax base and adjustment for inflation provided in existing law); and

WHEREAS, upon passage, Question B would grossly exacerbate the existing deficiency of Section 305 by establishing an all-but-absolute cap on future revenue growth capable of starving the

Approved as to Legal Sufficiency:	 M-NCPPC Legal Department	10/14/20 Date
-----------------------------------	--	------------------

M-NCPPC Resolution No. 20-25

Page 2

County Government of resources needed to provide services essential to the well-being of the communities and residents it serves; and

WHEREAS, although the application of Section 305 is not authorized by the Code of Maryland, Division II of the Land Use Article, with respect to property taxes imposed for the Commission, our agency has been for nearly a century, and currently remain as, a strategic partner with the Montgomery County Government in serving our bi-county communities and residents; and

WHEREAS, the Commission and Planning Board are vested stakeholders in the public debate about any charter amendment that portends a greater constraint on the Montgomery County Government’s ability to provide resources necessary to deliver vital recreation and other services that are related to, or implicated by, the mission of our agency; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board has duly reviewed and considered the direct and collateral impacts of the ballot questions identified herein on the mission of this entire agency, and duly adopted its Resolution No. 20-110, entitled “Resolution in Support of Ballot ‘Question A’ & Opposition to Ballot ‘Question B’ for the 2020 General Election in Montgomery County, Maryland”; and

WHEREAS, the Commission has duly reviewed and considered the direct and collateral impacts of the ballot questions identified herein on the mission of this entire agency.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Commission hereby shall, and hereby does, **support** the adoption of **Question A** by referendum to be held during the Montgomery County General Election of 2020; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Commission hereby shall, and hereby does, **oppose** the adoption of **Question B** by referendum to be held during the Montgomery County General Election of 2020; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Chair, Vice-Chair and Executive Director shall consider appropriate communications or notifications of the action taken by the Commission in adopting this Resolution and the reasonable policy justifications therefor.

* * * * *

CERTIFICATION

This is to certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of Resolution No. 20-25 adopted by the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission on motion of Commissioner Geraldo, seconded by Vice-Chair Hewlett, with Chair Anderson, Vice-Chair Hewlett, Commissioners Bailey, Cichy, Doerner, Geraldo and Patterson voting in favor of the motion, with Commissioners Fani-Gonzalez, Verma and Washington being absent from the meeting held on Wednesday, October 21, 2020 via video-conference, and broadcast by the Department Of Parks and Recreation, Prince George's County.


Asuntha Chiang-Smith Executive Director

Question A

Charter Amendment by Act of County Council

Property Tax Limit - Limit Tax Rate Increases

Amend Section 305 of the County Charter to prohibit the County Council from adopting a tax rate on real property that exceeds the tax rate on real property approved for the previous year, unless all current Councilmembers vote affirmatively for the increase. This amendment would replace the current property tax limit, which requires an affirmative vote of all current Councilmembers to levy a tax on real property that would produce total revenue that exceeds the total revenue produced by the tax on real property in the preceding fiscal year plus any increase in the Consumer Price Index. The current property tax limit exempts real property tax revenue derived from: (1) newly constructed property; (2) newly rezoned property; (3) certain property assessed differently under State law; (4) property that has undergone a change in use; and (5) property in a development tax district to provide funding for capital improvements.

- For / A Favor
- Against / En Contra

Question B

Charter Amendment by Petition

Property Tax Limit - Prohibit Override

Amend Section 305 of the County Charter to prohibit the County Council from levying an ad valorem tax on real property that would produce total revenue (not including property tax revenue from certain enumerated sources) that exceeds the total revenue produced by the tax on real property in the preceding fiscal year plus a percentage of the previous year's real property tax revenues that equals any increase in the Consumer Price Index. Section 305 currently permits the County Council to exceed the limit on real property tax revenue only upon the affirmative vote of all current Councilmembers

- For / A Favor
- Against / En Contra

Opinion | Why Montgomery County residents should reject these four ballot initiatives

Opinion by Editorial Board

MARYLAND'S STATE constitution sets a low bar for motivated citizens eager to impose their will on local governments. Even in the state's behemoth county — Montgomery, with 1.1 million residents — just 10,000 valid signatures are required to place a referendum on the ballot. That has been a standing invitation to citizens with grievances to appeal directly to the voters.

Two such proposals appear on this fall's ballot, and such is the County Council's distaste for them that it added rival measures to compete with each. In both cases — one involving property tax increases; the other, the composition of the council itself — the citizens' initiative is a bad idea. Yet neither of the council's competing proposals is preferable to the status quo. Montgomery voters should vote against [Questions A, B, C and D](#).

Questions A and B offer rival methods to limit increases to annual property taxes, which account for about a third of county tax-supported revenue. For 30 years, property tax revenue increases have been pegged to inflation, plus new construction, a strict ceiling exceeded rarely since 1990 that can be breached only if all nine council members agree.

