

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip Code	Are you representing yourself?	If no, what organization or whom do you represent?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachments
Bill No. 32-25											
2025-05-20 17:18:20	Cameron	Wilson	Severna Park	MD	21146	Yes		Bill No. 32-25: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Finance, Taxation, and Budget – Special Community Benefits Districts, Shore Erosion Control Districts, and Waterways Improvements Districts – Administrative Charge – Penalties for Non-Compliance – Maryland Homeowners Association Act and Open Meetings Act Compliance	Support	<p>I want to support this bill, and believe that the fees should be much higher. I am 31 years old and grew up here in Severna Park and cannot afford housing, either for rent or to purchase, at anything less than minimu 60% of my take home pay. I pay County income taxes. These entitled homeowners do not pay full property taxes on their homes because the County does not assess them on the full market value of these homes and then on top of that have huge homestead credit benefits.</p> <p>Now they are asking workers paying income tax to pay for their private beaches? I remember in high school being told to leave by homeowners when simply walking by the water after school. These people are greedy and are stealing our taxes for their multi-million dollar mansions and private waterfront while barring "neighbors" from these natural resources and spaces.</p> <p>They are talking about being volunteers paying for landscaping and beach care. Fine, we should remove these community benefit associations and they can all make their own HOAs and collect fees from residents to pay their own way. We should be removing homestead tax handouts, we should be assessing property values using market methodology annually. We need these homeowners to pay for their beaches, roads, sidewalks, traffic lights, schools, and not getting huge tax exemptions while workers unable to afford homes pay county income tax without any benefits.</p>	
2025-05-21 16:10:06	Peter	Vail	Annapolis	MD	21403	Yes		Bill No. 32-25: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Finance, Taxation, and Budget – Special Community Benefits Districts, Shore Erosion Control Districts, and Waterways Improvements Districts – Administrative Charge – Penalties for Non-Compliance – Maryland Homeowners Association Act and Open Meetings Act Compliance	Support	<p>I spoke at the May 19th meeting. I thought I'd follow-up on a few items</p> <p>1) How much fees should be paid by each Special Tax District? I think it should be based on the # of households in each district. \$284K of County Support divided by all SCBD households seems correct to me. How about a provision to assess the "County Support Costs" every 5 years?</p> <p>2) Oyster Harbor had it's monthly Board Meeting last night. No one spoke about the legislation, which was curious. One of our "problem" Board Members was at the County Community Summit hosted by Vincent Moulden's group. She joked about how easy we have it as an SCBD to use the County Taxing Authority vs. having to collect dues as an HoA. It's such a benefit that it should come with more strings attached.</p> <p>3) I think there may be some value in separating the extra responsibilities of the SCBDS vs. the Shoreline Erosion Control or Waterway Improvement Districts. I don't have anything to add other than the SECDs and WIDs might be different?</p> <p>4) Have we thought about abolishing these tax districts all together? Maybe they're more trouble than they're worth... for the County.</p> <p>5) I wonder if there is an opportunity to set up an e-mail address or hotline for Members of the associations overseeing SCBD funds to make complaints. Or maybe a more robust website with Do's and Don'ts? I feel like I've had 0 recourse despite e-mailing almost everyone I could think of.</p> <p>6) I think it would be helpful to have one Board Member from each SCBD randomly rotate into another one for a year. Call them the "outside" referee... and they could have the power to call out anything that seems amiss.</p> <p>Anywho, thank you to everyone for doing what you do.</p>	
2025-05-28 19:38:25	Rachel	Kline	Riva	Maryland	21140	No	Sylvan Shores S	Bill No. 32-25: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Finance, Taxation, and Budget – Special Community Benefits Districts, Shore Erosion Control Districts, and Waterways Improvements Districts – Administrative Charge – Penalties for Non-Compliance – Maryland Homeowners Association Act and Open Meetings Act Compliance	Oppose	<p>Sylvan Shores strongly opposes this legislation. We welcome transparency and accountability; however, this bill penalizes well-functioning organizations (like ours) while a few "bad apples" have gone unchecked. Audit processes exist for this reason. The bill raises legal ambiguities and administrative costs, and hinders effective volunteer governance. For all-volunteer governances, such as ours, these rules will be unduly burdensome and almost insurmountable in their complexity. We won't be able to function. Formal comments are attached.</p>	https://www.aacounty.org/system/files/webform/cc_legislative_testimony/58315/sylvan-shores-letter-to-aaco-re-bill-32-25.pdf
2025-05-30 9:13:13	Kurt	Svensden	Arnold	MD	21012	Yes		Bill No. 32-25: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Finance, Taxation, and Budget – Special Community Benefits Districts, Shore Erosion Control Districts, and Waterways Improvements Districts – Administrative Charge – Penalties for Non-Compliance – Maryland Homeowners Association Act and Open Meetings Act Compliance	No position	<p>See attached 1-page PDF with my written testimony</p>	https://www.aacounty.org/system/files/webform/cc_legislative_testimony/58476/testimony-bill-32-25-scbd-fees-and-public-good.pdf

