





May 9, 2025

**FISCAL AND POLICY NOTE**

TO: Jennifer A. Jenkins  
Council Administrator

Colette R. Gresham, Esq.  
Deputy Council Administrator

THRU: Josh Hamlin   
Director of Budget and Policy Analysis

FROM: Shalene Miller-Whye   
Legislative Budget and Policy Analyst

RE: Policy Analysis and Fiscal Impact Statement  
CB-29-2025 Police Facility Adequacy

---

**CB-29-2025** (*Proposed by: The Chair at the request of the Acting County Executive*)

Assigned to the Government Operations and Fiscal Policy (GOFP) Committee

AN ACT CONCERNING POLICE FACILITY ADEQUACY for the purpose of removing the requirement for police facility adequacy from the County's subdivision regulations.

---

**Fiscal Summary**

**Direct Impact:**

*Expenditures:* No anticipated expenditure impact.

*Revenues:* Reduction of revenue received through the public safety mitigation fee.

**Indirect Impact:**

No anticipated indirect impact.

Website: <https://pgccouncil.us> | Wayne K. Curry Administration Bldg.  
Office: (301) 952-3431 | 1301 McCormick Drive, 3rd Floor  
FAX: (301) 780-2097 | Largo, Maryland 20774

### **Legislative Summary:**

CB-29-2025<sup>1</sup> was presented by the Chair at the request of the Acting County Executive and referred to the Government Operations and Fiscal Policy Committee. It would repeal and reenact with amendments, Subtitle 24 Subdivision Regulations, Sec. 24-4501, 24,4502, and 24-4508 of the County Code.

If enacted, CB-29-2025 would:

- Remove the Police from the level of service (LOS) standards for public facilities.
- Remove police response times as the level of service standards indicator, applicable to residential development, which include the following guidelines:
  - The population generated by the proposed subdivision, at each stage, shall not exceed the service capacity of existing police stations, in accordance with the Public Safety Guidelines, approved by Resolution of the Council
  - Require the Chief of Police to submit a statement reflecting adequate equipment pursuant to studies and regulations used by the County, or the Public Safety Master Plan for police stations in the vicinity of the area of the proposed subdivision; and
  - A statement by the Police Chief that the rolling 12-month average, adjusted monthly, for response times in the vicinity of the proposed subdivision is a maximum of 25 minutes total for non-emergency calls and a maximum of 10 minutes total for emergency calls for service.
- Remove guidelines for mitigation of adequate public facilities at existing police stations when the proposed subdivision exceeds service capacity, with the following requirements:
  - The population generated by the proposed subdivision at each stage of the proposed subdivision will not exceed the service capacity of existing police stations as determined by the Planning Board in the "Guidelines for the Mitigation of Adequate Public Facilities: Public Safety Infrastructure" as may be amended from time to time;
  - Adequate police facilities available to serve the population generated by the proposed subdivision are programmed with 100 percent of the expenditures for the construction of the facility in the adopted County CIP in accordance with the Public Safety Guidelines; or
  - That adequate police facilities and improvements are participated in or funded by the applicant on a pro-rata basis, including participation in a specific Public Facilities Financing and Implementation Program (as defined in Subtitle 27) that will alleviate any inadequacy in accordance with the Public Safety Guidelines.

---

<sup>1</sup> [CB-29-2025](#)

**Resource Personnel:**

- Rhonda L. Weaver, County Attorney
  - Angela Rodgers, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer
- 

**Current Law/Background:**

For the subdivision process, the current law establishes a level of service standards for public facilities including transportation, pedestrian and bikeway adequacy, parks and recreation, police, fire and rescue, and schools that provide clear guidance to the County and applicants about when facilities are considered adequate and create guidance for future infrastructure investments needed to accommodate existing residents and anticipated growth. For the Police, this is applicable to residential development and establishes the following standard: Response times for service are within twenty-five (25) minutes total for non-emergency calls, and ten (10) minutes total for emergency calls in each police district. If facilities and personnel are not adequate according to the standards set, mitigation is triggered with the following:

- (1) The population generated by the proposed subdivision at each stage of the proposed subdivision will not exceed the service capacity of existing police stations as determined by the Planning Board in the "Guidelines for the Mitigation of Adequate Public Facilities: Public Safety Infrastructure" as may be amended from time to time;
- (2) Adequate police facilities available to serve the population generated by the proposed subdivision are programmed with 100 percent of the expenditures for the construction of the facility in the adopted County CIP in accordance with the Public Safety Guidelines; or
- (3) That adequate police facilities and improvements are participated in or funded by the applicant on a pro-rata basis, including participation in a specific Public Facilities Financing and Implementation Program (as defined in Subtitle 27) that will alleviate any inadequacy in accordance with the Public Safety Guidelines.