On this year's ballot, an initiative by veteran gadfly [Robin Ficker](#) (Question B) proposes locking in the current cap, with no breaching rights even for a unanimous council. The Question B proposal would make no difference in most years but could hamstring the county during economic slumps when the council tries to safeguard parks, libraries and other amenities. The competing, council-backed proposal ([Question A](#)) would set a different cap — on the property tax rate, rather than overall receipts. That would have yielded slightly more revenue — about \$13 million annually since 2004, on average, a pittance against Montgomery's nearly \$6 billion budget. The council's argument that its tax-cap proposal would help attract new employers to the county is unconvincing; just as likely, some might see it as a back-door tax increase. In fact, the current regime has worked well enough; the council has generally stuck to the limit, and county services are amply funded.

The other two ballot questions propose changes to the makeup of the nine-member council, which consists of four members elected at-large and five who represent districts. A plan to switch to nine individual districts (Question D) is [backed](#) by labor unions and real estate interests; they reckon they'd gain influence on a council stripped of at-large members. Yet an all-district council might also be more parochial.

The competing, council-backed blueprint (Question C) would retain the four at-large seats and add two district seats, for a total of 11 members. While it's true the county's population has boomed in recent decades, and some upcounty residents feel under-represented, it would take a finely honed ear to detect any broad clamor to expand a council that has done fine with nine members. As it is, every citizen can vote for five of the nine council seats — their own district representative, plus four elected at-large. That seems like plenty.

Read more:

R E S O L U T I O N

**IN SUPPORT OF BALLOT “QUESTION A” &
OPPOSITION TO BALLOT “QUESTION B”
FOR THE 2020 GENERAL ELECTION IN MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MARYLAND**

WHEREAS, the Montgomery County Planning Board (“**Planning Board**”) hereby takes administrative notice that the voters of Montgomery County will consider two ballot questions relating to County property tax limits, as described further below, in the upcoming general election that culminates on November 3, 2020; and

WHEREAS, under existing law, Section 305 of the Charter of Montgomery County, Maryland (“**Section 305**”), any imposition of County real property taxes requires a unanimous vote by the County Council if the imposition would yield more revenue than the amount generated in the preceding fiscal year (calculated with certain allowances in the tax base and after adjustment for annual consumer inflation); and

WHEREAS, one deleterious effect of Section 305, among others, is that it precludes the Montgomery County Government from capturing fully the natural growth in revenue that would otherwise inure to benefit local service delivery from the growth in property values attributable to the County’s successful planning initiatives and policy outcomes; and

WHEREAS, ballot “**Question A**” (attached hereto as Exhibit 1) would amend Section 305 to allow the Montgomery County Council to establish a tax rate for County real property taxes that exceeds the rate approved for the previous year – but only with a unanimous council vote in favor of any such rate increase; and

WHEREAS, upon passage, the effect of Question A will be to correct the impact of Section 305 by providing greater flexibility and allowing the Montgomery County Government to capture fully the revenue enhancement available from rising property values in the ordinary course; and

WHEREAS, by contrast to the ameliorative effect of Question A, ballot “**Question B**” (attached hereto as Exhibit 2) would amend Section 305 to fully prohibit the County Council – notwithstanding even a unanimous desire otherwise – from imposing a County real property tax that yields more revenue than the amount generated in the preceding fiscal year (calculated with the same allowances in the tax base and adjustment for inflation provided in existing law); and

WHEREAS, upon passage, Question B would grossly exacerbate the existing deficiency of Section 305 by establishing an all-but-absolute cap on future revenue growth capable of starving the County Government of resources needed to provide services essential to the well-being of the communities and residents it serves; and

WHEREAS, although the application of Section 305 is not authorized by the Code of Maryland, Division II of the Land Use Article, with respect to property taxes imposed for the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (“**Commission**”), the Planning Board and Commission nevertheless have been partners with the Montgomery County Government in serving Montgomery County communities and residents since 1954 and 1927, respectively; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board and Commission is a vested stakeholder in the public debate about any charter amendment that portends to further constrain the Montgomery County Government County Government’s ability to provide resources necessary to deliver vital recreation and other services that are related to, or implicated by, the mission of our agency; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board has duly reviewed and considered the direct and collateral impacts of the ballot questions identified herein on the mission of this entire agency.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board hereby shall, and hereby does, **support** the adoption of **Question A** by referendum to be held during the Montgomery County General Election of 2020; and


BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Planning Board hereby shall, and hereby does, **oppose** the adoption of **Question B** by referendum to be held during the Montgomery County General Election of 2020; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Executive Director shall present this resolution for consideration by the full Commission during its next regularly scheduled meeting.

* * * * *

CERTIFICATION

This is to certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the Montgomery County Planning Board of the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission on motion of Commissioner Cichy, seconded by Commissioner Verma, with Chair Anderson, Vice Chair Fani-González, and Commissioners Cichy, Patterson, and Verma voting in favor at its regular meeting held on Thursday, October 8, 2020, in Wheaton, Maryland.



Casey Anderson, Chair
Montgomery County Planning Board