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip Code	Are you representing yourself?	If no, what organization or whom do you represent?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachments
2025-05-30 12:03:48	Lance	Davis	Edgewater	MD	21037	No	Loch Haven Civic	Bill No. 32-25: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Finance, Taxation, and Budget – Special Community Benefits Districts, Shore Erosion Control Districts, and Waterways Improvements Districts – Administrative Charge – Penalties for Non-Compliance – Maryland Homeowners Association Act and Open Meetings Act Compliance	Oppose	<p>I am the Loch Haven Civic Association president and wanted to reach out to you about bill #32-25, AN ORDINANCE concerning: Finance, Taxation, and Budget – Special Community Benefits Districts, Shore Erosion Control Districts, and Waterways Improvements Districts – Administrative Charge – Penalties for Non-Compliance – Maryland Homeowners Association Act and Open Meetings Act Compliance.</p> <p>We are very concerned about this bill.</p> <p>I am therefore reaching out to you with some of our concerns. They are as follows: The current 5% fee is reasonable for the service the county provides. I have seen no further explanation for the potential increase. Nearly doubling this fee will put a hardship on several communities to continue to manage their assets and services. My read of OMA is that SCBD's are NOT public bodies and therefore are not required to follow OMA. Making SCBD's meet OMA puts an undue burden on communities to manage their business, their assets and services. It is difficult enough to get out notices per our own bylaws to owners and renters, let alone reasonable time to notify the general public of our meetings. My understanding is that this bill is being proposed because someone stole from a SCBD. The actions in this bill do NOT stop this from happening. The rules and regulations that we must follow with the county for a SCBD is a community's best protection. The existing law further covers this issue. I therefore encourage you to vote against this bill and the anticipated amendments. We have enough government burden to make a SCBD work with very little resources and volunteer effort. This bill does not help us and it does not protect us.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p>	
2025-05-30 16:18:56	Cindy	Hall	Arnold	Maryland	21012	No	Pines Community	Bill No. 32-25: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Finance, Taxation, and Budget – Special Community Benefits Districts, Shore Erosion Control Districts, and Waterways Improvements Districts – Administrative Charge – Penalties for Non-Compliance – Maryland Homeowners Association Act and Open Meetings Act Compliance	Oppose		https://www.aacounty.org/system/files/webform/cc_legislative_testimony/58546/aa-co-council-bill-32-25-pines-citizens-improvement-assoc-june-2025.docx
2025-05-30 21:17:29	Andrew	Snowdon	Annapolis	Maryland	21403-4509	No	Bay Ridge Civic	Bill No. 32-25: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Finance, Taxation, and Budget – Special Community Benefits Districts, Shore Erosion Control Districts, and Waterways Improvements Districts – Administrative Charge – Penalties for Non-Compliance – Maryland Homeowners Association Act and Open Meetings Act Compliance	Oppose		https://www.aacounty.org/system/files/webform/cc_legislative_testimony/58566/snowdon.testimony.5.30.25.pdf
2025-05-30 21:19:38	Lily	Openshaw	Annapolis	MD	21403	No	Bay Ridge Civic	Bill No. 32-25: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Finance, Taxation, and Budget – Special Community Benefits Districts, Shore Erosion Control Districts, and Waterways Improvements Districts – Administrative Charge – Penalties for Non-Compliance – Maryland Homeowners Association Act and Open Meetings Act Compliance	Oppose		https://www.aacounty.org/system/files/webform/cc_legislative_testimony/58567/brca-public-comment-on-bill-32-5.28.25.kdk_.docx

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip Code	Are you representing yourself?	If no, what organization or whom do you represent?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachments
2025-05-31 9:32:19	Arian	Lucas	Edgewater	MD	21937	Yes		Bill No. 32-25: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Finance, Taxation, and Budget – Special Community Benefits Districts, Shore Erosion Control Districts, and Waterways Improvements Districts – Administrative Charge – Penalties for Non-Compliance – Maryland Homeowners Association Act and Open Meetings Act Compliance	Oppose	<p>I highly recommend NOT approving this proposal as introduced.</p> <p>Proposed 32-25 is an interesting work that’s needs more background basis for changing existing ordinances and further considering its organization vis-à-vis our existing County ordinances.</p> <p>At a minimum, I suggest removing 32-25 from immediate consideration to provide time to consider amendments and reorganization, and further study.</p> <p>Many community associations that manage these districts are administered by a dedicated group of volunteers. These proposed requirements will reduce our "pool" of volunteers due to those who will choose to not participate due to increased required management actions.</p> <p>Detailed comments:</p> <p>Admin Charge –</p> <p>There are no data to justify a large change in the Admin Charge – both for the percent charge to Districts that do not administer disbursements and to the Max Admin Charge. Nomenclature needs to be clarified i.e. CPI usage.</p> <p>Instead of Admin Charge based on Tax Amount, Admin Charge should be a flat fee or based on the number of tax accounts. The number of Tax Accounts in each District drives the greatest variable of County admin effort (cost) amongst Districts in administering this program. As presently arranged, a district with a greater number of tax accounts but a lower tax collected has a lower admin charge than a district with fewer tax accounts but a higher tax collected amount. For example, a SCBD with 369 tax accounts, a SCBD tax amount of \$18,450 and a 5% Admin charge of \$922.50 will take greater effort to process (each property tax bill), than to process a SCBD with 57 tax accounts, a tax of \$42,750 and a 5% Admin charge of \$2,137.50. Changes in a flat fee or number of accounts is more relatable to the CPI, than a community self-tax which may increase or decrease as a community decides each Budget cycle.</p> <p>Contact Info – does not address how this is to be adjudged and enforced. It is fruitful for abuse. We've all been taken aback by the immediate, automated, non-responsive email response. Is an automated response a valid “response” that meets this proposed requirement?</p> <p>Penalties – Who, how adjudges non-compliance? Who, how decides which penalty type?</p> <p>Dissolution – current ordinances address dissolution and abolition in separate sections of TITLE 7. SPECIAL COMMUNITY BENEFIT DISTRICTS, SHORE EROSION CONTROL DISTRICTS, AND WATERWAYS IMPROVEMENTS DISTRICTS. Proposed 32-25 appears to combine? How will this apply?</p> <p>General Provisions – HOA and Open Meetings Acts – proposed reads that only Special Community Benefit Districts are to comport with parts of these MD Acts. Sections (D)(1) and (D)(2) are unreasonable requirements for volunteer organizations.</p>	
2025-05-31 19:21:26	James	Boyd	Edgewater	Md	21037	Yes		Bill No. 32-25: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Finance, Taxation, and Budget – Special Community Benefits Districts, Shore Erosion Control Districts, and Waterways Improvements Districts – Administrative Charge – Penalties for Non-Compliance – Maryland Homeowners Association Act and Open Meetings Act Compliance	Oppose	I urge you not to support passing bill 32-25	
2025-06-01 6:56:49	Pam	Foster	Shady Side	MD	20764	No	Cedarhurst Citize	Bill No. 32-25: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Finance, Taxation, and Budget – Special Community Benefits Districts, Shore Erosion Control Districts, and Waterways Improvements Districts – Administrative Charge – Penalties for Non-Compliance – Maryland Homeowners Association Act and Open Meetings Act Compliance	Oppose		https://www.aacounty.org/system/files/webform/cc_legislative_testimony/58626/cedarhurst-online-testimony-opposition-to-bill-32-25-6-1-25.pdf

