

---



---

# COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY & PUBLIC SAFETY

CHARLES ALLEN, CHAIRPERSON  
FISCAL YEAR 2023  
COMMITTEE BUDGET REPORT

---



---



**TO:** Members of the Council of the District of Columbia

**FROM:** Councilmember Charles Allen  
Chairperson, Committee on the Judiciary & Public Safety

**DATE:** April 21, 2022

**SUBJECT:** **DRAFT** Report and Recommendations of the Committee on the Judiciary and Public Safety on the Fiscal Year 2023 Budget for the Agencies under its Purview

The Committee on the Judiciary and Public Safety (“Committee”), having conducted performance and budget oversight hearings and received public and government testimony on the Mayor’s proposed operating and capital budgets for Fiscal Year 2023 (“FY23”) for the agencies under its purview, reports its recommendations for review and consideration by the Committee of the Whole. The Committee also comments on certain sections of the Fiscal Year 2023 Budget Support Act of 2022 (“BSA”), as proposed by the Mayor, proposes its own BSA subtitles, and comments on the other budget legislation before the Council.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### **I. COMMITTEE BUDGET RECOMMENDATIONS ..... 3**

#### **See Attachment A for the Committee Budget Adjustments Table**

A.	Executive Summary .....	6
B.	Fiscal Year 2023 Agency Operating Budget Summary Table .....	13
C.	Fiscal Year 2023 Agency Operating Budget by Program Table .....	22
D.	Fiscal Year 2023 Agency Full-Time Equivalent Summary Table .....	29
E.	Fiscal Years 2023-2028 Agency Capital Budget Summary Table .....	34
F.	Transfers in from Other Committees Table .....	44
G.	Transfers out to Other Committees Table .....	45
H.	Revenue Adjustments Table .....	47

I.	Budget Support Act Subtitle Funding Table.....	48
J.	Funding of Bills Previously Passed Subject to Appropriations Table.....	49
II.	<b>FISCAL YEAR 2022 REVISED LOCAL BUDGET ACTS, FISCAL YEAR 2023 LOCAL BUDGET ACT, AND FISCAL YEAR 2023 FEDERAL PORTION BUDGET REQUEST ACT RECOMMENDATIONS .....</b>	<b>50</b>
III.	<b>FISCAL YEAR 2023 BUDGET SUPPORT ACT RECOMMENDATIONS .....</b>	<b>52</b>
A.	<b>Recommendations on Budget Support Act Subtitles Proposed by the Mayor .....</b>	<b>52</b>
1.	Title III. Subtitle A. Automated External Defibrillator Incentive Program .....	53
2.	Title III. Subtitle B. Emergency Medical Services Transport Contracts .....	57
3.	Title III. Subtitle D. School Safety and Security .....	62
B.	<b>Recommendations for New Budget Support Act Subtitles.....</b>	<b>66</b>
1.	Title –. Subtitle –. Access to Justice Initiative .....	67
2.	Title –. Subtitle –. Attorney General Civil Investigations Clarification .....	69
3.	Title –. Subtitle –. Comprehensive Cognitive Health Training for First Responders.....	75
4.	Title –. Subtitle –. Criminal Code Reform Commission .....	80
5.	Title –. Subtitle –. Metropolitan Police Department Budget and Staffing Transparency .....	85
6.	Title –. Subtitle –. Office of Unified Communications Telecommunicator CPR Program.....	91
7.	Title –. Subtitle –. Office of Victim Services and Justice Grants Transparency.....	94
8.	Title –. Subtitle –. Special Education Attorneys for Emerging Adult Defendants.....	99
9.	Title –. Subtitle –. Subject-to-Appropriations Repeals and Modifications .....	104
IV.	<b>COMMITTEE ACTION .....</b>	<b>105</b>
V.	<b>ATTACHMENTS .....</b>	<b>107</b>
A.	<b><i>Committee Budget Adjustments Table</i></b>	

**B.    *Legislative Language for the Committee's Recommended Budget Support Act Subtitles***

## I. COMMITTEE BUDGET RECOMMENDATIONS

Committee on the Judiciary and Public Safety Chairperson Charles Allen began his tenure with the Committee in January 2017. In Council Period 24, he is joined on the Committee by Councilmembers Anita Bonds, Mary M. Cheh, Vincent C. Gray, and Brooke Pinto.

The Committee has jurisdiction over matters affecting the judiciary and judicial procedure that are within the authority of the Council; matters affecting decedents' estates and fiduciary affairs; matters affecting criminal law and procedure; juvenile justice; elections; campaign finance; matters arising from or pertaining to the police and fire regulations of the District of Columbia; and other matters related to police protection, correctional institutions (including youth corrections), fire prevention, emergency medical services, homeland security, criminal justice, and public safety.<sup>1</sup>

The Committee additionally serves as the Council's liaison to federal agencies in the justice system, including the District of Columbia Courts, the Public Defender Service for the District of Columbia, the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia, the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency, the Pretrial Services Agency, the Federal Bureau of Prisons, and the United States Parole Commission.

The Committee is charged with oversight of the performance and operating and capital budgets of the agencies, boards, and commissions listed on the next page. In total, *the Committee oversees 39 District government entities, which, in the Mayor's proposed budget for FY23, comprise a total budget of more than **\$1.73 billion in gross funds** and approximately **10,450 full-time equivalents** ("FTEs").* The District agencies, boards, and commissions that come under the Committee's purview are as follows:

---

<sup>1</sup> See Rules of Organization and Procedure for the Council of the District of Columbia, Council Period 24, Rule 237, <https://lims.dccouncil.us/downloads/LIMS/46190/Meeting1/Enrollment/PR24-0001-Enrollment1.pdf>.

<b><i>Agencies, Boards, and Commissions</i></b>	
• Board of Elections	• Homeland Security and Emergency Management Agency/Homeland Security Commission
• Child Support Guideline Commission	• Judicial Nomination Commission
• Clemency Board	• Metropolitan Police Department/Use of Force Review Board/Police Officer Standards and Training Board
• Commission on Judicial Disabilities and Tenure	• Office of Campaign Finance
• Corrections Information Council	• Office of Neighborhood Safety and Engagement
• Criminal Code Reform Commission	• Office of Police Complaints/Police Complaints Board
• Criminal Justice Coordinating Council	• Office of the Attorney General
• Department of Corrections	• Office of the Chief Medical Examiner/Child Fatality Review Committee/Developmental Disabilities Fatality Review Committee/Maternal Mortality Review Committee/Violence Fatality Review Committee
• Department of Forensic Sciences/Science Advisory Board	• Office of the Deputy Mayor for Public Safety and Justice/Comprehensive Homicide Strategy Elimination Task Force/Concealed Pistol Licensing Review Board/Motor Vehicle Theft Prevention Commission
• District of Columbia National Guard	• Office of Unified Communications
• District of Columbia Sentencing Commission	• Office of Victim Services and Justice Grants/Access to Justice Initiative/Domestic Violence Fatality Review Board/Juvenile Justice Advisory Group
• Fire and Emergency Medical Services Department	• Uniform Law Commission

In the winter and spring of 2022, the Committee held the [performance and budget oversight hearings](#) listed below for the agencies under its purview. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the Council's performance and budget process was conducted virtually; the Committee held fourteen oversight hearings over the Zoom platform and also solicited written testimony relating to all its agencies.

<b><i>Performance Oversight Hearings</i></b>	
<i>January 20, 2022</i>	Department of Forensic Sciences/Science Advisory Board, Office of the Deputy Mayor for Public Safety and Justice
<i>January 27, 2022</i>	Office of Unified Communications, Office of Victim Services and Justice Grants
<i>February 2, 2022</i>	Fire and Emergency Medical Services Department, Homeland Security and Emergency Management Agency, Office of the Chief Medical Examiner/Fatality Review Committees
<i>February 9, 2022</i>	Board of Elections, Office of Campaign Finance
<i>February 10, 2022</i>	Office of the Attorney General, Office of Neighborhood Safety and Engagement
<i>February 17, 2022</i>	Metropolitan Police Department/Police Officers Standards and Training Board/Use of Force Review Board, Office of Police Complaints
<i>February 18, 2022</i>	Judicial Nomination Commission, Commission on Judicial Disabilities and Tenure, District of Columbia Sentencing Commission, Criminal Code Reform Commission, Criminal Justice Coordinating Council
<i>March 2, 2022</i>	Corrections Information Council, Department of Corrections

<b><i>Budget Oversight Hearings</i></b>	
<i>March 23, 2022</i>	Department of Corrections, Corrections Information Council, Office of the Deputy Mayor for Public Safety and Justice
<i>March 24, 2022</i>	Office of the Attorney General, Office of Neighborhood Safety and Engagement
<i>March 30, 2022</i>	Metropolitan Police Department, Office of Police Complaints
<i>March 31, 2022</i>	Department of Forensic Sciences/Science Advisory Board, Office of the Deputy Mayor for Public Safety and Justice ( <i>ctd.</i> )
<i>April 6, 2022</i>	Criminal Justice Coordinating Council, Office of Victim Services and Justice Grants
<i>April 7, 2022</i>	Fire and Emergency Medical Services Department, Office of Unified Communications, Board of Elections, Office of Campaign Finance

## A. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### *See Attachment A for the Committee Budget Adjustments Table*

This *Report and Recommendations of the Committee on the Judiciary and Public Safety on the Fiscal Year 2023 Budget for the Agencies under its Purview* was developed over months of agency oversight hearings and public and stakeholder engagement. The summary below highlights many of the Committee's notable investments in the FY23 budget, including the approval of proposed investments by the Mayor (so noted as "approved").

The Committee's recommended budget centers around the following themes:

### *Fully Funding the District's Public Safety Strategies*

- Strategically invests in public health-based approaches to community safety:
  - Approves and enhances the budget of the ***Office of Neighborhood Safety and Engagement*** – the District agency charged with promoting community-based strategies to prevent violence and improve community safety – by more than 19% to \$34.1 million, with 90 staff; the agency was initially created and funded in FY18 with a budget of only \$2.1 million and 16 staff, and the Committee has grown its budget each year since
  - Approves \$9.7 million for ***new violence interrupters***, for a total of \$13.8 million for ***violence intervention contracts*** in 25 priority communities across the District
  - Approves \$7.5 million for the ***Pathways Program*** – currently in its 10th cohort – to serve 200 residents at risk of committing or being victims of gun violence; Pathways is a transitional employment program that works to decrease participants' involvement in the criminal justice system and improve their employment, education, and training outcomes
    - Approves an increase in the Pathways participants' wages through a \$1.1 million enhancement
  - Approves funding for ***20 "life coaches"*** to support individuals identified in the Criminal Justice Coordinating Council and National Institute for Criminal Justice Reform's [\*Gun Violence Problem Analysis\*](#) as being at high risk of committing gun violence, supplemented by an additional

\$475,000 in one-time local funds identified by the Committee for client incentives

- Funds the Office of the Attorney General's ***Cure the Streets violence intervention program*** at \$11.3 million, which will support ten sites across the District
- Identifies a \$1.1 million enhancement for the District's network of ***Hospital-Based Violence Intervention Programs*** ("HVIPs") through the Office of Victim Services and Justice Grants, including \$575,000 in recurring dollars to supplement the HVIPs' FY23 proposed budget (including \$300,000 from the Committee on Government Operations & Facilities) and \$500,000 in one-time funding for a new HVIP project to develop, implement and evaluate protocols and training for law enforcement and medical providers to guide their interactions and reduce gun violence
- Approves the Executive's proposal for an ***additional 347 Metropolitan Police Department sworn officers*** – including a \$14.2 million enhancement to hire 108 new officers, convert 42 cadets, and keep on 17 senior police officers – and the following ***recruitment and retention incentives***:
  - \$500,000 for the ***Housing Allowance Incentive Program***, a 150% increase over the FY22 approved budget, to cover six months of costs associated with temporary housing for new recruits
  - \$1.2 million for the ***Police Officer Retention Program***, a 200% increase over the FY22 approved budget, to subsidize tuition reimbursement and educational incentives
  - \$5.2 million for a new enhancement for ***recruit hiring bonuses***
  - \$210,000 for a new enhancement for ***cadet conversion bonuses***
- Improves community trust in, and accountability of, law enforcement by:
  - Identifying funding for the civilian ***Office of Police Complaints***, with an enhancement of \$152,000 for additional staffing
  - Including a new Budget Support Act subtitle and \$673,610 to ***enhance stop and frisk data reporting by the Metropolitan Police Department and require basic budget, hiring, attrition, staffing, and overtime transparency***



