

**Department of Legislative Services**  
Maryland General Assembly  
2023 Session

**FISCAL AND POLICY NOTE**  
**Third Reader**

House Bill 561

(Carroll County Delegation)

Environment and Transportation

Education, Energy, and the Environment

---

**Town of Mount Airy (Carroll County and Frederick County) - Urban Renewal Authority**

---

This bill authorizes the Town of Mount Airy to undertake urban renewal projects within urban renewal areas by exercising the power of eminent domain to acquire properties in specific areas. The town may not initiate an urban renewal project unless its legislative body adopts a resolution that defines the area and finds that rehabilitation or redevelopment is necessary and in the public’s interest. Condemnation of land or property under the bill must be in accordance with the procedure set forth in State law. Further, the bill sets forth procedures for taking the property, funds which may be used to do so, and disposition of the property, including authorization to dispose of it to private persons. Property may not be taken without just compensation, either as agreed upon by the parties or awarded by a jury.

---

**Fiscal Summary**

**State Effect:** No direct effect; however, the bill could result in a minimal increase in State tax revenues, as discussed below. Expenditures are not affected.

**Local Effect:** If the bill’s authority is used, the Town of Mount Airy’s expenditures may increase to acquire land and conduct urban renewal projects, and town revenues may increase from the sale of land and properties acquired. While not a direct effect, the bill could result in a minimal increase in tax revenues for Mount Airy and Carroll and Frederick counties.

**Small Business Effect:** Minimal overall, but potential meaningful if a property targeted for urban renewal is a small business or if any urban renewal projects lead to additional economic activity for small businesses in the town.

---

## Analysis

### Current Law:

#### *Eminent Domain*

The power to take, or condemn, private property for public use is one of the inherent powers of state government and, through the state, its political subdivisions. Courts have long held that this power, known as “eminent domain,” is derived from the sovereignty of the state. Both the federal and State constitutions limit the condemnation authority. Both constitutions establish two requirements for taking property through the power of eminent domain: (1) the property taken must be for a “public use”; and (2) the party whose property is taken must receive “just compensation,” which may not be less than the fair market value of the real property. In either event, the party whose property is being taken is generally entitled to a judicial proceeding prior to the taking of the property. However, the Maryland Constitution does authorize “quick-take” condemnations in limited circumstances prior to a court proceeding.

Other entities have been given express statutory authority by the State to exercise condemnation powers under specified circumstances, including the major subdivisions of the State, municipalities, and specified utilities such as gas, oil pipeline, railroad, telephone and telegraph, and water companies.

#### *Public Use*

There is no clear cut rule to determine whether a particular use of property taken through eminent domain is a “public use,” and Maryland courts have broadly interpreted the term. The Court of Appeals has recognized takings that encompass a “public benefit” or a “public purpose.” Maryland courts have given great deference to a legislative determination as to whether property should be taken for a particular public purpose.

The courts have stated that government may not simply transfer property from one private party to another. For example, in *Van Witsen v. Gutman*, 79 Md. 405 (1894), the Court of Appeals invalidated a condemnation by Baltimore City in which the court found the transfer would have benefited one private citizen at the cost of others. However, transferring property from one private party to another is not necessarily forbidden. In *Prince George’s County v. Collington*, 275 Md. 171 (1975), the Court of Appeals authorized the county to use its eminent domain authority to take private property to be used for economic development purposes, even though the property was not blighted. The *Collington* court enunciated the following rule: “projects reasonably designed to benefit the general public, by significantly enhancing the economic growth of the State or its

subdivisions, are public uses, at least where the exercise of the power of condemnation provides an impetus which private enterprise cannot provide.” *Id.* at 191.

### *U.S. Supreme Court Ruling*

The U.S. Supreme Court ruled in *Kelo v. City of New London*, 125 S. Ct. 2655 (2005) that New London, Connecticut’s use of its condemnation authority under a state law to require several homeowners in an economically depressed area to vacate their properties to make way for mixed use development did not violate the U.S. Constitution. In essence, the *Kelo* decision left the determination to state law as to whether eminent domain may be used for economic development purposes. An earlier decision, *Berman v. Parker*, 75 S. Ct. 98 (1954), had already found that taking a nonblighted property in a blighted area as part of an overall economic development scheme does not violate the U.S. Constitution.

### *Urban Renewal Authority*

Article XI-E of the Maryland Constitution grants municipalities broad power to amend their existing charters or local laws and to adopt a new charter without the approval of the General Assembly. In addition, Article XI-E generally prohibits the General Assembly from enacting local laws for particular municipalities. However, this general prohibition is expressly qualified by Article III, Section 61 of the Constitution (the Urban Renewal Amendment). This amendment provides that the General Assembly’s power to enact local laws regarding local urban renewal projects for slum clearance prevails over the restrictions contained in Article XI-E. The General Assembly has enacted more than 60 separate public local laws authorizing individual municipalities to carry out urban renewal projects for the rehabilitation of slum or blighted areas. Chapter 519 of 1995 amended the home rule powers of municipalities as expressed in Article 23A of the Code by adding the power to acquire land or property for development or redevelopment and to sell or otherwise dispose of the land or property to any private, public, or quasi-public entity. The law, however, specifies that this power may be exercised only by a municipality that has urban renewal authority for slum clearance under Article III, Section 61 of the Maryland Constitution.

The Town of Mount Airy does not have the power to use eminent domain for an urban renewal area. As of July 1, 2021, the population of Mount Airy totaled 9,755, with 6,181 individuals residing in Carroll County and 3,574 individuals residing in Frederick County.

**State Fiscal Effect:** If an urban renewal area in the Town of Mount Airy is rehabilitated and the real property assessable base increases, property tax revenues increase. Similarly, if an area is revitalized and additional residents move to these areas, income tax and sales tax revenues could increase. It is noted that any tax revenue that might derive from

economic development depends on the success of a particular project. Given the population of the town, it is assumed that any such impact is minimal.

**Local Fiscal Effect:** The fiscal impact of the bill depends on whether the town exercises eminent domain authority for urban renewal purposes, how many times this authority is used, and the value of any property taken, none of which can be quantified at this time. If the town exercises this authority, expenditures increase related to legal fees and land and property acquisition costs. However, the town could recoup some or all of these expenditures if a property taken is sold to a developer.

In addition to the direct fiscal effect of the bill, there is an indirect effect that urban renewal could have on local tax revenues. If a blighted area in the town is rehabilitated and the real property assessable base increases, property tax revenues increase. Similarly, if an area is revitalized and additional residents move to these areas, income tax and sales tax revenues could increase. It is noted that any tax revenue that might derive from economic development depends on the success of a particular project. Given the population of the town, it is assumed that any such impact is minimal.

---

### **Additional Information**

**Prior Introductions:** Similar legislation has been introduced within the last three years. See HB 1385 of 2020.

**Designated Cross File:**SB 313 (Carroll County Senators) - Education, Energy, and the Environment.

**Information Source(s):** Carroll and Frederick counties; Comptroller's Office; Town of Mount Airy; Judiciary (Administrative Office of the Courts); Department of Commerce; Department of Housing and Community Development; Maryland Department of Planning; Maryland Department of Transportation; State Department of Assessments and Taxation; Department of Legislative Services

**Fiscal Note History:** First Reader - February 6, 2023  
js/hlb Third Reader - March 20, 2023

---

Analysis by: Donovan A. Ham

Direct Inquiries to:  
(410) 946-5510  
(301) 970-5510