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip Code	Are you representing yourself?	If no, what organization or whom do you represent?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachments
2025-06-01 12:36:52	Jane	Clark	Annapolis	Maryland	21403	Yes		Bill No. 32-25: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Finance, Taxation, and Budget – Special Community Benefits Districts, Shore Erosion Control Districts, and Waterways Improvements Districts – Administrative Charge – Penalties for Non-Compliance – Maryland Homeowners Association Act and Open Meetings Act Compliance	Oppose	First, I live in a community that is an AA County special tax district (Bay Ridge). Second, I attended the County Council meeting on May 19, 2025 and listened to the testimony not only from my own community but from that of other special tax district communities. It is clear to me from this meeting that the Council members do not appreciate the work and money that these districts provide TO the county and SAVE the county. Consider, for example, all the volunteer time our community puts in to oversee, plan, and implement shore erosion efforts. Yes, the beaches enhance our community but they also help with maintenance of the Bay’s shores – an asset for all of Marylanders. Or consider the cost to the county of providing police protection and speeding enforcement in the community that we PAY (nearing \$250k a year). Consider all the 911 calls that any one community might make over the year – and add that into the county’s budget. Finally, the “open meeting” law of Maryland is for “government agencies.” Our community is incorporated as the Bay Ridge Civic Association and is not a Maryland government agency. Solving the problems of community boards not replying to emails or holding meetings that are not well advertised or volunteers that steal funds from the community cannot be remedied with Bill 32-25 (even with amendments). I, therefore, ask that the bill be withdrawn.	
2025-06-01 13:19:54	Stuart	Jones	Annapolis	MD	21403-4509	No	Bay Ridge Civic	Bill No. 32-25: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Finance, Taxation, and Budget – Special Community Benefits Districts, Shore Erosion Control Districts, and Waterways Improvements Districts – Administrative Charge – Penalties for Non-Compliance – Maryland Homeowners Association Act and Open Meetings Act Compliance	Oppose		https://www.aacounty.org/system/files/webform/cc_legislative_testimony/58648/testimony_stuart-jones_june_2_2025.pdf
2025-06-01 15:15:14	Donald	Bartnick	Edgewater	Md	21037	Yes		Bill No. 32-25: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Finance, Taxation, and Budget – Special Community Benefits Districts, Shore Erosion Control Districts, and Waterways Improvements Districts – Administrative Charge – Penalties for Non-Compliance – Maryland Homeowners Association Act and Open Meetings Act Compliance	Oppose	I strongly oppose this proposed bill. It would appear that the bill was originally proposed as a result of some criminal activity within one or perhaps two of the 90 special community benefits districts. It was observed in previous testimony on this bill that the bill would have had no impact on that behavior had it been in place then. Then the bill was resurrected as if it solved some imagined fiscal inequity between the haves and have nots over a relatively small amount of money relative to the total budget of Anne Arundel County. The amendments are whittling around the edges. In my community of Shoreham Beach, the special community benefits taxes are levied by the community members on each other and are used to provide services that we do not receive from Anne Arundel County that other citizens of the county receive in exchange for their county taxes. The residents of Shoreham Beach are taxing ourselves so we can maintain the roads, plow our snow, improve our storm water management, and preserve the community. The county should provide these services. We should receive all county services that other communities receive and if we wanted more, we could then use the additional tax revenue. Keeping our community properly maintained, helps stabilize and improve our property values, which the county then assesses for real estate taxes. The county benefits enormously from what special benefit tax districts do by taxing themselves and re-investing in their communities. This bill is incredibly short-sighted in understanding the inter connectedness of taxes, services, property improvement, real estate assessments, and communities. I urge rejection of this bill entirely. No number of amendments will make this a good bill.	
2025-06-01 16:42:23	Jameya	Way	SHADY SIDE	MD	20764	No	Columbia Beach	Bill No. 32-25: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Finance, Taxation, and Budget – Special Community Benefits Districts, Shore Erosion Control Districts, and Waterways Improvements Districts – Administrative Charge – Penalties for Non-Compliance – Maryland Homeowners Association Act and Open Meetings Act Compliance	Oppose	Columbia Beach Civic Improvement Association opposes Bill 32-25.	https://www.aacounty.org/system/files/webform/cc_legislative_testimony/58661/letter_060125_proposed-bill-32-25_final.pdf
2025-06-01 18:54:09	Joan	Brannigan	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		Bill No. 32-25: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Finance, Taxation, and Budget – Special Community Benefits Districts, Shore Erosion Control Districts, and Waterways Improvements Districts – Administrative Charge – Penalties for Non-Compliance – Maryland Homeowners Association Act and Open Meetings Act Compliance	Support	As a taxpayer I feel I must support this bill to be fair to all residents.	

