

**PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY COUNCIL**  
**COMMITTEE REPORT**  
**2024 Legislative Session**

Reference No.: CB-083-2024  
Draft No.: 2  
Committee: Health, Human Services, and Public Safety  
Date: October 17, 2024  
Action: FAV(A)

**REPORT:**

Committee Vote: Favorable 5-0, with Amendments (In favor Council Members: Fisher, Hawkins, Blegay, Olson, and Watson)

**REPORT:**

The Health, Human Services, and Public Safety Committee met on October 17, 2024, to consider CB-083-2024 Draft 2A. The amendments incorporated the sponsors, and those from the Administration were presented to the committee members. They had been previously discussed at the October 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting.

Vice Chair Hawkins motioned to move favorably on the proposed Draft 2A, seconded by Council Member Olson.

The Health, Human Services, and Public Safety Committee voted favorably 5-0 on CB-083-2024 Draft 2.

The Health, Human Services, and Public Safety Committee convened on October 3, 2024, to consider CB-083-2024 and CB-91-2024.

Staff provided an overview of CB-083-2024 and CB-091-2024, noting that CB-083-2024 added provisions to Subtitle 19, Division 2A13 of the County Code (Pollution). While both bills incorporate definitions from State legislation, CB-083-2024 contains several sections not included in the state bill. CB-091-2024 provides definitions from State legislation with provisions added to Subtitle 18, Division 410 of the County Code (Police).

The Office of Law reviewed CB-083-2024 and CB-091-2024 as presented on September 10, 2024, and finds them in proper legislative form. The Office of Law sees no legal impediment to enactment.

Mr. David Moody, the Legislative Budget and Policy Analyst, provided written comments on the Policy Analysis and Fiscal Impact Statement for CB-083-2024 and CB-091-2024.

Mr. Ron Weiss, Ft. Washington, provided written comments and supported CB-091-2024 and CB-083-2024.

CB-083-2024 and CB-091-2024 were considered together because they related to establishing a pilot program to authorize noise abatement monitoring systems. The Administration withdrew CB-091-2024.

A proposed draft 2 of CB-083-2024 was presented to the committee members for discussion. Reese Espy-Glassman, Legislative Officer, explained that the amendments combine the two bills in collaboration with Ms. Sakinda Skinner, Council Liaison, Office of the County Executive, noting that most of the amendments were technical.

On page 2, Definitions were added for the following terms: “Agency,” “Noise Abatement Monitoring System,” “Noise Abatement Monitoring System Operator,” “Owner,” “Violation,” and “Noise Measuring Device.” These definitions were included in the state bill.

Additionally, on Page 3, under Section 19-12.02, language for “Program Established” has been added. There were technical amendments on page three, lines 25, 27, and 30.

The changes are also technical on page 4 and page 5.

The language is revised on page 6. It currently states that the citation must be mailed, but the wording applicable to the “motor vehicle” has been replaced with “should be mailed” under this division.

Ms. Skinner stated that she would collaborate with Ms. Espy-Glassman on page 6, which addresses penalties and incorporates feedback from the Prince George’s County Police Department.

Council Member Dernoga, the bill co-sponsor, believes CB-083-2024 is the preferred version, as its language better fits under Subtitle 19, which addresses noise pollution, rather than Subtitle 18, which deals with administrative public safety agencies. Both bills have some gaps in aligning with state law, and language from CB-091-2024 needs to be incorporated into CB-083-2024.

Council Member Olson moved to approve the amendments Ms. Glassman reviewed for CB-083-2024 Draft 2, which Council Member Watson seconded. The motion passed 5-0.

Ms. Skinner discussed the Administration's proposed amendments that Council Member Dernoga has agreed to incorporate into CB-083-2024 Draft 2.

On page 2, line 1, seeking clarification that “chief” refers to the Chief of the Prince George’s Police Department,

On page 3, under Section 19-126-03, line 14 discusses the monitoring systems. Line 15 states that the county must deploy and utilize three noise abatement monitoring systems. The Administration requests that the language be aligned with state law to say “at least, but no more than three.”

On page 5, line 2, “Operations and Enforcement,” should remain. To eliminate redundancy, change line 24, where it repeats enforcement, to “Civil Penalties.”

On page 6, line 3 discusses the use of fines collected. It was recommended to create a new 19-126.06 section titled “Use of Funds,” which mirrors the state law.

A section regarding the use of funds was removed on line 6, and it should be reinstated to specify that the money must be used solely to recover costs associated with implementing and administering noise abatement monitoring systems and for public safety programs, including pedestrian safety. The Administration requests that the language about “Use of Funds” be incorporated into Draft 2.

A Council Member raised concerns about how the noise abatement monitoring systems' locations are determined, asking whether they are placed in the noisiest areas or based on other factors.

Major Swonger responded that the systems will be deployed at various locations throughout the county, partly based on community complaints of excessive noise, which have already been received. Additionally, deployment will depend on road conditions and the ability to install the systems. Since the enforcement system requires multiple cameras and acoustic sensors, safe placement locations of the roadway will be a critical factor in the deployment strategy.

A question was raised about the noise level. A state limit of 85 decibels, outlined in a state code section, requires certified devices to measure noise levels.

A way to identify suitable locations for the noise abatement monitoring devices would involve an existing task force responsible for determining speed cameras' location.

A Council Member sought clarification on the fine. Major Swonger indicated that the first violation will result in a warning, followed by a 30-day cooling-off period, during which you'll receive a violation notice alongside your warning before any enforcement action, such as fines.

Major Swonger further explained that you wouldn't be able to purchase a vehicle from a dealership that has passed a Maryland inspection if it violates this law or has been modified inappropriately.

A Council Member requested clarification on the targeted population of this legislation: drag racing? Major Cline indicated that the focus isn't just illegal drag racing. It's also vehicles that have been modified, altered exhaust systems, and aftermarket systems that are being targeted.

Major Anthony Cline and Major Jordan Swonger participated in the work session to provide input and respond to the Council Members' questions.

After discussion, the Health, Human Services, and Public Safety Committee voted favorably 5-0 to hold for further discussion.