

Casino Local Impact Fund FY24 Budget Review Pre-vote Feedback and Responses-- June 8th, 2023

Goal 1- Transportation Connectivity

1.1 Complete Streets Planning

Vote Tally-

Approve- 2

Disapprove—0

Request more information- 1

LDC Comments-

- Pigtown has requested multiple improvements related to traffic calming, striping, signage, and enforcement to stop over-the-road trucks from parking overnight and for weeks on end in the community.
- This was also discussed in the May 3rd meeting.

Response-

- CLIF staff have been in communication with Citizens of Pigtown, Pigtown Main Street, and City DOT over these issues, and is awaiting DOT input. FY24 fully funds PTMS's request for \$50,000 to study the implementation of new streetscaping, wayfinding, lighting, and other items to provide safer and clearer travel between Pigtown and the Entertainment District.

1.2 Warner & Stockholm Streets Infrastructure & Streetscaping

Vote Tally

Approve- 1

Disapprove- 1

Request more information- 1

LDC Comments-

- I started above, this is an equity issue. This one area/project, which has 0 residents, is getting nearly 25% of the funding. This money is meant to offset the impacts of the gaming industry on the surrounding area. It is not meant to be a rebate on the money the Casinos provide to the state and Baltimore City.
- Would like more information on "developer contributions to be determined."
- This was also discussed in the May 3rd meeting.

Response-

- While this is properly categorized as a “Transportation Connectivity” project due to its extensive focus on creating a comprehensive and safe walk/roll environment connecting the casino entertainment district to the surrounding communities, it is also an economic development project that will create a sustainable source of both entry-level and career opportunities.
- The project is tied into the Reimagine Middle Branch Plan, creating connectivity and improving the public space environment ringing the waterfront. Specifically, the Warner-Stockholm construction includes separated, multi-use facility for the Gwynns Falls-Middle Branch Trail.
- DOT consultants are currently developing the cost sharing analysis.

Goal 2- Environmental Sustainability

2.1 Launch Pilot Sanitation Programs/Clean Corps

Vote Tally-

Approve- 3

Disapprove—0

Request more information- 0

LDC Comments-

- “Approve, great idea.”

Response-

N/A

2.2 Enhanced Solid Waste Services

Vote Tally-

Approve- 1

Disapprove—0

Request more information- 2

LDC Comments-

- I approve the additional Solid waste funding but had a Question -- what happened with the compacting trashcans with solar?
- Also, is this Casino Crew above and beyond what the normal DPW allocation would be to these areas? And how will LDC be able to track that?
- How much of FY23 budget has been spent?
- LDC members are interested in tracking tools for viewing reports on the new 311 code for “Casino Crew” responses.

Response-

- The compacting solar trash cans are still in use in many places; however, many have broken and have been replaced with standard cans. CLIF staff have repeatedly asked DPW for data and its evaluation, also with mixed or limited results, exacerbated by changes in personnel/leadership and COVID-19.

- The Casino Crew does provide services above and beyond the baseline DPW services. These included extra corner can emptying and 311 requests for illegal dumping. DPW has been working with 311 to establish enhanced reporting guidelines to track which 311 service requests were fulfilled with the Casino Crew to provide more precise reporting.
- We have requested updated spending from the budget office. Through Q2, they were spending at approximately 40% of budget, due to staffing issues which have largely been addressed.

2.3 Marine Trash Removal: Middle Branch & Ridgely's Cove

Vote Tally-

Approve- 2

Disapprove—0

Request more information- 1

LDC Comments-

- Very much needed and I approve. How will this be maintained going forward?

Response-

- This has been a yearly commitment of CLIF since 2016. The City is entering into year 3 of a second 3-year contract. We expect to maintain this level of funding and working with the contractor to expand and adapt service as other solid-waste initiatives change the workload.
- For example, "Gwynda, the Good Wheel of the West" -- the trash wheel at the mouth of the Gwynn's Falls -- has been effective in reducing the overall volume of trash entering the upper Middle Branch (Ridgely's Cove) enabling the contractor to shift some of their time to other shorelines (and lessened the need for us to add as much supplemental funding as provided in prior years for "emergency" clean-ups).

2.4 Improving Parks & Green Space: Solo Gibbs Phase 1

Vote Tally-

Approve- 1

Disapprove—0

Request more information- 2

LDC Comments-

- I support the Solo Gibbs funding. I would also request additional support for Carroll Park. Parks and Rec has (on multiple occasions) indicated they do not have funding for requested improvements at that park. I would propose a portion of the Warner Street money be reallocated to Carroll Park improvements.
- "...have they spent their FY23 allocation? "

Response-

- The CLIF team continues to coordinate with Rec and Parks and the South Baltimore Gateway Partnership, Parks and People, Kaboom!, and many other partners to strategize around funding park projects in South Baltimore.