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip Code	Are you representing yourself?	If no, what organization or whom do you represent?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachments
2025-06-01 21:58:25	Jill	Whitall	Annapolis	MD	21403	Yes		Bill No. 32-25: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Finance, Taxation, and Budget – Special Community Benefits Districts, Shore Erosion Control Districts, and Waterways Improvements Districts – Administrative Charge – Penalties for Non-Compliance – Maryland Homeowners Association Act and Open Meetings Act Compliance	Oppose	<p>To Councilwoman Rodvien and other members of the Committee I love Maryland, Anne Arundel County and the community, Bay Ridge (BR), in which I have lived for the past thirty years. Since retiring, I have increased my volunteering and was elected and re-elected to the Board of BR Community Association (BRCA) in April 2023 and 2025 (we have two-year terms). After attending the May 19 Council meeting and especially, subsequently, noting the vote on Amendment #5, I was confused. Firstly, I did not understand (in the initial proposal) that our monthly Board meetings and monthly General BRCA meetings (including one devoted to the two Tax Boards as required by the County) should comply with the State “open meeting” law, for which it was not intended. I was confused, secondly, after Councilwomen Rodvien put in the partially reasonable Amendment No. 5: This amendment modifies the applicability of the Maryland Open Meetings Act to community association meetings, including providing that community association meetings do not have to be open to the general public (this is the reasonable part) but must be open to invitees of owners of property within the district (this mandate needs detailed clarification since it could be a slippery slope that encourages bad actors to ask more bad actors to attend these meetings). The confusion lies in the fact that this amendment was defeated, meaning the original intention still stands. One hopes that the four Nay voters were thinking that the second part of the amendment is not adequate/justified, and not believing that the “open meeting” suggestion should still stand! To be clear; I cannot understand why BRCA is considered a “public” body and therefore under the obligation to follow the “open meeting” law. Who and how is it defined as such? We are not even an HOA. We are a civic association run by volunteers, whose workload would vastly increase if we had to comply with open meetings regulations and fear punitive sanctions. From my perspective the Board tries to be transparent with all of BR owners and renters. Elections are held every year with a two-year limit on the President, Vice President and Secretary positions and up to four years (re-elected) for the Treasurer. This keeps a healthy influx of new Board members. I feel we being punished for running well. Lastly, I am not a lone ranger, I agree with the BRCA Board positions articulated very well by others. I urge you to reject the “open meeting” mandate and to concentrate on the financial aspects of the original bill as a separate and needed issue. Secretary of BRCA 2023-25.</p>	
2025-06-01 23:12:54	Anastasia	Hopkinson	Annapolis	Maryland	21403	No	Annapolis Neck Federation	Bill No. 32-25: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Finance, Taxation, and Budget – Special Community Benefits Districts, Shore Erosion Control Districts, and Waterways Improvements Districts – Administrative Charge – Penalties for Non-Compliance – Maryland Homeowners Association Act and Open Meetings Act Compliance	Oppose	<p>ANPF OPPOSES Bill O.32-25</p> <p>The Annapolis Neck Peninsula Federation (ANPF), a long-standing volunteer organization focused on land use and conservation, opposes Bill O.32-25, which seeks to:</p> <p>1.Raise administrative fees charged to community Tax Districts, 2.Require compliance with the Maryland Open Meetings Act and HOA Act, 3.Impose penalties for non-compliance.</p> <p>Key Concerns:</p> <p>•Fee Increases Require Justification: ANPF supports fair administrative fees but urges the County to base increases on actual, tracked costs—not estimates. Future fees could be increased during the normal budgeting process, based on actual data.</p> <p>•Regulation Won’t Fix Management Issues: Poor communication (“transparency”) and late financial reports (“accountability”) are management issues, not regulatory failures. Heavy regulation and penalties discourage volunteer participation and increase legal risk.</p> <p>•Open Meetings Act Is Misapplied: The OMA is designed for staffed government employees, not community volunteers. Applying it to communities is overly burdensome and ineffective.</p> <p>Constructive Solutions Preferred: ANPF recommends training, education, and supportive County oversight—not punitive measures or the threat of Tax District dissolution. A proper appeals process is also essential.</p> <p>ANPF urges the Council to WITHDRAW Bill O.32-25 and instead propose separate legislation: one bill focused on administrative fees and another bill focused on community Board of Directors support. Furthermore, ANPF encourages the Council to form a citizens’ task force to develop such new legislation.</p>	

