

COUNTY COUNCIL OF ANNE ARUNDEL COUNTY, MARYLAND

Minutes of

Legislative Session 2021, Legislative Day No. 17

September 7, 2021 - 7:00 P.M.

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Lacey at 7:00 P.M. and opened with the Invocation given by Mr. Pruski. The Pledge of Allegiance was led by a Boy Scout from District 4. The meeting was held in the County Council Chambers, Arundel Center, Annapolis, Maryland. There were approximately 30 persons in the audience.

The following members of the County Council were present:

Sarah F. Lacey	First District
Allison Pickard	Second District
Nathan Volke	Third District
Andrew C. Pruski	Fourth District
Amanda Fiedler	Fifth District
Lisa D.B. Rodvien	Sixth District
Jessica Haire	Seventh District

The County Auditor's Office was represented by the County Auditor, Michelle Bohlayer. Linda Schuett, Legislative Counsel, was also present.

ETHICS STATEMENT

Laura Corby, Administrative Officer, read aloud the Ethics Statement.

INVITATION TO AUDIENCE

The Administrative Officer stated there were no submissions of written public testimony received for Invitation to Audience through the online testimony tool.

The following person spoke on Invitation to Audience:

Linda Davis, Linthicum
Brent Glosser, Annapolis
Jennifer Sell, Severna Park

There was no one else present who wished to speak, and the Invitation to Audience was concluded.

PRELIMINARY MOTION

On motion of Mr. Pruski, seconded by Ms. Pickard, the Council voted that the partial reading of any bill, resolution, minutes, or amendment constitutes the reading of the whole.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

On motion of Ms. Rodvien, seconded by Mr. Volke, the minutes of the meeting of July 19 and July 29, 2021 were approved as presented.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

BILL NO. 72-21 AN ORDINANCE concerning: Purchasing – Capital Improvement Contracts – Prevailing Wage and Local Hiring – FOR the purpose of establishing prevailing wage and local hiring provisions applicable to specific types of capital improvement contracts; defining certain terms; adding the types of capital improvement contracts to which prevailing wage provisions apply; allowing wage deductions in specific instances; requiring capital improvement contracts to include specific terms; adding worksite notice requirements; requiring maintenance of certain records relating to prevailing wage requirements; allowing audits investigations of complaints of violations of prevailing wage requirements; adding local hiring requirements; adding reporting requirements for prevailing wage and local hiring data; establishing penalties for violations of prevailing wage and local hiring provisions; providing for the applicability of this Ordinance; providing for a delayed effective date; and generally relating to purchasing.

By Ms. Lacey, Chair

(by request of the County Executive)

and Ms. Pickard, Ms. Lacey, Mr. Pruski, and Ms. Rodvien

BILL NO. 73-21 AN ORDINANCE concerning: Approval of Lease Agreement for Coppermine Tennis Facility – FOR the purpose of approving an agreement to lease County-owned property located at 1580 Millersville Road, Millersville, MD 21108, to Coppermine Racquet and Fitness LLC.

By Ms. Lacey, Chair

(by request of the County Executive)

BILL NO. 74-21 AN ORDINANCE concerning: Subdivision and Development – Site Development – Exemptions – FOR the purpose of exempting agricultural buildings and accessory uses to farming from the requirements for site development; exempting temporary uses from the requirements for site development; and generally relating to subdivision and development.

By Ms. Haire

BILL NO. 75-21 AN ORDINANCE concerning: Subdivision and Development – Community Meetings – Exemption for In-Kind Replacements – FOR the purpose of exempting in-kind replacement of a deck or accessory structure to residential development from the requirement to hold a community meeting; and generally relating to subdivision and development.

By Ms. Fiedler

BILL NO. 76-21 AN ORDINANCE concerning: Finance, Taxation, and Budget – Real Property Taxes – Credits – Business Entities Affected by a State of Emergency – FOR the purpose of establishing a real property tax credit for business entities affected by a declared state of emergency; establishing eligibility criteria for the credit; providing for the calculation and duration of the credit; establishing a deadline for filing for the credit and the form of application for the credit; and generally relating to finance, taxation, and budget.