- Specifically, the Mayor’s Office is leading coordination among SBGP and BCRP to program out the uses of local impact grant funds over a multi-year period along with City bond funding and Program Open Space funds to put projects on a timeline of completion.
- The current CLIF focus is on Solo Gibbs Park and Florence Cummins Park.
- SBGP has led the focus on Carroll Park. CLIF funds have gone to the Sculpture at the NE corner and Bush St Cycle Track to make it more accessible. SBGP is leading on the rec center renovation.
- For Solo Gibbs, the capital funds are being banked to start construction in FY24 once construction documents (currently underway) are completed. We can share the detailed schedule when it is completed.

2.5 Reimagine Middle Branch Plan and Initiatives

Vote Tally-

Approve- 2

Disapprove—0

Request more information- 1

LDC Comments-

- I would even recommend more funding be allocated to the Middle Branch Projects.
- How is "division of labor" (with SBGP) determined to ensure there is no duplication of effort?

Response-

- At this point in time, the CLIF funding for RMB is being used where it is needed, i.e. in providing auxiliary planning and permitting resources in the form of a new Planner who is tasked with keeping existing funded RMB projects moving forward, and in pursuing new funding opportunities.
- Other planning work is being undertaken with the use of CLIF and SBGP funds, and “Middle Branch Projects” are scattered throughout CLIF spending in FY23 and FY24 including funds for solid waste, community development, Solo Gibbs, developing and implementing environmental education and environmental justice curriculum and material for school kids, as well as neighborhood planning studies and enhancement projects.
- RMB provides the framework for aligning and finding synergy between many of these ongoing initiatives.
- Division of labor is admittedly somewhat organic, with ample communication and coordination. SBGP and the City lead on different projects, but our work is coordinated. The specific organization and management framework for respective roles and leveraging is currently a work in progress.

Goal 3- Safety

3.1 CitiWatch CCTV Camera Expansion Projects/Maintenance Reserve

Vote Tally-

Approve- 2

Disapprove—0

Request more information- 1

LDC Comments-

- This is the 4th largest line item. Additional surveillance and cameras have been shown not to be effective in deterring crime.

Response-

- We have repeatedly asked for outcomes from BPD/CitiWatch with limited results. There is new leadership there and they have acknowledged the need for better tracking and interpreting of data. Preliminary data received for 2023 indicate that CW has been valuable in investigations including getting guns off the streets. We are working with CitiWatch and BPD to develop regular quantitative and qualitative reporting of the efficacy of the cameras.
- CitiWatch cameras are placed in response to requests from the community. Communities continue to request cameras to deter crime and help investigations.

3.2 Enhanced Policing: Casino Sub-District

Vote Tally-

Approve- 2

Disapprove—1

Request more information- 1

LDC Comments-

- ...I see security at the Casino to be a ""cost of doing business"" line item which should be shouldered by the casino in their business operating budget.
- On top of this, in order to accommodate the Top Golf site, we also had to pay for the relocation of BARCS. While we are grateful for the new BARCS facility, its move did incur additional costs (paid for by the impact funds) that otherwise would not have been incurred should we have just renovated their building in the old site. The casino/developers are disproportionately benefiting from the impact funds. "
- This was also discussed in the May 3rd meeting.

Response-

- Horseshoe pays directly for BPD presence inside the casino, which consists of overtime-duty option shifts that must remain at the podium. On-duty officers are prohibited, per city policy, from patrolling locations with alcoholic beverage sales and may only respond for calls for service. Likewise, Top Golf has its own private security, and the Paramount will be required to as well.
- The Casino Sub-District is solely tasked with patrolling the public spaces surrounding the casino. Private "Special Police" are not allowed per state law to patrol public property, so there is no legal mechanism for providing private police patrolling the streets surrounding the Horseshoe Casino
- The BCAS arrangement was a multi-faceted agreement in which Top Golf and the developers paid significant sums for the properties above and beyond the fair market value and performed other environmental remediation projects.

- CLIF monies paid for a portion of the cost of relocating BCAS and constructing a modern, appropriate facility for its legally mandated functions on previously blighted (and blighting) City-owned property. The sale of the TopGolf property paid for the balance of the construction costs, while converting a vacant lot (“Lot J”) and the former BCAS site into viable, tax-paying business with a large workforce (of net new jobs). The prior BCAS facility did not meet health code standards and was in a flood zone, making it unfeasible for renovation/reuse.