- Creates opportunities for individuals returning home from incarceration and detention to help them reenter successfully and prevent reoffending:
  - Funds \$21.6 million for justice grants at the Office of Victim Services and Justice Grants (\$6.4 million in local dollars, \$3.1 million in federal dollars, and \$10.1 million in District Recovery Plan funds), including:
    - As proposed:
      - Continues last year's unprecedented \$10 million investment in ***flexible funding for reentry services providers to support returning citizens*** with housing, transportation assistance, connectivity, and other temporary or immediate expenses
    - As identified by the Committee:
      - Grows ***reentry housing grants*** with an enhancement of \$1 million in one-time local funds
      - Accepts \$200,000 in recurring local funds from the Committee on Government Operations & Facilities and identifies an additional \$500,000 in recurring local funds, for a total of ***\$700,000 in additional funding for reentry grants***
  - Identifies the full budget – \$2.1 million in recurring local dollars – to continue the Department of Corrections' ("DOC") LEAD Up! and LEAD Out! Programs, pre- and post-release reentry and employment programs, respectively, that provide leadership, education, and development opportunities to residents incarcerated in or released from DOC or Bureau of Prisons ("BOP") facilities
  - Creates ***5 new permanent paralegal positions at the Office of the Attorney General*** for graduates of the [Mayor's Office of Returning Citizen Affairs/Georgetown Paralegal Program](#)

### **Addressing the Needs of Crime Victims and Survivors**

- Funds \$40.1 million for victim services grants at the Office of Victim Services and Justice Grants (\$30.1 million in local dollars, \$1.1 million from the Crime Victim Assistance Fund, \$4.8 million in federal dollars, and \$4.1 million in District Recovery Plan funds), including:

- As proposed:
  - \$3.8 million in District Recovery Plan funds for ***additional units of emergency and transitional housing for victims of domestic violence***
  - \$350,000 in District Recovery Plan funds for ***grants for LGBTQ+ residents for targeted services and dedicated emergency shelter housing***
  - \$1.9 million for ***trauma-informed mental health services and alternative healing options for victims of gun violence***
- As identified by the Committee, an additional:
  - \$575,000 in recurring and \$500,000 in one-time local dollars to supplement the proposed budget for Hospital-Based Violence Intervention Programs, as noted above
  - \$500,000 in recurring local dollars to support the organizational viability of victim services providers, such as through increases to staff salaries
  - \$1 million in one-time local dollars for ***domestic violence services grants***
  - \$1 million in one-time local dollars for ***sexual violence services grants***
- Includes a Budget Support Act subtitle to ***promote transparency by requiring that the Office of Victim Services and Justice Grants publish information about its funding awards and budget***
- Approves \$1.9 million in ARPA funds for same-day access to ***trauma-informed mental health services*** for victims of gun violence
- Approves \$2.2 million in ARPA funds for a ***flexible housing assistance program for victims of gun violence*** and residents at-risk of victimization with relocation and short- to medium-term housing stabilization

**Improving the Conditions of Detention and Confinement**

- Approves a transformational \$251 million investment to **build a new annex** to the Correctional Treatment Facility that will serve as a **reimagined treatment and residential facility**
- Approves \$25 million in capital investments to **maintain safe, secure, and humane conditions for residents** at the Central Detention Facility and Correctional Treatment Facility until the new annex can be completed
- Identifies \$200,000 in recurring local funds to improve the monitoring of conditions of confinement in DOC and BOP facilities by hiring a **new Deputy Director and Program Analyst at the Corrections Information Council**
- Includes a new subtitle and \$300,000 in recurring local dollars for a grant through the Office of Victim Services and Justice Grants to provide **special education legal representation to emerging adult defendants with disabilities** by a legal services and advocacy organization serving older students with special education needs who are involved in the District's justice systems

**Expanding Access to Justice and Enhancing Legal Protections for Vulnerable District Residents**

- Funds \$25.7 million for [civil legal services for low-income District residents](#):
  - \$16,739,000 for Access to Justice grants, including enhancements of:
    - \$1 million in recurring local funds identified by the Committee
    - \$1 million in one-time local funds identified by the Committee for a new coordinated civil legal services intake project
    - \$1.5 million in recurring local funds and \$1.5 million in one-time ARPA funds from the Committee on Labor & Workforce Development for eviction diversion coordination
  - \$950,000 for the Loan Repayment Assistance Program for Poverty Lawyers, including an enhancement of \$600,000 in one-time local dollars
  - \$8,000,000 for the Civil Legal Counsel Projects Program for eviction defense

- Enhances funding at the Office of the Attorney General to protect District residents and consumers:
  - ***Funds \$182,000 and a new Senior Antitrust Trial Attorney*** to protect consumers from price fixing, bid rigging, and other anti-competitive behavior
  - Partners with the Committee on Labor & Workforce Development to accept \$656,299 in ARPA funds for ***two new temporary Paid Leave Enforcement Attorneys***
  - Partners with the Committee on Government Operations & Facilities to accept \$106,347 in recurring local dollars for ***a new Public Corruption Trial Attorney*** and \$155,868 in recurring local dollars for a ***Workers' Rights Paralegal***

### **Investing in Fire, EMS, and 911**

- Approves \$4.7 million to bring on an additional ***34 firefighter/emergency medical technicians*** and ***16 firefighter/paramedics***
- Invests in critical Fire and Emergency Medical Services Department (“FEMS”) capital projects by approving:
  - \$16.5 million for the ***development and construction of a new Engine 7*** and to ***complete the relocation of Engine 26***
  - \$15.4 million in FY23 for the ***purchase and replacement of 12 ambulances, 2 ladder trucks, and 5 pumpers***
  - \$77.8 million for the FEMS ***Fleet Maintenance Reserve Facility***
  - \$16.2 million for a ***new Fireboat – 1***
- Identifies \$225,000 in one-time local dollars to ***replace gym equipment for 5 firehouses***, in addition to the 3 already funded in FY23
- Continues enhancing funding by \$172,000 in recurring local dollars for the FEMS O2X Human Performance Program, which will ***address employee wellness*** and help personnel manage the daily stresses of serving on the front lines

- Approves \$2.4 million to support the Office of Unified Communications – the District’s 911 call center – by adding **13 call takers, 10 dispatchers, and 5 assistant watch commanders**
- Identifies an additional \$100,000 in one-time local funding to provide **recruiting incentives** to support the recruitment of 911 call-takers and dispatchers
- Approves \$250,000 in recurring local funding to **provide rebates to property owners and lessees for the purchase and installation of AEDs in publicly accessible areas** and \$98,000 in recurring funding for the hiring of one full-time employee at FEMS to manage the rebate incentive program
- Identifies \$90,640 in one-time and recurring local funding and includes a new Budget Support Act subtitle to create **a telecommunicator CPR (t-CPR) training program** at the Office of Unified Communications
- Includes a new Budget Support Act subtitle to require **training and continuing education for FEMS and MPD personnel on identifying and interacting with individuals living with Alzheimer’s** and other dementias
- Identifies \$200,000 in one-time local dollars to transfer to the Committee on Health for a **pilot program within the Department of Behavioral Health’s Crisis Services team to provide counseling to survivors of natural and human-made disasters such as house or building fires, structure collapses, public transit crashes, and other small- to mid-size incidents**

**B. FISCAL YEAR 2023 AGENCY OPERATING BUDGET SUMMARY TABLE**

OPERATING BUDGET SUMMARY						
<i>Fund Type</i>	<i>Fund Detail</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>Mayor's FY 2023 Proposed</i>	<i>Committee's Change from Mayor's FY 2023 Proposed</i>	<i>Committee's FY 2023 Recommendation</i>	<i>Committee's Percent Change from FY 2022 Approved</i>
<b>BOARD OF ELECTIONS</b>						
FEDERAL GRANT FUND	FEDERAL GRANTS	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
FEDERAL GRANT FUND	FEDERAL GRANTS	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
FEDERAL GRANT FUND	FEDERAL GRANTS - COVID19	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
LOCAL FUND	CONTINGENCY RESERVE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
LOCAL FUND	LOCAL FUNDING - COVID-19	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
LOCAL FUND	LOCAL FUNDS	\$12,184,639	\$11,869,576	\$0	\$11,869,576	(2.59%)
PRIVATE GRANT FUND	PRIVATE GRANT FUND	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
<b>TOTAL GROSS FUNDS</b>		<b>\$12,184,639</b>	<b>\$11,869,576</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$11,869,576</b>	<b>(2.59%)</b>
<b>COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL DISABILITIES AND TENURE</b>						
FEDERAL PAYMENTS	FEDERAL PAYMENTS – INTERNAL	\$330,000	\$330,000	\$0	\$330,000	0.00%
LOCAL FUND	LOCAL FUNDS	\$65,236	\$65,236	\$584,093	\$649,329	895.35%
<b>TOTAL GROSS FUNDS</b>		<b>\$395,236</b>	<b>\$395,236</b>	<b>\$584,093</b>	<b>\$979,329</b>	<b>147.78%</b>
<b>CORRECTIONS INFORMATION COUNCIL</b>						
LOCAL FUND	LOCAL FUNDS	\$892,575	\$947,597	\$210,450	\$1,158,047	29.74%
PRIVATE DONATIONS	PRIVATE DONATIONS	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
<b>TOTAL GROSS FUNDS</b>		<b>\$892,575</b>	<b>\$947,597</b>	<b>\$210,450</b>	<b>\$1,158,047</b>	<b>29.74%</b>
<b>CRIMINAL CODE REFORM COMMISSION</b>						
LOCAL FUND	LOCAL FUNDS	\$907,173	\$727,536	\$232,688	\$960,224	5.85%
<b>TOTAL GROSS FUNDS</b>		<b>\$907,173</b>	<b>\$727,536</b>	<b>\$232,688</b>	<b>\$960,224</b>	<b>5.85%</b>
<b>CRIMINAL JUSTICE COORDINATING COUNCIL</b>						
FEDERAL GRANT FUND	FEDERAL GRANTS	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$0	\$150,000	0.00%
FEDERAL PAYMENTS	FEDERAL PAYMENTS – INTERNAL	\$2,150,000	\$2,450,000	\$0	\$2,450,000	13.95%
LOCAL FUND	LOCAL FUNDS	\$1,535,764	\$1,724,656	\$455,000	\$2,179,656	41.93%
OPERATING INTRA-DISTRICT FUNDS	INTRA-DISTRICT	\$90,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	(100.00%)
PRIVATE DONATIONS	PRIVATE DONATIONS	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
<b>TOTAL GROSS FUNDS</b>		<b>\$3,925,764</b>	<b>\$4,324,656</b>	<b>\$455,000</b>	<b>\$4,779,656</b>	<b>21.75%</b>
<b>DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS</b>						
FEDERAL GRANT FUND	FEDERAL GRANTS	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
FEDERAL PAYMENTS	CORONAVIRUS RELIEF FUND	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%