By Mr. Volke

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION NO. 41-21 – RESOLUTION approving the terms and conditions of the acquisition of real property consisting of between approximately 0.62 +/- acres and 0.765 +/- acres, known as 443 Crain Highway, Glen Burnie, Maryland 21061, from HB, Incorporated, utilizing funds from the Advance Land Acquisition Capital Project

By Ms. Lacey, Chair
(by request of the County Executive)

RESOLUTION NO. 42-21 – RESOLUTION nominating a member to serve on the Anne Arundel County Ethics Commission

By Ms. Fiedler

RESOLUTION NO. 43-21 – RESOLUTION appointing members of the Salary Standard Commission

By Ms. Lacey, Chair, and by Mr. Volke and Mr. Pruski

ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

Ms. Fiedler stated she wished to take a moment to recognize Hospital Corpsman 2nd Class Sarah Burns, who was killed in a helicopter crash in California. She is from Severna Park. She offered her condolences to her family and husband.

Ms. Rodvien and Ms. Haire stated they wished to take a moment to acknowledge the damage that was done during the recent tornado which affected their districts, Annapolis and South County. There has been an outpouring of support and they stated their thankfulness that there were no serious injuries or deaths associated with this storm.

Ms. Fiedler, Ms. Haire and Ms. Pickard asked to be added as co-sponsors to Resolution No. 43-21.

Ms. Lacey stated there would be interviews held for the District 1 Board of Education seat on September 13, 2021, and details of the time and location will be posted on the County website.

PUBLIC HEARINGS AND CALL OF BILLS FOR FINAL READING AND/OR VOTE

BILL NO. 66-21 (As Amended)

The Chair called Bill No. 66-21, as amended, An Ordinance concerning: Zoning – Parking, Nonresidential Outdoor Lighting, and Signage – Prohibited Signs and Temporary Signs – For the purpose of amending the definition of “sign”; allowing wind signs and signs painted on the roof of a structure; repealing the limitation on temporary real estate and construction signs; allowing temporary signs for particular uses to exceed the normal size; limiting the number of temporary signs allowed on a private property; allowing temporary signs to be displayed for a certain period of time; making technical changes; and generally relating to zoning; and the Administrative Officer read the title.

Ms. Haire, Sponsor, stated this bill has been discussed several times. She has amendments to present and stated she would reserve her comments for that time.

Pete Baron, Director, Government Affairs, accompanied by Lori Rhodes, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer, Planning and Zoning, Land Use, Lynn Miller, Office of Planning and Zoning, and Lori Blair Klasmeier, Legislative County Attorney, Office of Law, stated they would reserve comment until the amendments were presented.

The Chair opened the public hearing on Bill No. 66-21, as amended.

The Administrative Officer stated there was one submissions of public testimony received for Bill No. 66-21, as amended, which was posted to the website and is part of the official record.

The following individuals spoke on Bill No. 66-21, as amended:

Sarah Price, Annapolis
Andria Chiaramonte, Edgewater
Mike Lofton, Harwood, representing Growth Action Network

There was no one else present who wished to speak and the hearing was concluded.

The Chair called Bill No. 66-21, as amended, An Ordinance concerning: Zoning – Parking, Nonresidential Outdoor Lighting, and Signage – Prohibited Signs and Temporary Signs; and the Administrative Officer read a portion of the title.

Ms. Haire stated she believes it is time to take a comprehensive look at the sign ordinances in the Code.

Mr. Baron stated the Administration agrees with Ms. Haire and thinks the amendments which are going to be presented are a good compromise.

Amendment No. 7

The Chair called for Amendment No. 7, and the Administrative Officer read the description:

This amendment modifies the limitation on the number of temporary signs allowed on a private property to apply to wind signs only.

Ms. Haire explained the reason for the amendment.

Mr. Baron stated the Administration supports the amendment.

Mr. Volke asked how the number of signs was arrived at and if they had considered the amount of frontage a business has to determine the number of signs allowed.

Ms. Haire stated it was an art not a science. She explained that she thinks most businesses will put the signs at the entrance to their business no matter how much frontage they have.