3.3 Safe Streets-MedStar Hospital Responder Program & DHHS School Based Violence Intervention Program

Vote Tally-

Approve- 3

Disapprove—0

Request more information- 0

LDC Comments-

- Great idea/program

Response-

N/A

Goal 4- Community Development & Revitalization

4.2 Community Enhancement Projects

Vote Tally-

Approve- 2

Disapprove—0

Request more information- 1

LDC Comments-

- What process is used to determine how this money is spent? Overlap with SBGP?

Response-

- For each of the \$50K allotments, CLIF staff work with the community associations to determine what the community wants to see. For further investments, they are in response to projects that support community development and need more funding. Sometimes these projects are brought to the CLIF team from communities, advocacy groups, city agencies, etc. There is overlap with SBGP, sometimes CLIF and SBGP supplement each other, sometimes one org or another is better suited to pursue a particular project.
- We need to acknowledge that this is a legacy (FY15) initiative. There has not been an active process for developing new CEP’s for some time. We are proposing to revive that to the extent where having funds available for tactical improvements in communities can be efficient. In general, we are not proposing to replicate the competitive grant program of SBGP.
- This was also discussed in the May 3rd meeting.

4.3 Community Development Fund

Vote Tally-

Approve- 3

Disapprove—0

Request more information- 0

LDC Comments-

- Would like to understand more about the "Middle Neighborhoods Strategy."
- Would like to see Middle Neighborhoods for Pigtown

Response-

- This a joint initiative of the Department of Planning, DHCD and Live Baltimore, being piloted around the City with ARPA funds. It is based on the findings that Baltimore is losing population, particularly in middle-class Black households, its ratio of homeowners to renters, and real estate value in its "Middle Neighborhoods" – not the lowest income neighborhoods, but neighborhoods also not benefitting from new investment or rising home values (and population):

"One way to think about middle neighborhoods is they are on the edge between growth and decline. These are neighborhoods where housing is often affordable and where the quality of life—measured by employment rates, crime rates, and public school performance—is sufficiently good that new home buyers are willing to play the odds and choose these neighborhoods over others in hopes they will improve rather than decline."

- Specifically, Healthy Neighborhoods Inc., will implement strategies and programs to attract, retain and support home ownership.
- CLIF funding will leverage that program to South Baltimore in Lakeland and parts of Cherry Hill. CLIF staff have reached out to relevant subject matter experts to set up a meeting to discuss the potential to include part or all of the Middle Neighborhoods strategy in Pigtown.

4.6 Neighborhood Planning Studies

Vote Tally-

Approve- 3

Disapprove—0

Request more information- 0

LDC Comments-

- The Pigtown-Carroll Camden study could have more money allocated.

Response-

- Fifty thousand dollars is the upper end of the amount requested by Pigtown Main Street. Further investments in planning, design and buildout are possible once the scope of the project is known

and stakeholders hone their requests. This will dovetail with Complete Streets Planning and other CLIF goals.

Goal 5 Economic Growth

5.2 Employment Connection Center

Vote Tally-

Approve- 3

Disapprove—0

Request more information- 0

LDC Comments-

- N/A

Response-

- N/A

5.3 Job Training Programs and Access

Vote Tally-

Approve- 3

Disapprove—0

Request more information- 0

LDC Comments-

- N/A

Response-

- N/A

5.4 YouthWorks Summer Employment

Vote Tally-

Approve- 3

Disapprove—0

Request more information- 0

LDC Comments-

- N/A

Response-

- N/A

Goal 6 Education

6.1 Educational Partnerships: Reading Partners

Vote Tally-

Approve- 3

Disapprove—0

Request more information- 0

LDC Comments-

- N/A

Response-

- N/A

6.2 Environmental Education Programming

Vote Tally-

Approve- 2

Disapprove—0

Request more information- 1

LDC Comments-

- Not a specific question on this program funding, but in terms of Education, the Pigtown Library could benefit from additional funding and programming. I would see this as a good opportunity to apply the impact funds to the neighborhoods.

Response-

- CLIF staff have had conversations with BDC, Pigtown Main Street, the developers of the Pratt Library Building, and Pratt Leadership. The property disposition agreement between the various city stakeholders and the developers has been finalized and since the redevelopment was part of a competitive process, it would disrupt the procurement process to provide further City funding to the development project. However, Pratt leadership is aware that there is funding available in Community Enhancement Projects and Community Development available if needed for fit-out of the library space, including media and technology.