*CB-089-2004*

CB-089-2004<sup>2</sup> first established the public facilities adequacy test for Police and Fire. Through this it created a 12 month rolling average for response times, including 25 minutes for non-emergency calls and 10 minutes for emergency calls.

---

<sup>2</sup> [Prince George's County Council - Reference No. CB-089-2004](#)

*CB-055-2005*

CB-055-2005<sup>3</sup> established the public safety surcharge, also known as the Public Safety and Behavioral Health surcharge, which is imposed on single-family detached dwellings, town homes, or dwelling units for any other building containing more than a single dwelling unit. The current surcharge for the developed tier is \$3,123 and \$9,362 per unit for all other buildings, as established by CR-063-2023.

*CB-056-2005*

CB-056-2005<sup>4</sup> established three monthly cycles of response time reports through the subdivision process. As well as added the requirements of deriving a mitigation plan between the applicant and the County, to be filed with the Planning Board if the applicant's project does not meet adequacy requirements. Additionally, this Bill required the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to submit guidelines for the mitigation of public safety facilities in areas of the County that do not allow the approval of a preliminary plan of subdivision by the Planning Board.

*CR-078-2005*

CR-078-2005<sup>5</sup> established adequate public safety facilities mitigation guidelines, including a mitigation plan and a mitigation fee. Through this, for the Police, mitigation guidelines established the following related to response times:

- If an application for a preliminary plan fails in any of the police service districts and the actual response times for both emergency calls and non-emergency calls do not exceed 20% above the respective required response times, the applicant may offer to mitigate as provided below.
- If an application for a preliminary plan fails in any of the police districts and the actual response times for emergency calls and/or non-emergency calls are greater than 20% above the required emergency response time, the applicant may not mitigate.
- Response times shall be stated in whole numbers, rounding where necessary in the following manner: a) decimal places between .01 and .49 shall be rounded to the nearest lower whole number; and b) decimal places between .50 and .99 shall be rounded to the nearest higher whole number.

The current public safety mitigation fee is \$4,983 per unit<sup>6</sup> and adjusts annually by percentage change in the Consumer Price Index for all Urban Consumers. The fee must be paid at the time of the issuance of a grading permit for the development.

---

<sup>3</sup> [Prince George's County Council - Reference No. CB-055-2005](#)

<sup>4</sup> [Prince George's County Council - Reference No. CB-056-2005](#)

<sup>5</sup> [Prince George's County Council - Reference No. CR-078-2005](#)

<sup>6</sup> [DIVISION 14C. - FEES AND CHARGES. | Code of Ordinances | Prince George's County, MD | Municode Library](#)

*CB-086-2023*

CB-086-2023<sup>7</sup> removed the ability for the County Council to waive any public safety facilities mitigation requirements for Police, Fire and Rescue Academy.

---

**Discussion/Policy Analysis:**

*Police Response Times/Concerns*

To understand police response times within the County, it is important to understand the level of calls and call types initiated from district to district.

In terms of the number of calls for service for CY 2024, the Police Department received 459,413 calls in 2024, a decrease of 0% or approximately 47,000 fewer calls. Every police district, except district 6, saw a decrease in the number of service calls received. Police District 3 saw a 3% uptick in calls received. The top citizen initiated calls were disorderly, accident, and welfare checks. The top officer initiated calls were premise checks and traffic stops. Of all the calls for service in 2024, 79% of them resulted in no report being initiated.

In relation to response times in 2024, the average response times for all calls Countywide were 13:16, 10:56 for priority calls, and 14:04 for non-priority calls. Across districts specifically, Division 5 saw the longest response time across all calls. Below is a breakdown of response times by call type and division.