On motion of Ms. Haire, seconded by Ms. Pickard, Amendment No. 7 was adopted by the following roll call vote:

Aye – Ms. Fiedler, Ms. Rodvien, Ms. Haire, Ms. Pickard, Mr. Volke, Mr. Pruski,
Ms. Lacey
Nay - None

Amendment No. 8

The Chair called for Amendment No. 8, and the Administrative Officer read the description:

This amendment adds limitations on the period of time of which a temporary sign related to an event may be displayed.

Ms. Haire explained the limitations added by this amendment.

Mr. Baron stated the Administration is comfortable with the amendment.

Mr. Volke asked how many complaints had been received about signs on private property.

Ms. Miller stated she didn't have a specific number to give to him but would get back to him on the number.

Mr. Baron stated that since the bill has been amended they would get back to him with the number of complaints before the next meeting.

On motion of Ms. Haire, seconded by Ms. Pickard, Amendment No. 8 was adopted by the following roll call vote:

Aye – Ms. Fiedler, Ms. Rodvien, Ms. Haire, Ms. Pickard, Mr. Pruski, Ms. Lacey
Nay – Mr. Volke

The Chair stated Bill No. 66-21, as amended, would be heard on September 20, 2021.

BILL NO. 67-21

The Chair called Bill No. 67-21, An Ordinance concerning: Public Ethics – Financial Disclosure – Legislative Counsel to the County Council – For the purpose of adding financial disclosure requirements applicable to the position of Legislative Counsel to the County Council; and generally relating to public ethics; and the Administrative Officer read the title.

Pete Baron, Director, Government Affairs, accompanied by Michael Botsaris, Director, Ethics Commission and Greg Swain, County Attorney, stated this bill was requested by the Ethics Commission and not the Administration.

Mr. Botsaris stated the Commission felt that the Council's Legislative Counsel is in a position to influence legislation and had the potential to influence language of legislation while the position also is free to maintain a private practice of law in the County for private clients. For

this reason the Ethics Commission is requesting the addition of a financial disclosure statement from the individual in this position.

Mr. Volke asked if the attorneys in the County Office of Law are required to file financial disclosures.

Mr. Botsaris stated only the County Attorney and the Deputy County Attorney are required to make these disclosures. He stipulated that the County Executive could request a financial disclosure from any County employee if he so chooses.

Ms. Haire asked if other counties require this type of disclosure.

Mr. Botsaris stated he hadn't done any research on this and was unaware if other counties had a Legislative Counsel position and if they were able to maintain an outside law practice.

Mr. Pruski asked if there was anything in particular that prompted this request.

Mr. Botsaris stated there had been inquiries regarding this particular Counsel which prompted this request.

Ms. Haire asked about the requirement for client confidentiality and if the financial disclosure could violate that.

Mr. Botsaris stated he wasn't aware of any issues this would present.

Ms. Lacey asked about the requirements for unregistered lobbyists.

Mr. Botsaris stated he would need to review the penalties for lobbyists who were not registered.

Ms. Pickard asked why there was no memo written to the Council to explain what the concerns were before there was a bill before them to pass.

Mr. Botsaris stated the Ethics Commission is not obligated to contact the Council to get their opinion prior to making recommendations.

Ms. Pickard stated 94 other County employees are required to fill out the disclosures. She stated she thought it would be more productive to receive a memo prior to having legislation proposed.

Mr. Botsaris stated the Ethics Commission looks at the Legislative Counsel as it would any other County employee. They don't go to other Directors of County officials when the Commission feels they need to change the Code in a furtherance of their duties. He stated he will bring that thought to the Commission, but he does not think it has been done in the past.

Ms. Pickard stated she thought there would be a different piece of legislation before them if those conversations had taken place.

Mr. Botsaris stated there had been conversations previously with Council staff.

Ms. Lacey stated that Mr. Botsaris should pass on to the Chair of the Ethics Commission that the Council would like for them to come before them since this legislation interferes with a current client relationship with the current Legislative Counsel.

The Administrative Officer stated there were no submissions of public testimony received for Bill No. 67-21.

There was no one present who wished to speak and the hearing was concluded.

The Chair called Bill No. 67-21, An Ordinance concerning: Zoning – Public Ethics – Financial Disclosure – Legislative Counsel to the County Council; and the Administrative Officer read a portion of the title.