6.3 Summer Head Start-- Associated Catholic Charities

Vote Tally-

Approve- 3

Disapprove—0

Request more information- 0

LDC Comments-

- N/A

Response-

N/A

Goal 7 Health & Wellness

7.1 Anti-Homelessness Strategies

Vote Tally-

Approve- 3

Disapprove—0

Request more information- 0

LDC Comments-

- I would even say this needs more funding.

Response-

- MOHS requested more funding, however that funding was to pay for all of the costs for South Baltimore. CLIF funding is intended for enhanced services above and beyond baseline services. The SBGD will have double the amount of outreach of other areas of the city. Funding for other activities and uses was offered, and MOHS may request FY24 supplemental funding.

Goal 9 Community Infrastructure

9.1 Fiberoptic Infrastructure

Vote Tally-

Approve- 2

Disapprove—0

Request more information- 1

LDC Comments-

- I still do not quite understand how this will turn into opportunities for the neighborhoods when the footprint of the fiber optics are so small.

Response-

- Staff have been coordinating with the Office of Broadband and Digital Equity (BDE) and its predecessors on investments (both CLIF and non-CLIF) in conduit and fiber for both CitiWatch cameras and for community broadband and other potential high-speed internet programs.
- Our plans for Westport are a model for achieving multiple co-benefits—public safety surveillance cameras, broadband to community facilities, Wi-Fi in public spaces, and in-home broadband for public housing residents, facilitated by BDE.
- While this strategy is limited in geographic area and impact, it is a template for using CLIF resources and statewide and federal broadband funding for coordinated strategies and co-benefits – and for making infrastructure resources available in South Baltimore neighborhoods for leveraging into increased broadband access once the City’s capacity and mechanisms are up and running.

Additional Questions/comments

- Q- I would encourage the LDC to support projects separate and distinct from the South Baltimore Gateway Partnership. The LDC should focus on larger scale City initiatives in line with the Mayor's agenda. It should not be funding smaller community enhancement that the SBGP would consider. Larger scale projects may include transformational economic development work, significant funding for homelessness, addressing urban blight, and larger-scale beautification work.
 - A- Coordination between SBGP and CLIF is ongoing and ever-changing. There are certain times where CLIF funds can be efficiently programmed through existing channels, for example- CLIF is better suited to work with DHCD to hire a new Code Enforcement Officer, or add funds to the Housing Upgrades Benefitting Seniors, implement Clean Corps alongside ARPA dollars, Youth Works, etc.
- Q- Grocery Store/Food Desert: When we spoke, we were batting around several ideas about how to address the food desert issues in SW. However, there are no LDC funds (or other city funds) being earmarked to do something on this. I think this fits directly into the quality of life and health/wellness goals. It is a big focus for the neighborhoods in SW.
 - A- CLIF staff and the Mayor's office are in conversation with BDC and others about using CLIF to help attract a grocery store to Mount Clare Junction. Grant funding can be allocated from the Community Development Fund (through DHCD) using FY24 appropriations, and from surplus fund balance if needed. The project's budget gap/needs are being identified.
- Q- Reporting: How will tracking of expenditures be tightened up? You and I talked about this when we met. I would like to know that when depts (police for example) are charging LDC funds, that its actually for the intended use. Impacts -- are we tracking impacts or KPIs or anything on these allocations? Are they effective?
 - Quarterly and more in-depth reporting is a priority for FY24. CLIF staff are developing tools and processes for this purpose.
 - LDC members are encouraged to contribute ideas on what would be appropriate KPI's.
- Q- Pigtown Library Renovation: This is another worthy and important project which should receive funding to enhance the renovation plans for the Washington Blvd library. I would implore the committee to consider this.
 - CLIF staff have had conversations with BDC, Pigtown Main Street, the developers of the Pratt Library Building, and Pratt Leadership. The property disposition agreement between the various city stakeholders and the developers has been finalized and since the redevelopment was part of a competitive process, it would disrupt the procurement process to provide further City funding to the development project. However, Pratt Leadership is aware that there is funding available in Community Enhancement Projects and Community Development available if needed for fit-out of the library space, including media and technology.
- I'm not a fan of allocating the full requested amount of dollars to projects that have underspent in the past.
 - That is an issue that we discuss with the agencies when budgeting for the FY. Hiring and retaining employees is an issue for the City of Baltimore just like most employers, so

often the under-spending is due to vacancies that we hope that they can fill moving forward.

- Also, as was discussed in our last meeting, it would be helpful to understand the division of labor/resources between SBGP and LDC.
 - We can have further discussions about this topic.