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip Code	Are you representing yourself?	If no, what organization or whom do you represent?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachments
2025-06-02 7:49:42	Tom	Knoll	Churchton	MD	20733	No	Franklin Manor C	Bill No. 32-25: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Finance, Taxation, and Budget – Special Community Benefits Districts, Shore Erosion Control Districts, and Waterways Improvements Districts – Administrative Charge – Penalties for Non-Compliance – Maryland Homeowners Association Act and Open Meetings Act Compliance	Oppose	<p>Dear Anne Arundel Council</p> <p>I am writing to express my opposition to Bill 32-25 Introduced by Councilmember Rodvien on April 21, 2025.</p> <p>1)According to section “e Administrative charge” here is how the math works out for Franklin Manor Citizens Association (FMCA). For FMCA the current administrative fees paid to the county are capped at \$2,000 for the Special Community Benefit District (SCBD) and \$2,000 for the Shore Erosion Control District (SECD) or \$4,000 per year in total. According to Bill 32-25 the new proposed fee structure at our current budget levels for both Community Benefit and Shore Erosion Accounts would be \$9,350 in 2027, \$12,600 in 2028, and \$16,200 for 2029. This would be a 317% increase over the bill's proposed three year period. If these fees pass the council this would prevent us from doing several of the current community maintenance and benefits projects we are doing and/or proposing for the future. In my opinion these proposed new administrative fees are outrageously high and punitive.</p> <p>2)Section “I (Contact) information” it states that each officer of the community association must make a contact email address available to the all the members of the community. When a community member contacts an association officer via email, the officer must respond within five days. If the response back to the community member is more than 5 days than a list of penalties kick in. This is really pragmatic especially if the association board member(s) is ill or out of town. The council needs to remember that all board members of these association are volunteers. We receive no compensation, and serve at the pleasure of the community and most associations have no paid administrative staff.</p> <p>3)I believe there is general consensus that the administration fee should be increased to cover the county's costs. But so far the actual “audited” costs have not been shared with the associations. I suggest the council scrap bill 32-25 and form a select group including some association board members to write a new bill that would address the administrative costs, and only the administrative costs, to this program in a fair and equitable way. The other provisions in bill 32-25, most of which Franklin Manor already practices, are just to problematic and unfair especially to small associations.</p>	
2025-06-02 8:20:53	Jane	Beard	Churchton	MD	20733	Yes		Bill No. 32-25: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Finance, Taxation, and Budget – Special Community Benefits Districts, Shore Erosion Control Districts, and Waterways Improvements Districts – Administrative Charge – Penalties for Non-Compliance – Maryland Homeowners Association Act and Open Meetings Act Compliance	Oppose		https://www.aacounty.org/system/files/webform/cc_legislative_testimony/58707/oppose-32-25.docx

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip Code	Are you representing yourself?	If no, what organization or whom do you represent?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachments
2025-06-02 9:10:20	Claire	Corcoran	Annapolis	MD	21403	Yes		Bill No. 32-25: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Finance, Taxation, and Budget – Special Community Benefits Districts, Shore Erosion Control Districts, and Waterways Improvements Districts – Administrative Charge – Penalties for Non-Compliance – Maryland Homeowners Association Act and Open Meetings Act Compliance	Oppose	<p>All,</p> <p>I serve as the president of Hillsmere Shores, one of the county's largest and well run SCBD's. I attended the council meeting on May 19th along with my VP and Secretary. What we heard was an overwhelming opposition to this Bill from the vast majority of the 50 individuals who testified in person. Additionally, we understand that there has been a great deal of opposition via email and through online testimony as well. Listen to your constituents.</p> <p>The newest amendments to this Bill do nothing to address the overarching concerns regarding the county imposing government bureaucracy upon private, civic, non-profit corporations such as the Hillsmere Shores Improvement Association. We take nothing away from the county; to the contrary, SCBD's by virtue of maintaining and improving their neighborhoods through countless hours of volunteer driven work, raise property values thereby beefing up the county coffers. For example, my community just completed a multi-year coastal resiliency project along Duval Creek and the South River that was completely volunteer-driven at a cost of hundreds of thousands of dollars with almost all of the funding cobbled together from grants and partnerships shepherded through via our volunteers. The county did not do this; we did. We do lots more that the county has no interest in taking on for the benefit of either the environment or our quality of life. Do not try to fix what isn't broken. This is a democracy - listen to the majority of voices you have heard from; the record shows that there is an overwhelming sentiment being expressed, and it is not in support of this Bill or any iteration thereof.</p> <p>This Bill constitutes unnecessary government overreach. If you have a few bad apples among the county's SCBDs, deal with them specifically, don't use a heavy hand on all. If the costs of administering this program are more than you take in, then become more efficient - there are much more advanced software programs than existed decades ago. You don't need more county employees or people to work harder; they need to work smarter thereby increasing efficiency and reducing the need for more undue taxation. 32-25 has all the hallmarks of a program designed to drive out volunteers, effectively killing the geese laying the golden eggs for you.</p> <p>V/R,</p> <p>Claire Corcoran, President HSIA</p>	