OPERATING BUDGET SUMMARY						
<i>Fund Type</i>	<i>Fund Detail</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>Mayor's FY 2023 Proposed</i>	<i>Committee's Change from Mayor's FY 2023 Proposed</i>	<i>Committee's FY 2023 Recommendation</i>	<i>Committee's Percent Change from FY 2022 Approved</i>
LOCAL FUND	ARPA - LOCAL REVENUE REPLACEMENT	\$425,000	\$425,000	\$0	\$425,000	(0.00%)
LOCAL FUND	CONTINGENCY RESERVE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
LOCAL FUND	LOCAL FUNDS	\$162,278,723	\$185,068,285	\$32,440	\$185,100,725	14.06%
OPERATING INTRA-DISTRICT FUNDS	BYRNE - JAG GRANT	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
OPERATING INTRA-DISTRICT FUNDS	INTRA-DISTRICT	\$764,343	\$0	\$0	\$0	(100.00%)
PRIVATE DONATIONS	PRIVATE DONATIONS	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
SPECIAL PURPOSE REVENUE FUNDS (O'TYPE)	CONCESSION INCOME	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$0	\$2,000,000	0.00%
SPECIAL PURPOSE REVENUE FUNDS (O'TYPE)	CORRECTIONS TRUSTEE REIMBURSEMENT	\$22,268,375	\$12,342,238	\$0	\$12,342,238	(44.58%)
SPECIAL PURPOSE REVENUE FUNDS (O'TYPE)	WELFARE ACCOUNT	\$248,665	\$248,665	\$0	\$248,665	0.00%
<b>TOTAL GROSS FUNDS</b>		<b>\$187,985,106</b>	<b>\$200,084,188</b>	<b>\$32,440</b>	<b>\$200,116,628</b>	<b>6.45%</b>
DEPARTMENT OF FORENSIC SCIENCES						
FEDERAL GRANT FUND	FEDERAL GRANTS	\$493,858	\$1,008,981	\$0	\$1,008,981	104.31%
FEDERAL PAYMENTS	ARPA - COUNTY	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
FEDERAL PAYMENTS	CORONAVIRUS RELIEF FUND	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
LOCAL FUND	CONTINGENCY CASH RESERVE FUNDING COVID19	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
LOCAL FUND	CONTINGENCY RESERVE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
LOCAL FUND	LOCAL FUNDS	\$28,433,107	\$30,944,840	\$0	\$30,944,840	8.83%
OPERATING INTRA-DISTRICT FUNDS	FEMA PUBLIC ASSISTANCE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
OPERATING INTRA-DISTRICT FUNDS	INTRA-DISTRICT	\$2,312,035	\$0	\$0	\$0	(100.00%)
OPERATING INTRA-DISTRICT FUNDS	PUBLIC HEALTH CRISIS RESPONSE	\$5,000,440	\$0	\$0	\$0	(100.00%)
OPERATING INTRA-DISTRICT FUNDS	REIMBURSEMENT FROM EP0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
PRIVATE GRANT FUND	PRIVATE GRANT FUND	\$0	\$865,184	\$0	\$865,184	0.00%
<b>TOTAL GROSS FUNDS</b>		<b>\$36,239,439</b>	<b>\$32,819,004</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$32,819,004</b>	<b>(9.44%)</b>
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA NATIONAL GUARD						
FEDERAL GRANT FUND	FEDERAL GRANTS	\$10,218,812	\$10,250,047	\$0	\$10,250,047	0.31%

OPERATING BUDGET SUMMARY						
<i>Fund Type</i>	<i>Fund Detail</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>Mayor's FY 2023 Proposed</i>	<i>Committee's Change from Mayor's FY 2023 Proposed</i>	<i>Committee's FY 2023 Recommendation</i>	<i>Committee's Percent Change from FY 2022 Approved</i>
FEDERAL PAYMENTS	FEDERAL PAYMENTS - INTERNAL	\$600,000	\$600,000	\$0	\$600,000	0.00%
LOCAL FUND	LOCAL FUNDS	\$5,236,902	\$5,830,260	\$0	\$5,830,260	11.33%
SPECIAL PURPOSE REVENUE FUNDS (O'TYPE)	REIMBURSABLE FROM OTHER GOVERNMENTS	\$147,514	\$147,514	\$0	\$147,514	0.00%
<b>TOTAL GROSS FUNDS</b>		<b>\$16,203,228</b>	<b>\$16,827,820</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$16,827,820</b>	<b>3.85%</b>
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SENTENCING COMMISSION						
LOCAL FUND	LOCAL FUNDS	\$1,627,831	\$1,301,342	\$316,860	\$1,618,202	(0.59%)
<b>TOTAL GROSS FUNDS</b>		<b>\$1,627,831</b>	<b>\$1,301,342</b>	<b>\$316,860</b>	<b>\$1,618,202</b>	<b>(0.59%)</b>
EMERGENCY PLANNING AND SECURITY FUND						
FEDERAL PAYMENTS	EMERGENCY PLANNING AND SECURITY FUND	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
FEDERAL PAYMENTS	FEDERAL PAYMENTS – INTERNAL	\$25,000,000	\$30,000,000	\$0	\$30,000,000	20.00%
LOCAL FUND	CONTINGENCY RESERVE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
LOCAL FUND	LOCAL FUNDS	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
<b>TOTAL GROSS FUNDS</b>		<b>\$25,000,000</b>	<b>\$30,000,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$30,000,000</b>	<b>20.00%</b>
FIRE AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT						
FEDERAL GRANT FUND	FEDERAL GRANTS	\$0	\$13,750	\$0	\$13,750	0.00%
FEDERAL GRANT FUND	FEDERAL GRANTS - COVID19	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
FEDERAL GRANT FUND	MEDICAID PUBLIC PROVIDER RECOVERY GRANT	\$0	\$46,778,867	\$0	\$46,778,867	0.00%
FEDERAL MEDICAID PAYMENTS	MEDICIAD PAYMENTS	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
FEDERAL PAYMENTS	CORONAVIRUS RELIEF FUND	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
FEDERAL PAYMENTS	PUBLIC HEALTH & SOCIAL SERVICES EMERG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
LOCAL FUND	CONTINGENCY RESERVE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
LOCAL FUND	LOCAL FUNDS	\$267,742,870	\$268,200,955	\$397,000	\$268,597,955	0.32%
OPERATING INTRA-DISTRICT FUNDS	DOMESTIC PREPAREDNESS GRANT - I/D	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
OPERATING INTRA-DISTRICT FUNDS	FEDERAL MEDICAID TRANSFER	\$37,907,993	\$0	\$0	\$0	(100.00%)
OPERATING INTRA-DISTRICT FUNDS	FEMA PUBLIC ASSISTANCE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
OPERATING INTRA-DISTRICT FUNDS	INTRA-DISTRICT	\$717,500	\$0	\$0	\$0	(100.00%)



OPERATING BUDGET SUMMARY						
<i>Fund Type</i>	<i>Fund Detail</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>Mayor's FY 2023 Proposed</i>	<i>Committee's Change from Mayor's FY 2023 Proposed</i>	<i>Committee's FY 2023 Recommendation</i>	<i>Committee's Percent Change from FY 2022 Approved</i>
OPERATING INTRA-DISTRICT FUNDS	REIMBURSEMENT FROM EP0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
PRIVATE DONATIONS	PRIVATE DONATIONS	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
PRIVATE GRANT FUND	PRIVATE GRANT FUND	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
SPECIAL PURPOSE REVENUE FUNDS (O*TYPE)	AUTOMATED EXT DEFIB REG FEE FUND	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$0	\$1,000	0.00%
SPECIAL PURPOSE REVENUE FUNDS (O*TYPE)	FEMS REFORM FUND	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
SPECIAL PURPOSE REVENUE FUNDS (O*TYPE)	OTHER REVENUE	\$28,000	\$28,000	\$0	\$28,000	0.00%
SPECIAL PURPOSE REVENUE FUNDS (O*TYPE)	REIMBURSABLE FROM OTHER GOVERNMENTS	\$456,734	\$477,372	\$0	\$477,372	4.52%
SPECIAL PURPOSE REVENUE FUNDS (O*TYPE)	SPECIAL EVENTS	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$0	\$500,000	0.00%
<b>TOTAL GROSS FUNDS</b>		<b>\$307,354,097</b>	<b>\$315,999,944</b>	<b>\$397,000</b>	<b>\$316,396,944</b>	<b>2.94%</b>
HOMELAND SECURITY AND EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY						
FEDERAL GRANT FUND	EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE GRANT	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
FEDERAL GRANT FUND	FEDERAL GRANTS	\$101,956,809	\$184,030,257	\$0	\$184,030,257	80.50%
FEDERAL GRANT FUND	FEDERAL GRANTS - COVID19	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
FEDERAL GRANT FUND	FEMA PUBLIC ASSISTANCE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
LOCAL FUND	CONTINGENCY RESERVE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
LOCAL FUND	LOCAL FUNDS	\$5,667,415	\$6,018,527	\$0	\$6,018,527	6.20%
OPERATING INTRA-DISTRICT FUNDS	EPSF - COVID	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
OPERATING INTRA-DISTRICT FUNDS	INTRA-DISTRICT	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
OPERATING INTRA-DISTRICT FUNDS	REIMBURSEMENT FROM EP0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
<b>TOTAL GROSS FUNDS</b>		<b>\$107,624,223</b>	<b>\$190,048,784</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$190,048,784</b>	<b>76.59%</b>
HOMELAND SECURITY GRANTS						
OPERATING INTRA-DISTRICT FUNDS	DOMESTIC PREPAREDNESS GRANTS - I/D	\$50,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	(100.00%)
<b>TOTAL GROSS FUNDS</b>		<b>\$50,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>(100.00%)</b>
JUDICIAL NOMINATION COMMISSION						

OPERATING BUDGET SUMMARY						
<i>Fund Type</i>	<i>Fund Detail</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>Mayor's FY 2023 Proposed</i>	<i>Committee's Change from Mayor's FY 2023 Proposed</i>	<i>Committee's FY 2023 Recommendation</i>	<i>Committee's Percent Change from FY 2022 Approved</i>
FEDERAL PAYMENTS	FEDERAL PAYMENTS - INTERNAL	\$300,000	\$300,000	\$0	\$300,000	0.00%
LOCAL FUND	LOCAL FUNDS	\$7,569	\$7,569	\$0	\$7,569	0.00%
<b>TOTAL GROSS FUNDS</b>		<b>\$307,569</b>	<b>\$307,569</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$307,569</b>	<b>0.00%</b>
METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT						
FEDERAL GRANT FUND	FEDERAL GRANTS	\$5,688,919	\$4,007,432	\$0	\$4,007,432	(29.56%)
FEDERAL PAYMENTS	ARPA - MUNICIPAL	\$511,466	\$359,000	\$0	\$359,000	(29.81%)
FEDERAL PAYMENTS	CORONAVIRUS RELIEF FUND	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
LOCAL FUND	ARPA - LOCAL REVENUE REPLACEMENT	\$5,000,000	\$5,244,822	\$0	\$5,244,822	4.90%
LOCAL FUND	CONTINGENCY RESERVE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
LOCAL FUND	LOCAL FUNDS	\$488,814,092	\$515,919,102	(\$5,600,000)	\$510,319,102	4.40%
OPERATING INTRA-DISTRICT FUNDS	CORP COUNSEL - CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT	\$500,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	(100.00%)
OPERATING INTRA-DISTRICT FUNDS	DPW HIGHWAY SAFETY	\$3,276,543	\$0	\$0	\$0	(100.00%)
OPERATING INTRA-DISTRICT FUNDS	FEMA PUBLIC ASSISTANCE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
OPERATING INTRA-DISTRICT FUNDS	FINGERPRINTING	\$68,305	\$0	\$0	\$0	(100.00%)
OPERATING INTRA-DISTRICT FUNDS	INTRA DISTRICT FUNDS FROM OGMD	\$1,537,661	\$0	\$0	\$0	(100.00%)
OPERATING INTRA-DISTRICT FUNDS	POLICE AND FIRE CLINIC	\$5,213,583	\$0	\$0	\$0	(100.00%)
OPERATING INTRA-DISTRICT FUNDS	PUBLIC SAFETY	\$250,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	(100.00%)
OPERATING INTRA-DISTRICT FUNDS	REIMBURSEMENT FROM EPO	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
PRIVATE DONATIONS	PRIVATE DONATIONS	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
SPECIAL PURPOSE REVENUE FUNDS (O'TYPE)	ASSET FORFEITURE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
SPECIAL PURPOSE REVENUE FUNDS (O'TYPE)	MISCELLANEOUS	\$4,360,000	\$4,410,000	\$0	\$4,410,000	1.15%
SPECIAL PURPOSE REVENUE FUNDS (O'TYPE)	REIMBURSABLE FROM OTHER GOVERNMENTS	\$1,572,452	\$1,611,877	\$0	\$1,611,877	2.51%
<b>TOTAL GROSS FUNDS</b>		<b>\$516,793,022</b>	<b>\$531,552,233</b>	<b>(\$5,600,000)</b>	<b>\$525,952,233</b>	<b>1.77%</b>
OFFICE OF CAMPAIGN FINANCE						

