Meeting Minutes - Local Control Advisory Board Meeting - Friday, 1/14/22

Members in Attendance:

Dana Moore, Ray Kelly, Jim Shea, Mark Washington, Ashiah Parker, Caylin Young, Elliot Cohen (FOP Rep), Nikki Thompson (Council President's Designee), Council President Mosby, Tre Murphy, Andy Smullian (Police Commissioner's Designee), Tyler Salley, Shantay Jackson, Senator Cory McCray

Staff: Natasha Mehu, Lisa Walden, Stefanie Mavronis, Adam Abadir, Lauron Perez, Elise Gillespie

Members Absent:

Lisa Robinson, Tyler Adamson, Robert Cherry, Del. Stephanie Smith, Lydia Walther Rodriguez, Michael Huber (Mayor's Designee)

Meeting Started: 10:03AM

I. Welcome and Introductions

• Board Members introduced themselves.

II. Potential for Budget Impact - Presentation from Finance Director Henry Raymond and Budget Director Bob Cename

- Budget Director Cename: We do not believe there will be big fiscal impacts.
 - The FY22 budget is \$555.1 million. The lion's share of money comes from the City's General Fund. Police are generally seen as a local government function.
 - We do get a handful of state, federal, and private grants, but the vast majority of resources are coming from the City's General Fund.
 - The largest buckets of service delivery are Police Patrol (42.1%) and Criminal Investigations Unit (10.6%).
 - Why is police spending so high?
 - a) Public safety spending is largely delegated to local governments with limited availability for funding from federal or state grants.
 - b) Staffing coverage for many positions are required 24 hours per day.
 - c) Minimum staffing levels are required to respond to calls for service, i.e. to report a crime, fire, or medical emergency.

Important to note that the City is doing the work of identifying calls for service that don't require a police response, right now on a pilot basis.

- d) Salaries and benefits tend to be higher for public safety workers vs. other laborers, to compensate for required skills and danger level.
- The City has tried to bring down the spending on police in the past few years.
 - a) Move to "on-call" posture for some non-critical specialized units, such as Mounted, Aviation, Marine, and traffic-related units.
 - b) Civilianization of certain administrative functions, such as forensic science, fiscal services, and human resources.
 - c) Rollout of telephone reporting for non-critical crime reporting, which frees up officer time for more urgent calls for service.
 - d) Change to a more efficial patrol schedule, which requires more annual appearances and minimizes wasted overlap hours.
 - e) Increasing the reimbursement rate for use of City police officers for special events or private security.
 - f) All have led to significant reductions in overtime spending, which peaked at nearly \$50 million in FY19 but reduced to \$36.4 million in FY21, a nearly one-third decline.
- On local control from a budget perspective, we do not think there will be a change. Even with BPD as a state agency, the City has always funded those obligations.
- Chair Moore: Is there an impact to the retirement system? Director Raymond says no. The Police and Fire Retirement System is under the control of the City. Any changes would be initiated by the City and approved by the Mayor and City Council.
- Chair Moore: Would this apply to union benefits? Director Raymond clarifies that all negotiations are between BPD and the City through the Office of the Labor Commissioner. This process has always been local to the City of Baltimore.
- Chair Moore: Are there potential expenses associated with the process of taking local control that we should be mindful of? Director Raymond says the City is not aware of any significant potential expenses. The Finance Department would be doing everything in its power to minimize those costs and duplication of administrative efforts, with a focus on preserving the General Fund.
- Director Raymond: All of the costs related to BPD will be the responsibility of the

City. We've walked through the operating budget. The City has also always been responsible for BPD's infrastructure, including facilities. The City will continue to be responsible for that, as the State has never provided funding for those items.

- Elliot Cohen: Are there financial implications for things the City Council wants to do through policy with regard to BPD that will change through local control?
 - Council President Mosby: Determined through a legal ruling back in 2014 when the City attempted to require BPD officers to wear body cameras. The Law Department said BPD was a state agency, so that would have to go through the State legislature instead of the City Council. This is about the autonomy that the City of Baltimore will have.

III. Approval of the Minutes

- Tyler Salley makes the motion. Seconded by Co-chair Parker.
- No questions or concerns about the draft minutes.

IV. Discussion of Next Meeting

- Hoping for a presentation soon with representatives from St. Louis.
- Discussion about mechanics and concern about the legislative process.
 - Do we need to do a fiscal impact statement?
- Discussion about committee structure.
 - After the next foundational meeting, the Advisory Board will be moving into committee work.
 - Tre Murphy: Requests conversation about committee structure via email to begin that discussion.
- Ray Kelly: We talked to community organizers in cities like St. Louis. Even though we don't think there will be a fiscal impact, we should ensure we're addressing the right things based on the experience of other cities. We do not want these issues to come up when we are in the short window of the legislative process to get it passed.
 - Elise Gillespie: One of the big differences between Baltimore and St. Louis, when they absorbed the police department, everything was separately owned by the police department. That is not a barrier for Baltimore because BPD is already under the umbrella of City services.
 - Chair Moore: The IT costs are an important part of the consent decree. These systems are owned by the City of Baltimore.

Meeting Adjourned: 10:52 AM