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip Code	Are you representing yourself?	If no, what organization or whom do you represent?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachments
2025-06-02 9:15:48	Aaron	Yager	Severna Park	MD	21146	Yes		Bill No. 32-25: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Finance, Taxation, and Budget – Special Community Benefits Districts, Shore Erosion Control Districts, and Waterways Improvements Districts – Administrative Charge – Penalties for Non-Compliance – Maryland Homeowners Association Act and Open Meetings Act Compliance	Support	<p>Council members,</p> <p>My name is Aaron Yager of 766 Cypress Road, Severna Park, and I live in the Manhattan Beach SCBD. I'm writing today in support Bill 32-25.</p> <p>The Council has heard and received a lot of testimony opposing this bill and only a few voices in support. I think my own experiences in Manhattan Beach and with the Manhattan Beach Civic Association (MBCA) might help explain why that is.</p> <p>At our last general meeting on 5/6/25, a resident asked how much money had been spent on ongoing litigation and where those funds came from. The board declined to provide that information during the meeting and have failed to provide it since.</p> <p>In the parking lot following the general meeting, I witnessed the MBCA Secretary approach the resident who asked the question – who was there with his wife – apparently seeking to confirm their identity. That same evening, the resident’s wife received a direct FB message from an MBCA Board member asking her and her family to leave the Manhattan Beach FB Group – a Group administered and moderated by MBCA Board members. Shortly thereafter and that same evening, the residents were blocked from Manhattan Beach FB Group.</p> <p>As for me and my wife, we've been blocked, without cause, from the Manhattan Beach Facebook Group since November 2024.</p> <p>Even more recently, I provided in-person testimony to this Council on 5/19/25. On the morning of 5/20/25, I went outside my home to find a bag of dog waste on my driveway.</p> <p>I take these types of events to be clear messages: stay quiet, or face consequences.</p> <p>I'm going to suggest to you that there are actually many people who support this bill but can't express their support publicly. They know that anything said in written testimony or emails to Council members becomes part of the public record.</p> <p>I can speak freely because I'm already facing backlash, but most people can't risk retaliation. They stay silent just to keep the peace.</p> <p>I hope that you'll pass Bill 32-25. It's a step in the right direction that will hopefully remind SCBDs that at least a modicum of transparency and accountability must be tied to their receipt of public funds.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	
2025-06-02 9:34:34	William	Mykins	Annapolis	Maryland	21403	Yes		Bill No. 32-25: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Finance, Taxation, and Budget – Special Community Benefits Districts, Shore Erosion Control Districts, and Waterways Improvements Districts – Administrative Charge – Penalties for Non-Compliance – Maryland Homeowners Association Act and Open Meetings Act Compliance	Oppose	<p>I have served as a board member of the Bay Highlands Civic Association (BHCA) off and on for the past 20 years, serving as Treasurer and currently as President. BHCA oversees the Bay Highlands SB CD which is comprised of approximately 100+ households and is responsible for maintaining roads, storm drains, street lighting, snow removal, and maintenance and improvement of community property. If not for the SB CD, most of these services would have to be provided by the County. We have historically had challenges finding community members to willing to commit to becoming a member of the board and volunteering their time. Time commitment seems to be the biggest constraint. So, adding additional reporting and administrative responsibilities will only make this situation worse. If we cannot recruit and retain board members, I don't know what the solution will be beyond terminating the SB CD and turning all responsibilities over to the County. I believe that there are already adequate controls in place, with the exception of potentially adding more frequent financial audits. The Bay Highlands SB CD already performs audits every two years rather than every four years as currently required by the County. Having served as Treasurer for almost 8 years, I can tell you that additional education and support is needed not additional regulation. Most board members and Treasurers do not have financial backgrounds and need support. Years ago the County used to conduct meetings to educate SB CD's but I'm not aware of any such meetings in the past 10 years. So, I oppose the bill as currently proposed, we need education and support not more requirements. Finally, SB CD's provide a valuable service to the community and we pay for these services and amenities on top of County property taxes — if SB CD's are not supported most of this responsibility and costs will be eventually be passed on to the County and it's taxpayers. Thank you, Bill Mykins</p>	