Response Times									
	All Calls			Priority Calls			Non-Priority Calls		
	2023 Avg	2024 Avg	CY 2023 – CY 2024 +/-	2023 Avg	2024 Avg	CY 2023 – CY 2024 +/-	2023 Avg	2024 Avg	CY 2023 – CY 2024 +/-
<b>Countywide</b>	<b>12:48</b>	<b>13:16</b>	<b>+0:28</b>	<b>10:37</b>	<b>10:56</b>	<b>+0:19</b>	<b>13:35</b>	<b>14:04</b>	<b>+0:29</b>
Division I	11:28	11:32	+0:04	09:13	09:02	-0:11	12:12	12:19	+0:07
Division II	13:50	14:51	+1:01	11:39	12:12	+0:33	14:32	15:41	+1:09
Division III	12:04	12:21	+0:17	10:19	10:44	+0:25	12:44	12:56	+0:12
Division IV	12:52	12:54	+0:02	10:40	10:44	+0:04	13:47	13:45	-0:02
Division V	16:18	18:57	+2:39	13:27	15:45	+2:18	17:14	19:57	+2:43
Division VI	12:17	12:28	+0:11	09:59	10:24	+0:25	12:55	13:06	+0:11
Division VII	14:24	15:01	+0:37	12:30	13:12	+0:42	15:00	15:33	+0:33
Division VIII	12:19	12:15	-0:04	10:20	10:18	-0:02	13:11	13:06	-0:05

According to the transmittal submitted by the Office of the County Executive, the current response times are not exactly accurate due to many factors, including:

---

<sup>7</sup> [Prince George's County Council - Reference No. CB-086-2023](#)

- the current dispatcher system (PremierOne CAD) relies on a dispatcher to take explicit action to populate timestamp values required to calculate the response time and it does not use GPS and unit/incident positioning to automatically determine when a unit is in the vicinity of a call.

Based on these factors, the Office of the County Executive reports that the vast majority of the calls for service records do not have the requisite timestamp values required for an accurate response time calculation. It is important to understand what percentage of calls have inaccurate response times recorded, combined with the percentage of incidents that are responded to based on when a unit is in the vicinity of a call.

Based on the data provided by the Police Department, which may not accurately reflect adequacy due to the above factors related to the current dispatcher system, the average response times Countywide do not meet the standards set by the adequacy test. This would, in turn, trigger mitigation guidelines for most police divisions in the County that do not meet the priority call requirement of 10 minutes average. If response times exceed 120%, the request is denied entirely.

This Bill would remove the Police Department from the adequacy test, including police response times, and any mitigation fees associated with projects that do not meet the requirements of the adequacy test. With the removal of this provision, there are no clear policies to track development as it relates to the number of police facilities and officers, as the population in a specific area increases. However, there is the Public Safety and Behavioral Health Surcharge,<sup>8</sup> which is imposed on single-family detached dwellings, town homes, or dwelling units for any other building containing more than a single dwelling unit. The current surcharge for the developed tier is \$3,123 and \$9,362 per unit for all other buildings. While this seeks to provide for growing populations and seeks to remedy any impact this may cause to the current Police Department complement, there is little data on how this effectively and adequately assists the Police Department in increasing the number of officers and police stations needed based on the development complement.

There are various concerns about how this can impact development, as it is a blanket requirement that does not adjust to various factors, including how the Police Department collects data, any district-based factors, or areas that may have more concentrated development.

### *Neighboring Jurisdictions*

Neighboring jurisdictions, including Howard County, Baltimore County, and Anne Arundel County, do not rely on police response times as an adequacy test. In Montgomery County, the Police Department performs studies for resource allocation and station locations to address any needs.

---

<sup>8</sup> [Prince George's County Code, Sec. 10-192.11, Public safety and behavioral health surcharge](#)

**Fiscal Impact:**

- *Direct Impact*

Enactment of CB-29-2025 may have an adverse fiscal impact due to the loss of mitigation revenue for projects that exceed 100% of the adequacy test requirements, as established by police response times. This mitigation fee is currently \$4,983 per unit.

- *Indirect Impact*

Enactment of CB-29-2025 may have a mixed impact. It could increase development without obstacles created by the subdivision process, extending the County's tax base overall; however, it could also strain public safety facilities if the Department's complement does not align with growing development.

- *Appropriated during the Current Fiscal Year Budget:*

N/A

---

**Questions for Committee Consideration:**

1. What percentage of call response times are inaccurately reported? How far off are the current reported response times?
2. Does the Public Safety Facilities Surcharge adequately address growing development in residential areas?
3. How does the Police Department consider what is prioritized with the Public Safety Facilities Surcharge? What data is available to see where these funds are dispersed to address residential area needs based on development trends?
4. Based on what the Department knows about response times, how far off in accuracy are the current reported response times?
5. What level of projects are between 101-119% in terms of police response times? How is this impacting development trends, negatively or positively?
6. What level of projects are 120% and above, leading to denial?
7. To understand the fiscal impact, what is the mitigation revenue obtained by the County over the last ten fiscal years?

---

**Effective Date:**

CB-29-2025 shall be effective forty-five (45) calendar days after it becomes law.

---

If you require additional information or have questions about this fiscal impact statement, please call me.