OPERATING BUDGET SUMMARY						
<i>Fund Type</i>	<i>Fund Detail</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>Mayor's FY 2023 Proposed</i>	<i>Committee's Change from Mayor's FY 2023 Proposed</i>	<i>Committee's FY 2023 Recommendation</i>	<i>Committee's Percent Change from FY 2022 Approved</i>
LOCAL FUND	CONTINGENCY RESERVE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
LOCAL FUND	FAIR ELECTIONS FUND	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
LOCAL FUND	FAIR ELECTIONS FUND	\$19,218,519	\$3,197,678	\$0	\$3,197,678	(83.36%)
LOCAL FUND	LOCAL FUNDING - COVID-19	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
LOCAL FUND	LOCAL FUNDS	\$4,220,596	\$4,275,412	\$0	\$4,275,412	1.30%
<b>TOTAL GROSS FUNDS</b>		<b>\$23,439,115</b>	<b>\$7,473,090</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$7,473,090</b>	<b>(68.12%)</b>
OFFICE OF NEIGHBORHOOD SAFETY AND ENGAGEMENT						
FEDERAL PAYMENTS	ARPA - COUNTY	\$4,534,861	\$0	\$0	\$0	(100.00%)
FEDERAL PAYMENTS	ARPA - MUNICIPAL	\$9,395,175	\$15,023,270	\$0	\$15,023,270	59.90%
LOCAL FUND	ARPA - LOCAL REVENUE REPLACEMENT	\$3,244,712	\$1,408,440	\$0	\$1,408,440	(56.59%)
LOCAL FUND	CONTINGENCY RESERVE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
LOCAL FUND	LOCAL FUNDS	\$11,535,316	\$17,031,218	\$545,000	\$17,576,218	52.37%
LOCAL FUND	NEIGHBORHOOD SAFETY AND ENGAGEMENT FUND	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
OPERATING INTRA-DISTRICT FUNDS	OVSJG SUB-GRANTS	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
<b>TOTAL GROSS FUNDS</b>		<b>\$28,710,063</b>	<b>\$33,462,928</b>	<b>\$545,000</b>	<b>\$34,007,928</b>	<b>18.45%</b>
OFFICE OF POLICE COMPLAINTS						
LOCAL FUND	LOCAL FUNDS	\$2,892,257	\$2,812,300	\$152,284	\$2,964,584	2.50%
<b>TOTAL GROSS FUNDS</b>		<b>\$2,892,257</b>	<b>\$2,812,300</b>	<b>\$152,284</b>	<b>\$2,964,584</b>	<b>2.50%</b>
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL						
FEDERAL GRANT FUND	FEDERAL GRANTS	\$24,134,276	\$27,896,281	\$0	\$27,896,281	15.59%
FEDERAL PAYMENTS	ARPA - STATE	\$0	\$0	\$288,317	\$288,317	0.00%
LOCAL FUND	ARPA - LOCAL REVENUE REPLACEMENT	\$3,257,288	\$3,314,291	\$0	\$3,314,291	1.75%
LOCAL FUND	LOCAL FUNDING - COVID-19	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
LOCAL FUND	LOCAL FUNDS	\$89,558,470	\$91,058,603	\$976,694	\$92,035,297	2.77%
OPERATING INTRA-DISTRICT FUNDS	FEMA PUBLIC ASSISTANCE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
OPERATING INTRA-DISTRICT FUNDS	ID-OFC OF STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF EDUCAT	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
OPERATING INTRA-DISTRICT FUNDS	INTRA DISTRICT - CORRECTIONS	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%

OPERATING BUDGET SUMMARY						
<i>Fund Type</i>	<i>Fund Detail</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>Mayor's FY 2023 Proposed</i>	<i>Committee's Change from Mayor's FY 2023 Proposed</i>	<i>Committee's FY 2023 Recommendation</i>	<i>Committee's Percent Change from FY 2022 Approved</i>
OPERATING INTRA-DISTRICT FUNDS	INTRA DISTRICT - ENVIRONMENT	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
OPERATING INTRA-DISTRICT FUNDS	INTRADISTRICT - DHCD	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
OPERATING INTRA-DISTRICT FUNDS	INTRADISTRICT - HEALTH CARE FINANCE	\$73,222	\$0	\$0	\$0	(100.00%)
OPERATING INTRA-DISTRICT FUNDS	INTRADISTRICT - ID DCRA	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
OPERATING INTRA-DISTRICT FUNDS	INTRADISTRICT - OFC OF THE MAYOR	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
OPERATING INTRA-DISTRICT FUNDS	INTRADISTRICT - OFFICE OF AGING	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
OPERATING INTRA-DISTRICT FUNDS	INTRADISTRICT - OFFICE OF PROPERTY MGMT	\$404,174	\$0	\$0	\$0	(100.00%)
OPERATING INTRA-DISTRICT FUNDS	INTRADISTRICT - VAWA	\$533,772	\$0	\$0	\$0	(100.00%)
OPERATING INTRA-DISTRICT FUNDS	INTRADISTRICT - WELFARE FRAUD	\$165,253	\$0	\$0	\$0	(100.00%)
OPERATING INTRA-DISTRICT FUNDS	INTRADISTRICT - ZONING	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
OPERATING INTRA-DISTRICT FUNDS	INTRA-DISTRICT CFSA	\$1,090,850	\$0	\$0	\$0	(100.00%)
OPERATING INTRA-DISTRICT FUNDS	INTRA-DISTRICT DHS	\$60,016	\$0	\$0	\$0	(100.00%)
OPERATING INTRA-DISTRICT FUNDS	INTRA-DISTRICT TAX & REVENUE	\$342,217	\$0	\$0	\$0	(100.00%)
OPERATING INTRA-DISTRICT FUNDS	INTRA-DISTRICT TRANSPORTATION	\$1,109,456	\$0	\$0	\$0	(100.00%)
OPERATING INTRA-DISTRICT FUNDS	RISK MANAGEMENT LEGAL COUNSEL	\$50,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	(100.00%)
OPERATING INTRA-DISTRICT FUNDS	RPTAC LITIGATION	\$10,001	\$0	\$0	\$0	(100.00%)
PRIVATE DONATIONS	PRIVATE DONATIONS	\$567,520	\$667,760	\$0	\$667,760	17.66%
SPECIAL PURPOSE REVENUE FUNDS (O'TYPE)	ATTORNEY GENERAL RESTITUTION FUND	\$1,000,000	\$500,000	\$0	\$500,000	(50.00%)
SPECIAL PURPOSE REVENUE FUNDS (O'TYPE)	CHILD SPT - TANF/AFDC COLLECTIONS	\$6,021,439	\$3,759,003	\$0	\$3,759,003	(37.57%)

OPERATING BUDGET SUMMARY						
<i>Fund Type</i>	<i>Fund Detail</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>Mayor's FY 2023 Proposed</i>	<i>Committee's Change from Mayor's FY 2023 Proposed</i>	<i>Committee's FY 2023 Recommendation</i>	<i>Committee's Percent Change from FY 2022 Approved</i>
SPECIAL PURPOSE REVENUE FUNDS (O'TYPE)	LITIGATION SUPPORT FUND	\$18,600,000	\$19,000,000	\$0	\$19,000,000	2.15%
SPECIAL PURPOSE REVENUE FUNDS (O'TYPE)	NUISANCE ABATEMENT	\$0	\$8,000	\$0	\$8,000	0.00%
SPECIAL PURPOSE REVENUE FUNDS (O'TYPE)	TENANT RECEIVERSHIP ABATEMENT FUND	\$0	\$351,709	\$0	\$351,709	0.00%
SPECIAL PURPOSE REVENUE FUNDS (O'TYPE)	VULNERABLE ADULT & ELDERLY EXPLOIT. FUND	\$0	\$10,000	\$0	\$10,000	0.00%
<b>TOTAL GROSS FUNDS</b>		<b>\$146,977,953</b>	<b>\$146,565,647</b>	<b>\$1,265,011</b>	<b>\$147,830,658</b>	<b>0.58%</b>
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF MEDICAL EXAMINER						
FEDERAL GRANT FUND	FEDERAL GRANTS	\$525,000	\$619,316	\$0	\$619,316	17.96%
FEDERAL PAYMENTS	CORONAVIRUS RELIEF FUND	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
LOCAL FUND	LOCAL FUNDS	\$13,444,704	\$14,665,369	\$0	\$14,665,369	9.08%
OPERATING INTRA-DISTRICT FUNDS	DOMESTIC PREPAREDNESS GRANT - I/D	\$163,234	\$0	\$0	\$0	(100.00%)
OPERATING INTRA-DISTRICT FUNDS	INTRA-DISTRICT	\$1,394,263	\$0	\$0	\$0	(100.00%)
PRIVATE DONATIONS	PRIVATE DONATIONS	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
PRIVATE GRANT FUND	PRIVATE GRANT FUND	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
<b>TOTAL GROSS FUNDS</b>		<b>\$15,527,201</b>	<b>\$15,284,685</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$15,284,685</b>	<b>(1.56%)</b>
OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY MAYOR FOR PUBLIC SAFETY AND JUSTICE						
LOCAL FUND	ARPA - LOCAL REVENUE REPLACEMENT	\$400,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	(100.00%)
LOCAL FUND	CONTINGENCY RESERVE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
LOCAL FUND	LOCAL FUNDS	\$1,999,136	\$2,989,539	\$0	\$2,989,539	49.54%
<b>TOTAL GROSS FUNDS</b>		<b>\$2,399,136</b>	<b>\$2,989,539</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$2,989,539</b>	<b>24.61%</b>
OFFICE OF UNIFIED COMMUNICATIONS						
LOCAL FUND	ARPA - LOCAL REVENUE REPLACEMENT	\$532,880	\$532,880	\$0	\$532,880	0.00%
LOCAL FUND	LOCAL FUNDS	\$29,036,076	\$45,416,465	\$195,640	\$45,612,105	57.09%
OPERATING INTRA-DISTRICT FUNDS	DOMESTIC PREPAREDNESS GRANT -I/D	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
OPERATING INTRA-DISTRICT FUNDS	FEMA PUBLIC ASSISTANCE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
OPERATING INTRA-DISTRICT FUNDS	HOMELAND SECURITY-RADIO COMMUNICATION	\$88,886	\$0	\$0	\$0	(100.00%)