Amendment No. 1

The Chair called for Amendment No. 1, and the Administrative Officer read the description:

This amendment requires each attorney in the County Office of Law to file with the Ethics Commission a financial disclosure statement.

Mr. Volke explained the purpose of the Amendment.

Mr. Botsaris stated he did not believe this was needed. He stated that a Conflict of Interest form may be more appropriate for those employees.

Ms. Lacey asked if a Conflict of Interest form would be something that required legislation.

Mr. Botsaris stated yes because it is an annual form that needs to be filled out and this position would need to be listed in the Code.

Ms. Pickard asked if the Commission had considered the option of a Conflict of Interest form instead of a Financial Disclosure form.

Mr. Botsaris stated they had and decided that a Financial Disclosure was a more appropriate vehicle to protect the public in this situation.

Ms. Lacey called on Mr. Swain to comment on the amendment.

Mr. Swain stated he disagreed with the amendment for several reasons. The primary difference is that the staff attorneys in the Office of Law are prohibited from practicing law outside of the Office of Law in the Charter. He stated there is very little difference between their staff attorneys working on legislation and others in other departments working to draft legislation.

Ms. Haire asked what the primary difference is between the Financial Disclosure and the Conflict of Interest forms.

Mr. Botsaris outlined the differences in the forms and stated that the Commission felt for the position of Legislative Counsel the Financial Disclosure form was more appropriate.

Mr. Volke asked about the section of Code that refers to the outside practice of law, which referenced the only person prohibited from the outside practice of law is the County Attorney.

Mr. Swain stated that may be correct, but the practice has always been that the staff of the Office of Law does not practice law outside of their work in the Office of Law.

Mr. Volke stated the outside practice of law was covered in an Executive Order enacted under County Executive Schuh. He asked if Mr. Swain would object to the attorneys in his office filling out a Conflict of Interest form.

Mr. Swain stated he would look at that option and let Mr. Volke know. He believes the obligation to report a conflict of interest already exists.

On motion of Mr. Volke, seconded by Ms. Fiedler, Amendment No. 1 was defeated by the following roll call vote:

Aye – Ms. Fiedler, Ms. Haire, Mr. Volke

Nay – Ms. Rodvien, Ms. Pickard, Mr. Pruski, Ms. Lacey

The Chair stated that the Council would like to work with the Commission on the crafting of this bill.

On motion of Mr. Volke, seconded by Ms. Pickard, the Council voted to hold the vote on Bill No. 67-21 until the September 20, 2021 Council meeting by the following roll call vote:

Aye – Ms. Fiedler, Ms. Rodvien, Ms. Haire, Ms. Pickard, Mr. Volke, Mr. Pruski,
Ms. Lacey

Nay - None

BILL NO. 68-21

The Chair called Bill No. 68-21, An Ordinance concerning: Public Safety – Animal Care and Control – Authority to Impound – Tethering of Dogs – For the purpose of amending the circumstances under which an animal may be impounded; amending the circumstances under which a dog may be tethered outdoors; and generally relating to animal care and control; and the Administrative Officer read the title.

Pete Baron, Director, Government Affairs, accompanied by Robin Catlett, Animal Care and Control, Captain Jeff Adams, Anne Arundel County Police, and Curran Ritter, Office of Law, stated the reason this legislation was being brought forward.

Ms. Catlett stated this was being brought forward to enable their officers to enforce the Code.

Mr. Volke asked about the temperature restrictions in the Code for tethering.

Ms. Catlett stated that tethering was not allowed at all in certain temperatures, and had to be supervised tethering during other times.

Mr. Volke asked about what constituted a violation.

Ms. Catlett stated that the supervision requirement is being tested because of video cameras which people are using instead of actually being present to supervise the animal.

Ms. Fiedler asked about the requirement of the person present being over 18 years old.

Ms. Haire stated that someone who is 13 can babysit according to State law. She asked if this bill is intending for an adult to be inside and someone who is 13 could be outside with the pet.

Ms. Catlett stated that was the intention of the original law, but it has begun to fail with the advent of electronic monitoring. They have found it to not be possible to determine if the animal can be seen by the person in the house.