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip Code	Are you representing yourself?	If no, what organization or whom do you represent?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachments
2025-06-02 10:00:14	WILLIAM	BOYD	EDGEWATER	MD	21037	Yes		Bill No. 32-25: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Finance, Taxation, and Budget – Special Community Benefits Districts, Shore Erosion Control Districts, and Waterways Improvements Districts – Administrative Charge – Penalties for Non-Compliance – Maryland Homeowners Association Act and Open Meetings Act Compliance	Oppose	I highly recommend NOT approving proposed Bill 32-25 as now amended. At a minimum, I suggest removing Bill 32-25 from immediate consideration to provide time for further study, to consider reorganization (perhaps two bills), and perhaps reconsideration as a proposed bill. Many community associations that manage these districts are administered by a dedicated group of volunteers. These proposed new administrative requirements will reduce our “pool” of volunteers due to those who will choose to not participate due to increased and, frankly, very complicated required actions of community associations. The email requirements are unreasonable and open for abuse – both ways. Much more should be said about the benefit these Districts provide to our County. Each community that has formed a special tax District takes on projects in their District that would otherwise be considered to be accomplished by our County government. In my District we pave and plow our roads, maintain shore erosion control and landscaping for our common areas, and maintain our storm water drains to list a few of the many projects we voluntarily take upon ourselves. There are no data to justify a large change in the Admin Charge. Basing an annual increase in the Max Admin Charge on the CPI increase would be an open-ended increasing spiral of greater increases. Basing the starting new number for Max Admin Charge at \$10,000 also makes for a higher annual increase in that charge. If we decide to use this idea, the starting number should be much lower. An Admin Charge should not be based on Tax Amount. Admin Charge should be a flat fee or based on the number of tax accounts. Admin charge for Districts that do not manage their own funds should have a higher Admin Charge.	
2025-06-02 10:33:58	Alan	MacDonald	Annapolis	Maryland	21403-4509	No	Bay Ridge Civic	Bill No. 32-25: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Finance, Taxation, and Budget – Special Community Benefits Districts, Shore Erosion Control Districts, and Waterways Improvements Districts – Administrative Charge – Penalties for Non-Compliance – Maryland Homeowners Association Act and Open Meetings Act Compliance	Oppose		https://www.aacounty.org/system/files/webform/cc_legislative_testimony/58745/asm-testimony-for-brca.pdf
2025-06-02 10:38:57	Renee	Montgomery	Annapolis	Maryland	21403-4509	No	Bay Ridge Civic	Bill No. 32-25: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Finance, Taxation, and Budget – Special Community Benefits Districts, Shore Erosion Control Districts, and Waterways Improvements Districts – Administrative Charge – Penalties for Non-Compliance – Maryland Homeowners Association Act and Open Meetings Act Compliance	Oppose		https://www.aacounty.org/system/files/webform/cc_legislative_testimony/58746/r-montgomery-testimony_b_5_18_25.docx
2025-06-02 10:40:17	David	Openshaw	Annapolis	MD	21403-4509	No	Bay Ridge Civic	Bill No. 32-25: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Finance, Taxation, and Budget – Special Community Benefits Districts, Shore Erosion Control Districts, and Waterways Improvements Districts – Administrative Charge – Penalties for Non-Compliance – Maryland Homeowners Association Act and Open Meetings Act Compliance	Oppose		https://www.aacounty.org/system/files/webform/cc_legislative_testimony/58748/dbo-testimony-on-bill-32-25.docx
2025-06-02 10:42:37	John	Vandekamp	Annapolis	Maryland	21403-4509	No	Bay Ridge Civic	Bill No. 32-25: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Finance, Taxation, and Budget – Special Community Benefits Districts, Shore Erosion Control Districts, and Waterways Improvements Districts – Administrative Charge – Penalties for Non-Compliance – Maryland Homeowners Association Act and Open Meetings Act Compliance	Oppose		https://www.aacounty.org/system/files/webform/cc_legislative_testimony/58749/john-vndkmp-testimony.5.19.25.docx

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip Code	Are you representing yourself?	If no, what organization or whom do you represent?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachments
2025-06-02 10:45:16	Bill	Davidson	Annapolis	MD	21403-4509	No	Bay Ridge Civic	Bill No. 32-25: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Finance, Taxation, and Budget – Special Community Benefits Districts, Shore Erosion Control Districts, and Waterways Improvements Districts – Administrative Charge – Penalties for Non-Compliance – Maryland Homeowners Association Act and Open Meetings Act Compliance	Oppose		https://www.aacounty.org/system/files/webform/cc_legislative_testimony/58753/bill-davidson-testimony_bill-32-25-5.19.25.docx
2025-06-02 10:58:20	Karen	Boyd	Edgewater	MD	21037	Yes		Bill No. 32-25: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Finance, Taxation, and Budget – Special Community Benefits Districts, Shore Erosion Control Districts, and Waterways Improvements Districts – Administrative Charge – Penalties for Non-Compliance – Maryland Homeowners Association Act and Open Meetings Act Compliance	Oppose	<p>I highly recommend NOT approving proposed Bill 32-25 as now amended. An increase is needed but as I stated before, how does the County justify the proposed five-fold increase to the maximum Admin Charge?</p> <p>The \$10,000 proposed max Admin Charge is not realistic. A five-fold increase in one year is very large. There are no data to back up this proposed increase. the number to start out probably should be lower. Maybe \$2,000, \$3,000 or \$4,000. Using \$10,000 as a starting place makes for an accelerated annual increase in the max number. A lower starting number will result in a smaller change each year and be less shocking with each annual change.</p> <p>Basing increases on the CPI may not be the best reflection of the County's increase of maximum Admin Charge to these Districts. Such changes should be based on the cost to the County to administer these Districts. And yes, the Districts that “do not receive and manage disbursements of funds” should pay more.</p> <p>Processing of budget requests, preparing (three) disbursement checks, annual auditing and fiscal year completion wrap-up reporting seems pretty much the same effort for each District, regardless of the size of tax amount.</p> <p>A flat charge per District or a charge based on number of tax accounts in each District seems more equitable. Future changes, based on such an Admin Charge, would better reflect changes in the CPI than that based on changes on the self-tax each District may increase or decrease with each budget cycle.</p> <p>I am in favor of an open meetings law applicable to the Districts, NOT a cut and paste from the Maryland Open Meetings Act and the Maryland Homeowners Association Act.</p> <p>At a minimum, I suggest removing Bill 32-25 from immediate consideration to provide time for further study, to consider reorganization (perhaps two bills), and perhaps reconsideration as a proposed bill.</p>	
2025-06-02 11:02:23	Karen	Boyd	Edgewater	MD	21037	Yes		Bill No. 32-25: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Finance, Taxation, and Budget – Special Community Benefits Districts, Shore Erosion Control Districts, and Waterways Improvements Districts – Administrative Charge – Penalties for Non-Compliance – Maryland Homeowners Association Act and Open Meetings Act Compliance	Oppose	<p>I highly recommend NOT approving proposed Bill 32-25 as now amended. An increase is needed but as I stated before, how does the County justify the proposed five-fold increase to the maximum Admin Charge?</p> <p>The \$10,000 proposed max Admin Charge is not realistic. A five-fold increase in one year is very large. There are no data to back up this proposed increase. the number to start out probably should be lower. Maybe \$2,000, \$3,000 or \$4,000. Using \$10,000 as a starting place makes for an accelerated annual increase in the max number. A lower starting number will result in a smaller change each year and be less shocking with each annual change.</p> <p>Basing increases on the CPI may not be the best reflection of the County's increase of maximum Admin Charge to these Districts. Such changes should be based on the cost to the County to administer these Districts. And yes, the Districts that “do not receive and manage disbursements of funds” should pay more.</p> <p>Processing of budget requests, preparing (three) disbursement checks, annual auditing and fiscal year completion wrap-up reporting seems pretty much the same effort for each District, regardless of the size of tax amount.</p> <p>A flat charge per District or a charge based on number of tax accounts in each District seems more equitable. Future changes, based on such an Admin Charge, would better reflect changes in the CPI than that based on changes on the self-tax each District may increase or decrease with each budget cycle.</p> <p>I am in favor of an open meetings law applicable to the Districts, NOT a cut and paste from the Maryland Open Meetings Act and the Maryland Homeowners Association Act.</p> <p>At a minimum, I suggest removing Bill 32-25 from immediate consideration to provide time for further study, to consider reorganization (perhaps two bills), and perhaps reconsideration as a proposed bill.</p>	
Bill No. 48-25											