OPERATING BUDGET SUMMARY						
<i>Fund Type</i>	<i>Fund Detail</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>Mayor's FY 2023 Proposed</i>	<i>Committee's Change from Mayor's FY 2023 Proposed</i>	<i>Committee's FY 2023 Recommendation</i>	<i>Committee's Percent Change from FY 2022 Approved</i>
OPERATING INTRA-DISTRICT FUNDS	INTRA-DISTRICT	\$889,453	\$0	\$0	\$0	(100.00%)
OPERATING INTRA-DISTRICT FUNDS	REIMBURSEMENT FROM EP0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
SPECIAL PURPOSE REVENUE FUNDS (O'TYPE)	911 & 311 ASSESSMENTS	\$24,441,479	\$14,625,087	\$0	\$14,625,087	(40.16%)
SPECIAL PURPOSE REVENUE FUNDS (O'TYPE)	PREPAID WIRELESS 911 CHARGES	\$360,000	\$355,000	\$0	\$355,000	(1.39%)
SPECIAL PURPOSE REVENUE FUNDS (O'TYPE)	REIMBURSABLES FROM OTHER GOVERNMENTS	\$95,024	\$0	\$0	\$0	(100.00%)
<b>TOTAL GROSS FUNDS</b>		<b>\$55,443,797</b>	<b>\$60,929,432</b>	<b>\$195,640</b>	<b>\$61,125,072</b>	<b>10.25%</b>
OFFICE OF VICTIM SERVICES AND JUSTICE GRANTS						
FEDERAL GRANT FUND	BYRNE - JAG GRANT	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
FEDERAL GRANT FUND	FEDERAL GRANTS	\$10,689,799	\$8,341,640	\$0	\$8,341,640	(21.97%)
FEDERAL PAYMENTS	ARPA – COUNTY	\$13,850,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	(100.00%)
FEDERAL PAYMENTS	ARPA - MUNICIPAL	\$15,798,466	\$10,505,281	\$0	\$10,505,281	(33.50%)
FEDERAL PAYMENTS	ARPA – STATE	\$0	\$7,000,000	\$1,500,000	\$8,500,000	0.00%
FEDERAL PAYMENTS	ARPA FUNDS 2021	\$8,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	(100.00%)
LOCAL FUND	ARPA - LOCAL REVENUE REPLACEMENT	\$1,120,000	\$11,827,326	\$0	\$11,827,326	956.01%
LOCAL FUND	COMMUNITY BASED VIOLENCE REDUCTION FUND	\$5,088,624	\$5,103,239	\$0	\$5,103,239	0.29%
LOCAL FUND	LOCAL FUNDS	\$46,591,526	\$50,167,694	\$9,675,000	\$59,842,694	28.44%
LOCAL FUND	PRIVATE SECURITY CAMERA INCENTIVE FUND	\$250,000	\$500,000	\$0	\$500,000	100.00%
OPERATING INTRA-DISTRICT FUNDS	OVSIG DOC JG	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
OPERATING INTRA-DISTRICT FUNDS	OVSJG DHCD SUBGRANT (INTRA-DISTRICT)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
OPERATING INTRA-DISTRICT FUNDS	OVSJGA SUBGRANT (INTRA DISTRICT)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
SPECIAL PURPOSE REVENUE FUNDS (O'TYPE)	CRIME VICTIMS ASSISTANCE FUND	\$4,556,494	\$1,109,432	\$0	\$1,109,432	(75.65%)
SPECIAL PURPOSE REVENUE FUNDS (O'TYPE)	DOM VIOLENCE SHELTER& TRANS HOUSING FUND	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
<b>TOTAL GROSS FUNDS</b>		<b>\$105,944,909</b>	<b>\$94,554,612</b>	<b>\$11,175,000</b>	<b>\$105,729,612</b>	<b>(0.20%)</b>

OPERATING BUDGET SUMMARY						
<i>Fund Type</i>	<i>Fund Detail</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>Mayor's FY 2023 Proposed</i>	<i>Committee's Change from Mayor's FY 2023 Proposed</i>	<i>Committee's FY 2023 Recommendation</i>	<i>Committee's Percent Change from FY 2022 Approved</i>
<b>SECTION 103 JUDGMENTS - GOVERNMENT DIRECTION AND SUPPORT</b>						
LOCAL FUND	SECTION 103-303 JUDGEMENTS	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
<b>TOTAL GROSS FUNDS</b>		<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>0.00%</b>
<b>SECTION 103 JUDGMENTS-ECON DEV &amp; REGUL</b>						
LOCAL FUND	SECTION 103-303 JUDGEMENTS	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
<b>TOTAL GROSS FUNDS</b>		<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>0.00%</b>
<b>SECTION 103 JUDGMENTS-PUBLIC EDUCATION SYSTEM</b>						
LOCAL FUND	LOCAL FUNDS	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
LOCAL FUND	SECTION 103-303 JUDGEMENTS	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
<b>TOTAL GROSS FUNDS</b>		<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>0.00%</b>
<b>SETTLEMENTS AND JUDGMENTS</b>						
LOCAL FUND	LOCAL FUNDS	\$28,024,759	\$28,024,759	\$0	\$28,024,759	0.00%
<b>TOTAL GROSS FUNDS</b>		<b>\$28,024,759</b>	<b>\$28,024,759</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$28,024,759</b>	<b>0.00%</b>
<b>UNIFORM LAW COMMISSION</b>						
LOCAL FUND	LOCAL FUNDS	\$60,250	\$60,250	\$0	\$60,250	0.00%
<b>TOTAL GROSS FUNDS</b>		<b>\$60,250</b>	<b>\$60,250</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$60,250</b>	<b>0.00%</b>
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>		<b>\$1,626,909,343</b>	<b>\$1,729,362,726</b>	<b>\$9,961,466</b>	<b>\$1,739,324,192</b>	<b>6.91%</b>



**C. FISCAL YEAR 2023 AGENCY OPERATING BUDGET BY PROGRAM TABLE**

AGENCY OPERATING BUDGET, BY PROGRAM					
<i>Program</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>Mayor's FY 2023 Proposed</i>	<i>Committee's Change from Mayor's FY 2023 Proposed</i>	<i>Committee's FY 2023 Recommendation</i>	<i>Committee Percent Change from FY 2022 Approved</i>
<b>BOARD OF ELECTIONS</b>					
1000 - AGENCY MANAGEMENT	\$4,609,113	\$4,888,378	\$0	\$4,888,378	6.06%
3000 - BOARD OF SUPERVISORS	\$51,500	\$51,500	\$0	\$51,500	0.00%
4000 - ELECTION OPERATIONS	\$7,524,026	\$6,929,698	\$0	\$6,929,698	(7.90%)
9960 - AUDIT ADJUSTMENTS	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
<b>TOTAL GROSS FUNDS</b>	<b>\$12,184,639</b>	<b>\$11,869,576</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$11,869,576</b>	<b>(2.59%)</b>
<b>COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL DISABILITIES AND TENURE</b>					
2000 - JUDICIAL DISABILITIES TENURE	\$395,236	\$395,236	\$584,093	\$979,329	147.78%
<b>TOTAL GROSS FUNDS</b>	<b>\$395,236</b>	<b>\$395,236</b>	<b>\$584,093</b>	<b>\$979,329</b>	<b>147.78%</b>
<b>CORRECTIONS INFORMATION COUNCIL</b>					
1000 - PRISONER WELL-BEING	\$892,575	\$947,597	\$210,450	\$1,158,047	29.74%
<b>TOTAL GROSS FUNDS</b>	<b>\$892,575</b>	<b>\$947,597</b>	<b>\$210,450</b>	<b>\$1,158,047</b>	<b>29.74%</b>
<b>CRIMINAL CODE REFORM COMMISSION</b>					
1000 - CRIMINAL CODE REFORM COMMISSION	\$907,173	\$727,536	\$232,688	\$960,224	5.85%
<b>TOTAL GROSS FUNDS</b>	<b>\$907,173</b>	<b>\$727,536</b>	<b>\$232,688</b>	<b>\$960,224</b>	<b>5.85%</b>
<b>CRIMINAL JUSTICE COORDINATING COUNCIL</b>					
1000 - RESEARCH ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION	\$1,037,145	\$1,175,159	\$155,000	\$1,330,159	28.25%
2000 - COLLAB. AND PLNG ACROSS AGENCIES	\$1,304,220	\$1,225,755	\$0	\$1,225,755	(6.02%)
3000 - INTEGRATED INFORMATION SYSTEM	\$1,584,399	\$1,923,742	\$300,000	\$2,223,742	40.35%
4000 - ASMP	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
<b>TOTAL GROSS FUNDS</b>	<b>\$3,925,764</b>	<b>\$4,324,656</b>	<b>\$455,000</b>	<b>\$4,779,656</b>	<b>21.75%</b>
<b>DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS</b>					
100F - AGENCY FINANCIAL OPERATIONS	\$1,913,254	\$1,955,864	\$0	\$1,955,864	2.23%
1100 - AGENCY MANAGEMENT	\$25,294,026	\$30,887,913	\$0	\$30,887,913	22.12%
2500 - INMATE SERVICES	\$59,683,758	\$58,624,786	\$2,100,000	\$60,724,786	1.74%
3600 - INMATE CUSTODY	\$101,094,068	\$108,190,624	(\$2,067,560)	\$106,123,064	4.97%
9900 - PAYROLL DEFAULT PROGRAM	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
9960 - YR END CLOSE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
COV1 - CORONAVIRUS RELIEF FUND	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
DCRP - DISTRICT RECOVERY PLAN	\$0	\$425,000	\$0	\$425,000	0.00%
<b>TOTAL GROSS FUNDS</b>	<b>\$187,985,106</b>	<b>\$200,084,188</b>	<b>\$32,440</b>	<b>\$200,116,628</b>	<b>6.45%</b>
<b>DEPARTMENT OF FORENSIC SCIENCES</b>					
1000 - AGENCY MANAGEMENT	\$5,939,846	\$8,083,437	\$0	\$8,083,437	36.09%



AGENCY OPERATING BUDGET, BY PROGRAM					
<i>Program</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>Mayor's FY 2023 Proposed</i>	<i>Committee's Change from Mayor's FY 2023 Proposed</i>	<i>Committee's FY 2023 Recommendation</i>	<i>Committee Percent Change from FY 2022 Approved</i>
2000 - FORENSIC SCIENCE LABORATORY	\$9,275,079	\$9,139,346	\$0	\$9,139,346	(1.46%)
3000 - PUBLIC HEALTH LABORATORY	\$11,620,263	\$5,594,437	\$0	\$5,594,437	(51.86%)
4000 - CRIME SCENE SCIENCES	\$9,404,252	\$10,001,785	\$0	\$10,001,785	6.35%
9960 - YR END CLOSE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
9980 - PAYROLL DEFAULT PROGRAM	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
<b>TOTAL GROSS FUNDS</b>	<b>\$36,239,439</b>	<b>\$32,819,004</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$32,819,004</b>	<b>(9.44%)</b>
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA NATIONAL GUARD					
0000 - (no program selected)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
1000 - AGENCY MANAGEMENT	\$3,661,972	\$3,723,235	\$0	\$3,723,235	1.67%
4000 - YOUTH PROGRAMS	\$4,922,410	\$5,427,961	\$0	\$5,427,961	10.27%
9960 - YR END CLOSE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
9980 - PAYROLL DEFAULT PROGRAM	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
<b>TOTAL GROSS FUNDS</b>	<b>\$8,584,381</b>	<b>\$9,151,196</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$9,151,196</b>	<b>6.60%</b>
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SENTENCING COMMISSION					
1000 - MANAGEMENT	\$193,834	\$135,019	\$0	\$135,019	(30.34%)
2000 - DATA COLLECTION (AIP)	\$1,433,997	\$1,166,323	\$316,860	\$1,483,183	3.43%
<b>TOTAL GROSS FUNDS</b>	<b>\$1,627,831</b>	<b>\$1,301,342</b>	<b>\$316,860</b>	<b>\$1,618,202</b>	<b>(0.59%)</b>
EMERGENCY PLANNING AND SECURITY FUND					
1000 - EMERGENCY PLANNING AND SECURITY COST	\$25,000,000	\$30,000,000	\$0	\$30,000,000	20.00%
<b>TOTAL GROSS FUNDS</b>	<b>\$25,000,000</b>	<b>\$30,000,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$30,000,000</b>	<b>20.00%</b>
FIRE AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT					
1000 - ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT	\$12,649,080	\$12,586,675	\$0	\$12,586,675	(0.49%)
100F - AGENCY FINANCIAL OPERATIONS	\$2,294,167	\$1,936,477	\$0	\$1,936,477	(15.59%)
2000 - CHIEF OF FIRE & EMERGENCY MEDICAL SVS	\$6,292,859	\$3,907,113	\$0	\$3,907,113	(37.91%)
3000 - OPERATIONS BUREAU	\$193,531,434	\$202,099,895	\$0	\$202,099,895	4.43%
4000 - EMS OPERATIONS BUREAU	\$30,829,578	\$32,566,077	\$0	\$32,566,077	5.63%
5000 - EMS MEDICAL DIRECTOR	\$3,972,047	\$4,699,213	\$0	\$4,699,213	18.31%
6000 - SUPPORT SERVICES BUREAU	\$20,688,254	\$21,793,576	\$225,000	\$22,018,576	6.43%
7000 - TECHNICAL SERVICES BUREAU	\$14,842,460	\$15,344,183	\$0	\$15,344,183	3.38%
8000 - PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT BUREAU (PDB)	\$22,254,218	\$21,066,735	\$172,000	\$21,238,735	(4.56%)
9980 - PAYROLL DEFAULT PROGRAM	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
<b>TOTAL GROSS FUNDS</b>	<b>\$307,354,097</b>	<b>\$315,999,944</b>	<b>\$397,000</b>	<b>\$316,396,944</b>	<b>2.94%</b>
HOMELAND SECURITY AND EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY					