Ms. Rodvien stated a situation she had in her family. She stated she thinks there are many responsible dog owners who are working within the framework of the prior law without having to be outside with the dog at all times. She stated she is presenting an amendment when appropriate.

Ms. Catlett went over the staffing of Animal Care and Control and the available officers to respond to calls.

Ms. Rodvien is concerned about their ability to impound the dog under this bill.

Ms. Catlett stated it is if conditions are not met. If the issue is resolved the officer can just leave.

Mr. Ritter stated it is at the discretion of the officer on site if conditions are met or if the dog should be impounded.

Mr. Volke asked how many times this particular instance of dogs being tethered without supervision has happened.

Ms. Catlett stated there was one instance where it happened over 25 times in three months.

Mr. Volke asked if the escalator should then be that the Officer has been there more than three times.

Ms. Catlett stated that a situation can get dangerous right after they leave and jurisdictions have had problems with Animal Care and Control not doing enough to help animals in trouble.

Ms. Pickard asked if the Officers are going around checking back yards for tethered dogs.

Ms. Catlett said they don't have the time but would like to.

Ms. Fiedler asked if thought had been put into making electronic monitoring not acceptable.

Ms. Catlett stated that was one aspect of this but there are more aspects than the electronic monitoring. Another aspect of it is when someone may be home but not supervising the animal.

Ms. Rodvien asked if there could be a tiered situation for the officer to be able to impound the animal if circumstances warranted it.

Ms. Catlett stated the reason for the legislation is to resolve the repeat offenders.

The Chair opened the public hearing on Bill No. 68-21.

The Administrative Officer stated there were three submissions of public testimony received for Bill No. 68-21, which were posted to the website and are part of the official record.

The following individuals spoke on Bill No. 68-21:

Rebecca Bene, Millersville
Bobby Condare', Glen Burnie

There was no one present who wished to speak and the hearing was concluded.

The Chair called Bill No. 68-21, An Ordinance concerning: Public Safety – Animal Care and Control – Authority to Impound – Tethering of Dogs; and the Administrative Officer read a portion of the title.

Amendment No. 1

The Chair called for Amendment No. 1, and the Administrative Officer read the description:

This amendment removes the requirement that the person needs to be outdoors while a dog is tethered outside.

Ms. Rodvien stated the purpose of this amendment.

Mr. Baron stated the Administration does not support this amendment.

Ms. Fielder stated she is concerned about the amendment, but that there is concern among the Council about this issue.

Ms. Rodvien withdrew her motion to adopt and Ms. Haire withdrew her second, on Amendment No. 1.

Ms. Rodvien made a motion, seconded by Mr. Volke, to hold Bill 68-21 to September 20, 2021. The motion was adopted by the following roll call vote:

Aye – Ms. Fiedler, Ms. Rodvien, Ms. Haire, Mr. Volke, Mr. Pruski
Nay – Ms. Pickard, Ms. Lacey

The Chair stated Bill 68-21 will be voted on September 20, 2021.

BILL NO. 69-21

The Chair called Bill No. 69-21, An Ordinance concerning: Current Expense Budget – Capital Budget and Program –Supplementary Appropriations and Fund Transfer - FOR the purpose of making supplementary appropriations from unanticipated revenues to certain offices, departments, institutions, boards, commissions, or other agencies in the general fund of the County for the current fiscal year; amending the Capital Budget for the current fiscal year by making a supplementary appropriation of funds from unanticipated general fund revenues to the Beverly Triton Nature Park capital project; amending the Capital Budget for the current fiscal year by transferring certain appropriations of funds between the Beverly Triton Nature Park, Eisenhower Golf Course, and Jug Bay Environmental Ed Ctr capital projects; amending the Capital Program and Capital Projects Bond Ordinance for the current fiscal year; and generally relating to making supplementary appropriations to the Current Expense Band the Capital Budget and transferring funds between projects in the Capital Budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2022; and the Administrative Officer read the title.

Pete Baron, Director, Government Affairs, was accompanied by Chris Trumbauer, Budget Officer, Jessica Leys, Director, Recreation and Parks, Erica Matthews, Recreation and Parks, David Braun, DPW, Beth O'Connell, DPW and Lori Blair Klasmeier, Legislative County Attorney.

