

**TESTIMONY ON  
WHITE FLINT DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT BILL 50-10 AMENDMENTS**

Good evening. My name is Barbara Sears. The purpose of my testimony is to call your attention to a redline of Bill 50-10 submitted by the White Flint Partnership proposing certain important amendments to the Bill for your consideration.

The first amendment is to Section 68C-4(b) and (f) of the Bill to add the requirement that a resolution adopted by the County Council which lists the specific transportation infrastructure improvements must include an estimated completion date, as well as an estimated cost, for each listed improvement.

The reason for including this provision is that the White Flint Sector Plan contains certain staging elements relating to the construction of infrastructure improvements which, if not met, will delay the ability of the property owners to commence construction of their development projects. Because the White Flint Development District is intended to provide funding for a large part of this infrastructure, the property owners need to know when the County intends to complete construction of the various infrastructure items. While unforeseen circumstances could delay the ultimate completion of construction, adding a requirement that the resolution provide for an intended completion date will give

the property owners some assurances as to when their respective projects may move forward.

The second amendment we propose is to add a new Section 68C-4(c) which provides that the infrastructure resolution to be adopted by the County Council must set a maximum rate of special tax applicable to each individual property in the District for the purpose of establishing the amount of revenues to be utilized in connection with the issuance of bonds as contemplated in Section 68C-6 of the Bill. We maintain that including within the Bill a requirement that the resolution mandate a maximum tax on the properties will provide the necessary certainty that the actual rate of tax will not exceed the rate utilized for the purposes of issuing the bonds, except in the limited circumstance I next discuss.

The County Executive has stated that its reluctance to require the inclusion of a maximum rate of tax is due to its concern that such a maximum rate might limit the County's ability to pay debt service on outstanding bonds issued by the County at some point in the future. For this reason, we have included language in the proposed amendment which would allow the actual rate of tax levied by the Council in any subsequent year after the year of bond issuance to exceed this maximum rate to the extent that the assessed value of properties located within the District declined on an aggregate basis or the revenues from the special taxes otherwise prove to be insufficient to pay scheduled bond debt service. We believe

that this amendment would address the expressed concern of the County Executive, yet would still provide reasonable certainty that the tax rate imposed on the District would not exceed a maximum rate specified in the resolution at the time of its adoption. We would continue to support the County Executive's policy objective that the County not impose a special tax in excess of 10 percent (10%) of the total real property tax rate for the District.

Finally, we have proposed the addition of a new Section 68C-7 which provides that any properties located within the White Flint Development District are exempt from the payment of transportation impact taxes at the time of building permit to the extent that special taxes are being levied against those properties. You will hear more on this from other speakers.

The County stands to greatly benefit financially from the increased jobs and tax base created by the planned development activity in White Flint through increased tax receipts, which its own economic analysis projects to be approximately \$7 billion. On behalf of the White Flint Partnership, we urge you to modify the Bill to include the amendments proposed by the Partnership.