AGENCY OPERATING BUDGET, BY PROGRAM					
<i>Program</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>Mayor's FY 2023 Proposed</i>	<i>Committee's Change from Mayor's FY 2023 Proposed</i>	<i>Committee's FY 2023 Recommendation</i>	<i>Committee Percent Change from FY 2022 Approved</i>
1000 - AGENCY MANAGEMENT	\$3,174,415	\$3,954,873	\$0	\$3,954,873	24.59%
2000 - PLANS AND PREPAREDNESS	\$5,246,633	\$1,662,334	\$0	\$1,662,334	(68.32%)
3000 - OPERATIONS	\$5,932,298	\$12,250,213	\$0	\$12,250,213	106.50%
4000 - HOMELAND SECURITY GRANTS	\$88,483,351	\$167,278,334	\$0	\$167,278,334	89.05%
5000 - FUSION CENTER	\$4,787,528	\$4,903,030	\$0	\$4,903,030	2.41%
9960 - YR END CLOSE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
9980 - PAYROLL DEFAULT PROGRAM	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
<b>TOTAL GROSS FUNDS</b>	<b>\$107,624,223</b>	<b>\$190,048,784</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$190,048,784</b>	<b>76.59%</b>
HOMELAND SECURITY GRANTS					
2000 - HOMELAND SECURITY GRANTS (PUBLIC SAFETY)	\$50,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	(100.00%)
3000 - HOMELAND SECURITY GRANTS (HUMAN SUPPORT)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
4000 - HOMELAND SECURITY GRANT (GOVT DIRECTION)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
5000 - HOMELAND SECURITY GRANTS (PUBLIC WORKS)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
6000 - HOMELAND SECURITY GRANTS (ECON DEVELOP)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
<b>TOTAL GROSS FUNDS</b>	<b>\$50,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>(100.00%)</b>
JUDICIAL NOMINATION COMMISSION					
2000 - JUDICIAL NOMINATION	\$307,569	\$307,569	\$0	\$307,569	0.00%
<b>TOTAL GROSS FUNDS</b>	<b>\$307,569</b>	<b>\$307,569</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$307,569</b>	<b>0.00%</b>
METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT					
1000 - REGIONAL FIELD OPERATIONS	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
1001 - PATROL SERVICES BUREAU NORTH AND SOUTH	\$235,751,169	\$255,760,054	(\$500,000)	\$255,260,054	8.28%
100C - CHIEF OF POLICE	\$8,397,942	\$10,769,119	\$0	\$10,769,119	28.24%
100F - AGENCY FINANCIAL OPERATIONS	\$3,839,092	\$4,116,725	\$0	\$4,116,725	7.23%
2001 - INVESTIGATIVE SERVICES BUREAU	\$97,744,893	\$66,367,187	\$0	\$66,367,187	(32.10%)
4001 - STRATEGIC SERVICES BUREAU	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
4900 - TECHNICAL AND ANALYTICAL SERVICES BUREAU	\$0	\$6,557,040	\$0	\$6,557,040	0.00%
5001 - CORPORATE SUPPORT BUREAU	\$28,581,769	\$0	\$0	\$0	(100.00%)
6000 - ORGANIZATION CHANGE PROGRAM	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
6001 - PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT BUREAU	\$43,011,951	\$54,798,691	\$123,610	\$54,922,301	27.69%

AGENCY OPERATING BUDGET, BY PROGRAM					
<i>Program</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>Mayor's FY 2023 Proposed</i>	<i>Committee's Change from Mayor's FY 2023 Proposed</i>	<i>Committee's FY 2023 Recommendation</i>	<i>Committee Percent Change from FY 2022 Approved</i>
7001 - INTERNAL AFFAIRS BUREAU	\$10,382,812	\$11,062,215	\$0	\$11,062,215	6.54%
8500 - YOUTH AND FAMILY ENGAGEMENT BUREAU	\$0	\$22,693,544	\$0	\$22,693,544	0.00%
9000 - HOMELAND SECURITY AND COUNTER-TERRORISM	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
9001 - HOMELAND SECURITY BUREAU	\$47,313,637	\$39,661,056	\$0	\$39,661,056	(16.17%)
9960 - YR END CLOSE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
9980 - PAYROLL DEFAULT PROGRAM	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
AMP1 - AGENCY MANAGEMENT	\$41,769,757	\$54,162,779	(\$5,223,610)	\$48,939,169	17.16%
DCRP - DISTRICT RECOVERY PLAN	\$0	\$5,603,822	\$0	\$5,603,822	0.00%
<b>TOTAL GROSS FUNDS</b>	<b>\$516,793,022</b>	<b>\$531,552,233</b>	<b>(\$5,600,000)</b>	<b>\$525,952,233</b>	<b>1.77%</b>
OFFICE OF CAMPAIGN FINANCE					
1000 - AGENCY MANAGEMENT	\$569,204	\$591,997	\$0	\$591,997	4.00%
2000 - OVERSIGHT SUPPORT SERVICES	\$2,761,619	\$2,783,413	\$0	\$2,783,413	0.79%
3000 - FAIR ELECTIONS FUND	\$20,108,292	\$4,097,679	\$0	\$4,097,679	(79.62%)
<b>TOTAL GROSS FUNDS</b>	<b>\$23,439,115</b>	<b>\$7,473,090</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$7,473,090</b>	<b>(68.12%)</b>
OFFICE OF NEIGHBORHOOD SAFETY AND ENGAGEMENT					
1000 - AGENCY MANAGEMENT	\$2,122,258	\$2,791,509	\$0	\$2,791,509	31.53%
100A - ONS - AGENCY FINANCIAL OPERATION (BUD)	\$335,690	\$347,592	\$0	\$347,592	3.55%
2000 - NEIGHBORHOOD SAFETY AND ENGAGEMENT	\$26,252,115	\$13,892,117	\$545,000	\$14,437,117	(45.01%)
9980 - PAYROLL DEFAULT PROGRAM	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
DCRP - DISTRICT RECOVERY PLAN	\$0	\$16,431,710	\$0	\$16,431,710	0.00%
<b>TOTAL GROSS FUNDS</b>	<b>\$28,710,063</b>	<b>\$33,462,928</b>	<b>\$545,000</b>	<b>\$34,007,928</b>	<b>18.45%</b>
OFFICE OF POLICE COMPLAINTS					
1000 - AGENCY MANAGEMENT	\$890,572	\$741,739	\$69,459	\$811,198	(8.91%)
2000 - COMPLAINT RESOLUTION	\$1,645,097	\$1,723,885	\$0	\$1,723,885	4.79%
3000 - PUBLIC RELATIONS	\$96,525	\$98,294	\$0	\$98,294	1.83%
4000 - POLICY RECOMMENDATION	\$260,063	\$248,382	\$82,825	\$331,207	27.36%
<b>TOTAL GROSS FUNDS</b>	<b>\$2,892,257</b>	<b>\$2,812,300</b>	<b>\$152,284</b>	<b>\$2,964,584</b>	<b>2.50%</b>
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL					
1000 - AGENCY MANAGEMENT	\$26,161,956	\$28,098,835	\$0	\$28,098,835	7.40%
100F - AGENCY FINANCIAL OPERATIONS	\$1,119,463	\$1,252,919	\$0	\$1,252,919	11.92%

AGENCY OPERATING BUDGET, BY PROGRAM					
<i>Program</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>Mayor's FY 2023 Proposed</i>	<i>Committee's Change from Mayor's FY 2023 Proposed</i>	<i>Committee's FY 2023 Recommendation</i>	<i>Committee Percent Change from FY 2022 Approved</i>
1200 - PERSONNEL LABOR AND EMPLOYMENT DIVISION	\$3,013,669	\$3,009,891	\$0	\$3,009,891	(0.13%)
2100 - COMMERCIAL DIVISION	\$7,545,847	\$7,257,766	\$0	\$7,257,766	(3.82%)
3100 - LEGAL COUNSEL DIVISION	\$2,429,314	\$2,074,147	\$0	\$2,074,147	(14.62%)
4000 - CHILD SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION	\$30,796,702	\$31,196,785	\$0	\$31,196,785	1.30%
5000 - LITIGATION	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
5100 - CIVIL LITIGATION DIVISION	\$7,377,163	\$11,781,441	\$0	\$11,781,441	59.70%
5200 - PUBLIC INTEREST DIVISION	\$6,975,592	\$0	\$0	\$0	(100.00%)
5300 - OFFICE OF CONSUMER PROTECTION	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
5400 - PUBLIC ADVOCACY DIVISION	\$9,029,780	\$11,466,199	\$577,408	\$12,043,607	33.38%
6100 - PUBLIC SAFETY DIVISION	\$15,423,009	\$14,287,584	\$155,868	\$14,443,452	(6.35%)
7000 - SOLICITOR GENERAL DIVISION	\$3,904,004	\$4,033,268	\$0	\$4,033,268	3.31%
8100 - FAMILY SERVICES DIVISION	\$5,704,506	\$4,555,836	\$0	\$4,555,836	(20.14%)
9200 - SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION	\$3,243,082	\$3,199,057	\$0	\$3,199,057	(1.36%)
9300 - OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL	\$24,253,866	\$21,037,628	\$531,735	\$21,569,363	(11.07%)
9960 - YR END CLOSE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
DCRP - DISTRICT RECOVERY PLAN	\$0	\$3,314,291	\$0	\$3,314,291	0.00%
<b>TOTAL GROSS FUNDS</b>	<b>\$146,977,953</b>	<b>\$146,565,647</b>	<b>\$1,265,011</b>	<b>\$147,830,658</b>	<b>0.58%</b>
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF MEDICAL EXAMINER					
1000 - ADMINISTRATIVE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM	\$3,690,218	\$2,975,892	\$0	\$2,975,892	(19.36%)
100F - AGENCY FINANCIAL OPERATION	\$164,139	\$167,191	\$0	\$167,191	1.86%
2000 - DEATH INVESTIGATIONS/ CERTIFICATIONS	\$7,888,119	\$8,408,338	\$0	\$8,408,338	6.59%
3000 - FATALITY REVIEW COMMITTEES	\$1,113,323	\$1,222,874	\$0	\$1,222,874	9.84%
4000 - FORENSIC TOXICOLOGY	\$2,671,401	\$2,510,389	\$0	\$2,510,389	(6.03%)
9980 - PAYROLL DEFAULT PROGRAM	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
<b>TOTAL GROSS FUNDS</b>	<b>\$15,527,201</b>	<b>\$15,284,685</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$15,284,685</b>	<b>(1.56%)</b>
OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY MAYOR FOR PUBLIC SAFETY AND JUSTICE					
1000 - ADMINISTRATIVE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM	\$2,021,996	\$2,611,736	\$0	\$2,611,736	29.17%
2000 - CONCEALED PISTOL LICENCING REVIEW BOARD	\$377,140	\$377,803	\$0	\$377,803	0.18%
<b>TOTAL GROSS FUNDS</b>	<b>\$2,399,136</b>	<b>\$2,989,539</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$2,989,539</b>	<b>24.61%</b>