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip Code	Are you representing yourself?	If no, what organization or whom do you represent?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachments
2025-05-31 17:52:27	Kelsey	Morse	Severn	MD	21144	Yes		Bill No. 48-25: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Subdivision and Development – Zoning – Tiny Home Community Development	Oppose	Removing forested areas that absorb water and prevent flooding in areas already heavily populated by residential communities is short-sighted and dangerous. An entire community exists downstream from the area where the developers would like to modify the code and build two new homes. It is more beneficial to keep the forested area than to have residential properties built.	



Kaley Schultze <ccschu24@aacounty.org>

Fwd: Concern for bill 32-25

Shannon Leadbetter <sleadbetter@aacounty.org>

Tue, May 20, 2025 at 9:02 AM

To: Kaley Schultze <ccschu24@aacounty.org>

Can you please share? Thank you!

Jess

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Lance Davis** [REDACTED]

Date: Mon, May 19, 2025 at 3:01 PM

Subject: Concern for bill 32-25

To: <SLeadbetter@aacounty.org>

Good Afternoon Councilmember Leadbetter,

I am the Loch Haven Civic Association president and wanted to reach out to you about bill #32-25, AN ORDINANCE concerning: Finance, Taxation, and Budget – Special Community Benefits Districts, Shore Erosion Control Districts, and Waterways Improvements Districts – Administrative Charge – Penalties for Non-Compliance – Maryland Homeowners Association Act and Open Meetings Act Compliance.

We are very concerned about this bill. Unfortunately, I have just returned from vacation missing the 11am deadline to submit testimony and find myself under the weather to attend in person.

I am therefore reaching out to you with some of our concerns. They are as follows:

- The current 5% fee is reasonable for the service the county provides. I have seen no further explanation for the potential increase. Nearly doubling this fee will put a hardship on several communities to continue to manage their assets and services.
- My read of OMA is that SCBD's are NOT public bodies and therefore are not required to follow OMA.
- Making SCBD's meet OMA puts an undue burden on communities to manage their business, their assets and services.
- It is difficult enough to get out notices per our own bylaws to owners and renters, let alone reasonable time to notify the general public of our meetings.
- My understanding is that this bill is being proposed because someone stole from a SCBD. The actions in this bill do NOT stop this from happening. The rules and regulations that we must follow with the county for a SCBD is a community's best protection. The existing law further covers this issue.

I therefore encourage you to vote against this bill and the anticipated amendments. We have enough government burden to make a SCBD work with very little resources and volunteer effort. This bill does not help us and it does not protect us.

Sincerely,

--

Lance Davis, LHCA President



--

Shannon Leadbetter
County Councilwoman

District 7

410.222.2417

Subscribe to the District 7 Newsletter [Here](#)



Kaley Schultze <ccschu24@aacounty.org>

Fwd: Fw: [annapolisroadsforum] Re: Reminder County Council Meeting Tonight at 7PM Public Hearing ALLBill AA 32-25 Question

Lisa Rodvien <ccrodv33@aacounty.org>
Reply-To: lisa.rodvien@aacounty.org
To: Kaley Schultze <ccschu24@aacounty.org>

Sun, Jun 1, 2025 at 3:24 PM

Hello Kaley,

I hope you are having a nice weekend.

Could you share this with my colleagues, please? Thank you!

Sincerely,

Lisa Rodvien, District 6 Councilmember

Anne Arundel County Council

P.O. Box 2700

Annapolis, MD 21401

410-222-1401

lisa.rodvien@aacounty.org

(she/her/hers)

[Subscribe](#) to my monthly newsletter!

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Dave bastian** [REDACTED]

Date: Mon, May 19, 2025 at 3:31 PM

Subject: Fw: [annapolisroadsforum] Re: Reminder County Council Meeting Tonight at 7PM Public Hearing ALLBill AA 32-25 Question

To: lisa.rodvien@aacounty.org <lisa.rodvien@aacounty.org>

I support the bill (I live in Annapolis Roads and hope there can be a criteria for transparency). Another concern I have is we pay about \$25K a year for County police. They submit monthly reports, but the community never sees them. The community also uses the tax money to pay for a couple picnics which is good for bringing people together but as best as I can tell less than half the community attends. This doesn't seem like an appropriate use of tax money.

Dave
[REDACTED]