Mr. Trumbauer stated the reason for the bill.

Ms. Haire asked about the timing of the estimates.

Mr. Trumbauer stated when the estimates were received and why they were not included in the budget.

Mr. Braun further explained the estimates were received in June.

Ms. Haire asked why the increase wasn't included in the budget.

Mr. Trumbauer explained it was his decision due to the timing of finding out on Friday and the budget being struck on Monday.

Ms. Haire asked what could be done in the future to avoid bids coming in too late in the process to be included in the budget.

Mr. Trumbauer stated they are working to make sure this doesn't happen again.

Mr. Volke asked if anyone attended the PAB and if so, what was their objection to this.

Mr. Braun stated the PAB thought they should negotiate with the low bidder, which they are not allowed to do under purchasing regulations.

Mr. Volke asked why the costs were so far off from the estimate and if it was just materials.

Mr. Braun explained the different costs and that it was not just materials but certain unknown issues such as soil work, hauling costs and dumping costs.

Ms. Haire asked what would happen if the project was not funded.

Mr. Trumbauer stated what options were available if the project was not funded through this bill.

Ms. Haire asked if they had to rebid the project would they lose this entire year.

Mr. Braun stated yes. They intended to get underway this fall and they would only lose next year.

The Chair opened the public hearing on Bill No. 69-21.

The Administrative Officer stated there was one submission of public testimony received for Bill No. 69-21, which were posted to the website and are part of the official record

The following individuals spoke on Bill No. 69-21:

Lisa Arrasmith, Annapolis
Walter Rider, Severna Park
Mike Lofton, Harwood

There was no one present who wished to speak and the hearing was concluded.

Mr. Volke asked if the bill had any PLA in it.

Mr. Braun stated it does not.

Mr. Volke asked why the funding sources are being switched around from other projects.

Mr. Trumbauer explained the process they used to determine how to fund the project.

Ms. Haire asked what some of the items they were looking at to make sure this doesn't happen again.

Mr. Braun outline several items they were considering to avoid this situation in the future.

Ms. Haire asked what part of the project would not be completed if this wasn't funded.

Mr. Trumbauer explained this is the reason why this bill was brought before the Council. It was not possible to break out any part of the project they could delete.

Ms. Haire asked for her colleague's support of the bill.

The Chair called Bill No. 69-21, An Ordinance concerning: Current Expense Budget – Capital Budget and Program – Supplementary Appropriations and Fund Transfer; and the Administrative Officer read a portion of the title.

Bill No. 69-21 was passed by the following roll call vote:

Aye – Ms. Fiedler, Ms. Rodvien, Ms. Haire, Ms. Pickard, Mr. Volke, Mr. Pruski,
Ms. Lacey
Nay - None

BILL NO. 70-21

The Chair called Bill No. 70-21, An Ordinance concerning: Snug Harbor Waterways Improvement District – Modification – FOR the purpose modifying the limits of the Snug Harbor Waterways Improvement District; and the Administrative Officer read the title.

Pete Baron, Director, Government Affairs, accompanied by Chris Trumbauer, Budget Officer and Lori Blair Klasmeier, Legislative County Attorney, explained the purpose of the bill.

The Chair opened the public hearing on Bill No. 70-21.

The Administrative Officer stated there were no submissions of public testimony received for Bill No. 70-21.

There was no one present who wished to speak and the hearing was concluded.

The Chair called Bill No. 70-21, An Ordinance concerning: Snug Harbor Waterways Improvement District – Modification; and the Administrative Officer read a portion of the title.

Bill No. 70-21 was passed by the following roll call vote:

Aye – Ms. Fiedler, Ms. Rodvien, Ms. Haire, Ms. Pickard, Mr. Volke, Mr. Pruski,
Ms. Lacey
Nay - None

BILL NO. 71-21

The Chair called Bill No. 70-21, An Ordinance concerning: Licenses and Registrations – Swimming Pools – Pool Operator and Lifeguard Licenses – FOR the purpose of repealing the requirement for a lifeguard license; increasing the fee for a pool operator license; increasing the term of a pool operator license; making technical changes; and generally relating to licenses and registrations; and the Administrative Officer read the title.