AGENCY OPERATING BUDGET, BY PROGRAM					
<i>Program</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>Mayor's FY 2023 Proposed</i>	<i>Committee's Change from Mayor's FY 2023 Proposed</i>	<i>Committee's FY 2023 Recommendation</i>	<i>Committee Percent Change from FY 2022 Approved</i>
<b>OFFICE OF UNIFIED COMMUNICATIONS</b>					
1000 - AGENCY MANAGEMENT	\$7,838,477	\$7,853,250	\$6,314	\$7,859,564	0.27%
100F - AGENCY FINANCIAL OPERATIONS	\$239,056	\$236,021	\$0	\$236,021	(1.27%)
2000 - EMERGENCY OPERATIONS (911) DIVISION	\$23,128,847	\$25,497,357	\$156,826	\$25,654,183	10.92%
3000 - NON-EMERGENCY OPERATIONS (311) DIVISION	\$5,895,876	\$6,546,056	\$0	\$6,546,056	11.03%
4000 - TECHNOLOGY OPERATIONS DIVISION	\$16,638,598	\$18,018,628	\$0	\$18,018,628	8.29%
5000 - PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS DIVISION	\$1,702,944	\$2,245,239	\$32,500	\$2,277,739	33.75%
9980 - PAYROLL DEFAULT PROGRAM	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
DCRP - DISTRICT RECOVERY PLAN	\$0	\$532,880	\$0	\$532,880	0.00%
<b>TOTAL GROSS FUNDS</b>	<b>\$55,443,797</b>	<b>\$60,929,432</b>	<b>\$195,640</b>	<b>\$61,125,072</b>	<b>10.25%</b>
<b>OFFICE OF VICTIM SERVICES AND JUSTICE GRANTS</b>					
1000 - AGENCY MANAGEMENT	\$602,093	\$1,200,248	\$0	\$1,200,248	99.35%
2000 - JUSTICE GRANTS	\$22,182,487	\$10,575,062	\$2,000,000	\$12,575,062	(43.31%)
3000 - ACCESS TO JUSTICE	\$22,589,347	\$13,089,347	\$5,600,000	\$18,689,347	(17.26%)
4000 - VICTIM SERVICES	\$48,396,218	\$34,254,108	\$3,575,000	\$37,829,108	(21.83%)
5000 - TRUANCY REDUCTION	\$5,088,624	\$5,103,239	\$0	\$5,103,239	0.29%
6000 - TARGETED SERVICES	\$7,086,140	\$1,000,000	\$0	\$1,000,000	(85.89%)
9960 - YR END CLOSE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
9980 - PAYROLL DEFAULT PROGRAM	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
DCRP - DISTRICT RECOVERY PLAN	\$0	\$29,332,607	\$0	\$29,332,607	0.00%
<b>TOTAL GROSS FUNDS</b>	<b>\$105,944,909</b>	<b>\$94,554,612</b>	<b>\$11,175,000</b>	<b>\$105,729,612</b>	<b>(0.20%)</b>
<b>SECTION 103 JUDGMENTS - GOVERNMENT DIRECTION AND SUPPORT</b>					
9900 - SECTION 103 JUDGEMENT- GOVT DIRE & SUPPT	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
<b>TOTAL GROSS FUNDS</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>0.00%</b>
<b>SECTION 103 JUDGMENTS-ECON DEV &amp; REGUL</b>					
9900 - SECTION 103 JUDGEMENT- ECONOMIC DEVELOP	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
<b>TOTAL GROSS FUNDS</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>0.00%</b>
<b>SECTION 103 JUDGMENTS-PUBLIC EDUCATION SYSTEM</b>					
0001 - SECTION 103 JUDGEMENTS	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00%
<b>TOTAL GROSS FUNDS</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>0.00%</b>
<b>SETTLEMENTS AND JUDGMENTS</b>					
1000 - SETTLEMENT AND JUDGMENTS	\$28,024,759	\$28,024,759	\$0	\$28,024,759	0.00%
<b>TOTAL GROSS FUNDS</b>	<b>\$28,024,759</b>	<b>\$28,024,759</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$28,024,759</b>	<b>0.00%</b>

AGENCY OPERATING BUDGET, BY PROGRAM					
<i>Program</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>Mayor's FY 2023 Proposed</i>	<i>Committee's Change from Mayor's FY 2023 Proposed</i>	<i>Committee's FY 2023 Recommendation</i>	<i>Committee Percent Change from FY 2022 Approved</i>
<b>UNIFORM LAW COMMISSION</b>					
1000 - UNIFORM LAW COMMISSION	\$60,250	\$60,250	\$0	\$60,250	0.00%
<b>TOTAL GROSS FUNDS</b>	<b>\$60,250</b>	<b>\$60,250</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$60,250</b>	<b>0.00%</b>
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>\$1,619,290,496</b>	<b>\$1,721,686,102</b>	<b>\$9,961,466</b>	<b>\$1,731,647,568</b>	<b>6.94%</b>

**D. FISCAL YEAR 2023 AGENCY FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT SUMMARY TABLE**

AGENCY FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT SUMMARY						
<i>Fund Type</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>Mayor's FY 2023 Proposed</i>	<i>Committee's Change from Mayor's FY 2023 Proposed</i>	<i>Committee's FY 2023 Recommendation</i>	<i>Committee's Percent Change from FY 2022 Approved</i>
<b>BOARD OF ELECTIONS</b>						
LOCAL FUND	46.12	60.00	60.00	0.00	60.00	0.00%
FEDERAL GRANT FUND	6.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00%
PRIVATE GRANT FUND	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00%
<b>TOTAL FTE</b>	<b>52.12</b>	<b>60.00</b>	<b>60.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>60.00</b>	<b>0.00%</b>
<b>COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL DISABILITIES AND TENURE</b>						
LOCAL FUND	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00%
FEDERAL PAYMENTS	1.00	2.00	2.00	0.00	2.00	0.00%
<b>TOTAL FTE</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>2.00</b>	<b>2.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>3.00</b>	<b>50.00%</b>
<b>CORRECTIONS INFORMATION COUNCIL</b>						
LOCAL FUND	8.00	10.00	10.00	2.00	12.00	20.00%
PRIVATE DONATIONS	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00%
<b>TOTAL FTE</b>	<b>8.00</b>	<b>10.00</b>	<b>10.00</b>	<b>2.00</b>	<b>12.00</b>	<b>20.00%</b>
<b>CRIMINAL CODE REFORM COMMISSION</b>						
LOCAL FUND	5.00	5.00	5.00	0.00	5.00	0.00%
<b>TOTAL FTE</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>0.00%</b>
<b>CRIMINAL JUSTICE COORDINATING COUNCIL</b>						
LOCAL FUND	4.06	4.07	5.07	1.00	6.07	49.14%
FEDERAL PAYMENTS	13.73	15.00	15.00	0.00	15.00	0.00%
FEDERAL GRANT FUND	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00%
PRIVATE DONATIONS	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00%
OPERATING INTRA-DISTRICT FUNDS	0.00	0.73	0.00	0.00	0.00	(100.00%)
<b>TOTAL FTE</b>	<b>17.79</b>	<b>19.80</b>	<b>20.07</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>21.07</b>	<b>6.41%</b>
<b>DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS</b>						
LOCAL FUND	887.10	1,098.00	1,214.00	(31.00)	1,183.00	7.74%
FEDERAL PAYMENTS	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00%
FEDERAL GRANT FUND	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00%
PRIVATE DONATIONS	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00%
SPECIAL PURPOSE REVENUE FUNDS (O'TYPE)	218.00	240.00	136.00	0.00	136.00	(43.33%)
OPERATING INTRA-DISTRICT FUNDS	31.00	4.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	(100.00%)
<b>TOTAL FTE</b>	<b>1,136.10</b>	<b>1,342.00</b>	<b>1,350.00</b>	<b>(31.00)</b>	<b>1,319.00</b>	<b>(1.71%)</b>
<b>DEPARTMENT OF FORENSIC SCIENCES</b>						

AGENCY FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT SUMMARY						
<i>Fund Type</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>Mayor's FY 2023 Proposed</i>	<i>Committee's Change from Mayor's FY 2023 Proposed</i>	<i>Committee's FY 2023 Recommendation</i>	<i>Committee's Percent Change from FY 2022 Approved</i>
LOCAL FUND	164.01	209.00	208.00	0.00	208.00	(0.48%)
FEDERAL PAYMENTS	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00%
FEDERAL GRANT FUND	3.01	6.00	7.00	0.00	7.00	16.67%
PRIVATE GRANT FUND	9.00	0.00	9.00	0.00	9.00	0.00%
OPERATING INTRA-DISTRICT FUNDS	37.00	43.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	(100.00%)
<b>TOTAL FTE</b>	<b>213.02</b>	<b>258.00</b>	<b>224.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>224.00</b>	<b>(13.18%)</b>
<b>DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA NATIONAL GUARD</b>						
LOCAL FUND	42.06	45.24	45.24	0.00	45.24	0.00%
FEDERAL PAYMENTS	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00%
FEDERAL GRANT FUND	87.94	98.76	120.76	0.00	120.76	22.28%
SPECIAL PURPOSE REVENUE FUNDS (O'TYPE)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00%
<b>TOTAL FTE</b>	<b>130.00</b>	<b>144.00</b>	<b>166.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>166.00</b>	<b>15.28%</b>
<b>DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SENTENCING COMMISSION</b>						
LOCAL FUND	6.01	7.00	7.00	2.00	9.00	28.57%
<b>TOTAL FTE</b>	<b>6.01</b>	<b>7.00</b>	<b>7.00</b>	<b>2.00</b>	<b>9.00</b>	<b>28.57%</b>
<b>EMERGENCY PLANNING AND SECURITY FUND</b>						
LOCAL FUND	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00%
FEDERAL PAYMENTS	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00%
<b>TOTAL FTE</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00%</b>
<b>FIRE AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT</b>						
LOCAL FUND	2,066.07	2,057.00	2,109.00	0.00	2,109.00	2.53%
FEDERAL PAYMENTS	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00%
FEDERAL GRANT FUND	0.00	0.00	152.00	0.00	152.00	0.00%
FEDERAL MEDICAID PAYMENTS	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00%
PRIVATE GRANT FUND	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00%
PRIVATE DONATIONS	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00%
SPECIAL PURPOSE REVENUE FUNDS (O'TYPE)	2.00	2.00	2.00	0.00	2.00	0.00%
OPERATING INTRA-DISTRICT FUNDS	10.00	141.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	(100.00%)
<b>TOTAL FTE</b>	<b>2,078.07</b>	<b>2,200.00</b>	<b>2,263.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>2,263.00</b>	<b>2.86%</b>
<b>HOMELAND SECURITY AND EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY</b>						
LOCAL FUND	26.17	29.25	31.25	0.00	31.25	6.84%