Ms. Fiedler, Sponsor, explained the reason for the bill.

Pete Baron, Director, Government Affairs, accompanied by Don Curtian, Department of Health and Lori Blair Klasmeier, Legislative County Attorney, stated the Administration supports the concept of the bill and will offer an amendment when appropriate.

The Chair opened the public hearing on Bill No. 71-21.

The Administrative Officer stated there were no submissions of public testimony received for Bill No. 71-21.

There was no one present who wished to speak and the hearing was concluded.

The Chair called Bill No. 71-21, An Ordinance concerning: Licenses and Registrations – Swimming Pools – Pool Operator and Lifeguard Licenses; and the Administrative Officer read a portion of the title.

Amendment No. 1

The Chair called for Amendment No. 1, and the Administrative Officer read the description:

This amendment changes the term of a pool license from three years to one year and makes term of a pool operator license concurrent with the term of the pool operator's training.

Mr. Baron explained the reason for the amendment.

Ms. Fiedler stated she was in favor of the amendment.

On motion of Mr. Volke, seconded by Ms. Pickard, Amendment No. 1 was adopted by the following roll call vote:

Aye – Ms. Fiedler, Ms. Rodvien, Ms. Haire, Ms. Pickard, Mr. Volke, Mr. Pruski,
Ms. Lacey
Nay – None

The Chair stated that Bill No. 71-21, as amended, will be heard on September 20, 2021.

HEARING AND OR VOTE ON RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION NO. 36-21

The Chair called Resolution No. 36-21, Resolution in support of the County Executive of Anne Arundel County promptly entering into an agreement with Robert A. Pascal Youth and Family Services, Inc. to lease and make fully available County owned property located at 41 Community Place in Crownsville, Maryland; and the Administrative Officer read the title.

Ms. Fiedler, Sponsor, stated the resolution is self-explanatory.

On motion of Ms. Fiedler, seconded by Ms. Rodvien, the Council voted to hold the vote on Resolution No. 36-21 until September 20, 2021, by the following roll call vote:

Aye – Ms. Fiedler, Ms. Rodvien, Ms. Haire, Ms. Pickard, Mr. Volke, Mr. Pruski,
Ms. Lacey
Nay – None

The Chair stated Resolution No. 36-21 would be voted on September 20, 2021.

RESOLUTION NO. 42-21

The Chair called Resolution No. 42-21, Resolution nominating a member to serve on the Anne Arundel County Ethics Commission; and the Administrative Officer read the title.

Ms. Fiedler stated there was a resume forwarded to the Council for Ms. Fitzgerald.

Ms. Lacey thanked the volunteers for the commissions.

The Chair called Resolution No. 42-21, Resolution nominating a member to serve on the Anne Arundel County Ethics Commission; and the Administrative Officer read a portion of the title.

Mr. Volke stated he went to high school with Ms. Fitzgerald, but could vote impartially on this nomination.

Resolution No. 42-21 was adopted by the following roll call vote:

Aye – Ms. Fiedler, Ms. Rodvien, Ms. Haire, Ms. Pickard, Mr. Volke, Mr. Pruski,
Ms. Lacey
Nay – None

RESOLUTION NO. 43-21

The Chair called Resolution No. 43-21, Resolution appointing members of the Salary Standard Commission; and the Administrative Officer read the title.

The Chair noted that all Councilmembers were co-sponsors of the Resolution.

Mr. Pruski noted the purpose of the Commission.

The Chair called Resolution No. 43-21, Resolution appointing members of the Salary Standard Commission; and the Administrative Officer read a portion of the title.

Resolution No. 43-21 was adopted by the following roll call vote:

Aye – Ms. Fiedler, Ms. Rodvien, Ms. Haire, Ms. Pickard, Mr. Volke, Mr. Pruski,
Ms. Lacey
Nay – None

OTHER BUSINESS

There was no further business.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, on motion of Ms. Pickard, seconded by Mr. Pruski, the meeting adjourned at 9:37 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Susan F. Cline

By Susan F. Cline

/s/ Laura Corby

For Laura Corby
Administrative Officer