AGENCY FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT SUMMARY						
<i>Fund Type</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>Mayor's FY 2023 Proposed</i>	<i>Committee's Change from Mayor's FY 2023 Proposed</i>	<i>Committee's FY 2023 Recommendation</i>	<i>Committee's Percent Change from FY 2022 Approved</i>
FEDERAL GRANT FUND	94.71	112.76	112.76	0.00	112.76	0.00%
OPERATING INTRA-DISTRICT FUNDS	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00%
<b>TOTAL FTE</b>	<b>120.88</b>	<b>142.01</b>	<b>144.01</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>144.01</b>	<b>1.41%</b>
HOMELAND SECURITY GRANTS						
OPERATING INTRA-DISTRICT FUNDS	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00%
<b>TOTAL FTE</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00%</b>
JUDICIAL NOMINATION COMMISSION						
LOCAL FUND	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00%
FEDERAL PAYMENTS	2.00	2.00	2.00	0.00	2.00	0.00%
<b>TOTAL FTE</b>	<b>2.00</b>	<b>2.00</b>	<b>2.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>2.00</b>	<b>0.00%</b>
METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT						
LOCAL FUND	4,177.38	4,746.25	4,742.25	1.00	4,743.25	(0.06%)
FEDERAL PAYMENTS	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00%
FEDERAL GRANT FUND	14.76	21.35	13.75	0.00	13.75	(35.60%)
PRIVATE DONATIONS	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00%
SPECIAL PURPOSE REVENUE FUNDS (O'TYPE)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00%
OPERATING INTRA-DISTRICT FUNDS	4.87	3.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	(100.00%)
<b>TOTAL FTE</b>	<b>4,197.01</b>	<b>4,771.60</b>	<b>4,757.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>4,758.00</b>	<b>(0.29%)</b>
OFFICE OF CAMPAIGN FINANCE						
LOCAL FUND	37.61	38.00	38.00	0.00	38.00	0.00%
<b>TOTAL FTE</b>	<b>37.61</b>	<b>38.00</b>	<b>38.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>38.00</b>	<b>0.00%</b>
OFFICE OF NEIGHBORHOOD SAFETY AND ENGAGEMENT						
LOCAL FUND	31.98	50.00	84.00	0.00	84.00	68.00%
FEDERAL PAYMENTS	0.00	14.00	6.00	0.00	6.00	(57.14%)
OPERATING INTRA-DISTRICT FUNDS	6.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00%
<b>TOTAL FTE</b>	<b>37.98</b>	<b>64.00</b>	<b>90.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>90.00</b>	<b>40.63%</b>
OFFICE OF POLICE COMPLAINTS						
LOCAL FUND	21.01	26.25	26.25	2.00	28.25	7.62%
<b>TOTAL FTE</b>	<b>21.01</b>	<b>26.25</b>	<b>26.25</b>	<b>2.00</b>	<b>28.25</b>	<b>7.62%</b>
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL						
LOCAL FUND	451.70	503.64	501.89	8.00	509.89	1.24%
FEDERAL PAYMENTS	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	2.00	0.00%
FEDERAL GRANT FUND	102.69	127.09	127.75	0.00	127.75	0.52%

AGENCY FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT SUMMARY						
<i>Fund Type</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>Mayor's FY 2023 Proposed</i>	<i>Committee's Change from Mayor's FY 2023 Proposed</i>	<i>Committee's FY 2023 Recommendation</i>	<i>Committee's Percent Change from FY 2022 Approved</i>
PRIVATE DONATIONS	8.00	8.00	9.38	0.00	9.38	17.25%
SPECIAL PURPOSE REVENUE FUNDS (O'TYPE)	45.27	75.98	74.30	0.00	74.30	(2.21%)
OPERATING INTRA-DISTRICT FUNDS	23.34	24.39	0.00	0.00	0.00	(100.00%)
<b>TOTAL FTE</b>	<b>631.00</b>	<b>739.10</b>	<b>713.32</b>	<b>10.00</b>	<b>723.32</b>	<b>(2.14%)</b>
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF MEDICAL EXAMINER						
LOCAL FUND	85.96	96.00	102.00	0.00	102.00	6.25%
FEDERAL PAYMENTS	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00%
FEDERAL GRANT FUND	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00%
PRIVATE GRANT FUND	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00%
PRIVATE DONATIONS	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00%
OPERATING INTRA-DISTRICT FUNDS	7.99	12.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	(100.00%)
<b>TOTAL FTE</b>	<b>93.95</b>	<b>108.00</b>	<b>103.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>103.00</b>	<b>(4.63%)</b>
OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY MAYOR FOR PUBLIC SAFETY AND JUSTICE						
LOCAL FUND	9.00	11.00	15.00	0.00	15.00	36.36%
<b>TOTAL FTE</b>	<b>9.00</b>	<b>11.00</b>	<b>15.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>15.00</b>	<b>36.36%</b>
OFFICE OF UNIFIED COMMUNICATIONS						
LOCAL FUND	271.01	291.00	420.00	0.00	420.00	44.33%
SPECIAL PURPOSE REVENUE FUNDS (O'TYPE)	67.01	94.00	3.00	0.00	3.00	(96.81%)
OPERATING INTRA-DISTRICT FUNDS	4.00	7.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	(100.00%)
<b>TOTAL FTE</b>	<b>342.02</b>	<b>392.00</b>	<b>423.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>423.00</b>	<b>7.91%</b>
OFFICE OF VICTIM SERVICES AND JUSTICE GRANTS						
LOCAL FUND	14.95	19.95	25.47	0.00	25.47	27.67%
FEDERAL PAYMENTS	0.00	3.00	3.00	0.00	3.00	0.00%
FEDERAL GRANT FUND	1.00	2.05	2.83	0.00	2.83	38.05%
SPECIAL PURPOSE REVENUE FUNDS (O'TYPE)	2.00	2.00	0.43	0.00	0.43	(78.50%)
OPERATING INTRA-DISTRICT FUNDS	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00%
<b>TOTAL FTE</b>	<b>17.95</b>	<b>27.00</b>	<b>31.73</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>31.73</b>	<b>17.52%</b>
SECTION 103 JUDGMENTS - GOVERNMENT DIRECTION AND SUPPORT						
LOCAL FUND	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00%

AGENCY FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT SUMMARY						
<i>Fund Type</i>	<i>FY 2021 Actuals</i>	<i>FY 2022 Approved</i>	<i>Mayor's FY 2023 Proposed</i>	<i>Committee's Change from Mayor's FY 2023 Proposed</i>	<i>Committee's FY 2023 Recommendation</i>	<i>Committee's Percent Change from FY 2022 Approved</i>
<b>TOTAL FTE</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00%</b>
<b>SECTION 103 JUDGMENTS-ECON DEV &amp; REGUL</b>						
LOCAL FUND	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00%
<b>TOTAL FTE</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00%</b>
<b>SECTION 103 JUDGMENTS-PUBLIC EDUCATION SYSTEM</b>						
LOCAL FUND	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00%
<b>TOTAL FTE</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00%</b>
<b>SETTLEMENTS AND JUDGMENTS</b>						
LOCAL FUND	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00%
<b>TOTAL FTE</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00%</b>
<b>UNIFORM LAW COMMISSION</b>						
LOCAL FUND	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00%
<b>TOTAL FTE</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00%</b>
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>9,157.52</b>	<b>10,368.76</b>	<b>10,450.38</b>	<b>(12.00)</b>	<b>10,438.38</b>	<b>0.67%</b>

**E. FISCAL YEARS 2023-2028 AGENCY CAPITAL BUDGET SUMMARY TABLE**

Project No.	Project Title	Allotment Scenario	Available Allotment (3-16-22)	FY 2023	FY 2024	FY 2025	FY 2026	FY 2027	FY 2028	6-Year Total
Board of Elections (DL0)										
VTS02C	BOARD OF ELECTIONS MANAGEMENT SYSTEM	Existing Balances	2,104,629	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
VTS02C Total			2,104,629	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DL0 Total			2,104,629	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
D.C. National Guard (FK0)										
NG715C	YOUTH CHALLENGE EDUCATIONAL CAMPUS	Existing Balances	30,636	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NG715C Total			30,636	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
FK0 Total			30,636	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Department of Corrections (FL0)										
B25RNC	DOC HQ AND READY CENTER	Existing Balances	7,000,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
B25RNC Total			7,000,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CGN01C	GENERAL RENOVATIONS AT DOC FACILITIES	Approved FY22 CIP for FY23-27	0	2,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	0	6,000,000
		Mayor's Proposed FY23 Change	0	1,000,000	0	0	0	0	1,000,000	2,000,000
		Existing Balances	5,030,026	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Committee's FY23 Recommendation	(100,000)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CGN01C Total			4,930,026	3,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	8,000,000
CGN02C	CTF GENERAL RENOVATION	Approved FY22 CIP for FY23-27	0	2,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	0	6,000,000
		Mayor's Proposed FY23 Change	0	1,000,000	0	0	0	0	1,000,000	2,000,000
		Existing Balances	4,399,829	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Committee's FY23 Recommendation	(100,000)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CGN02C Total			4,299,829	3,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	8,000,000
CGN08C	HEATING SYSTEM REPLACEMENT	Mayor's Proposed FY23 Change	0	5,000,000	0	0	0	0	0	5,000,000
		Existing Balances	18,424,424	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Committee's FY23 Recommendation	(100,000)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CGN08C Total			18,324,424	5,000,000	0	0	0	0	0	5,000,000

Project No.	Project Title	Allotment Scenario	Available Allotment (3-16-22)	FY 2023	FY 2024	FY 2025	FY 2026	FY 2027	FY 2028	6-Year Total
CR001C	MASTER EQUIPMENT LEASE - FL CORRECTION	Existing Balances	350,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CR001C Total			350,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CR002C	RENOVATION OF CELL DOORS AND MOTORS	Existing Balances	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CR002C Total			5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CR003C	UPGRADE FIRE ALARM AND SPRINKLER SYSTEM	Existing Balances	4,806	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CR003C Total			4,806	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CR004C	UPGRD CNTRL SECURITY COMD CT	Existing Balances	70,967	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CR004C Total			70,967	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CR104C	HVAC REPLACEMENT FOR CDF	Existing Balances	9,892,192	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Committee's FY23 Recommendation	(100,000)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CR104C Total			9,792,192	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CRB01C	NEW CORRECTIONAL FACILITY FOR (CDF)	Mayor's Proposed FY23 Change	0	500,000	0	0	3,500,000	120,000,000	126,500,000	250,500,000
CRB01C Total			0	500,000	0	0	3,500,000	120,000,000	126,500,000	250,500,000
MA203C	EXTERIOR STRUCTURAL FINISHING	Existing Balances	7,496,081	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Committee's FY23 Recommendation	(100,000)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MA203C Total			7,396,081	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MA220C	EMERGENCY POWER SYSTEM UPGRADES	Approved FY22 CIP for FY23-27	0	1,500,000	0	0	0	0	0	1,500,000
		Mayor's Proposed FY23 Change	0	0	2,000,000	0	0	0	0	2,000,000
		Existing Balances	1,936,197	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MA220C Total			1,936,197	1,500,000	2,000,000	0	0	0	0	3,500,000
N7001C	INFRASTRUCTURE SYSTEM UPGRADE - DOC	Existing Balances	1,622,270	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
N7001C Total			1,622,270	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
FL0 Total			55,726,797	13,000,000	4,000,000	2,000,000	5,500,000	122,000,000	128,500,000	275,000,000
Department of Forensic Sciences (FR0)										
DCI19C	CAPITAL AND I.T. EQUIPMENT - DFS	Existing Balances	1,101,756	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DCI19C Total			1,101,756	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DIG19C	FORENSIC EVIDENCE DIGITAL STORAGE	Approved FY22 CIP for FY23-27	0	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	0	5,000,000

Project No.	Project Title	Allotment Scenario	Available Allotment (3-16-22)	FY 2023	FY 2024	FY 2025	FY 2026	FY 2027	FY 2028	6-Year Total
		Mayor's Proposed FY23 Change	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,000,000	1,000,000
		Existing Balances	2,333,846	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DIG19C Total			2,333,846	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	6,000,000
FLE19C	CRIME SCENE SPECIALIZATION VEHICLES	Approved FY22 CIP for FY23-27	0	72,125	53,120	47,886	14,249	66,293	0	253,673
		Mayor's Proposed FY23 Change	0	0	(31,872)	(31,126)	(7,124)	(33,147)	1	(103,268)
		Existing Balances	183,033	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
FLE19C Total			183,033	72,125	21,248	16,760	7,125	33,146	1	150,405
FR019C	CAPITAL RENOVATIONS - DFS	Existing Balances	292,540	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
FR019C Total			292,540	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
HDW02C	LABORATORY & HOSPITAL EQUIPMENT - DFS	Approved FY22 CIP for FY23-27	0	922,402	680,125	913,135	658,357	2,549,363	0	5,723,382
		Mayor's Proposed FY23 Change	0	0	224,875	(13,135)	241,643	(1,549,363)	1,095,980	0
		Existing Balances	3,106,952	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Committee's FY23 Recommendation	(510,000)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
HDW02C Total			2,596,952	922,402	905,000	900,000	900,000	1,000,000	1,095,980	5,723,382
LIM20C	DFS LABORATORY INFORMATION MANAGEMENT SY	Existing Balances	1,155,826	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
LIM20C Total			1,155,826	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
VEM21C	VEHICLE ELEVATOR MODERNIZATION	Approved FY22 CIP for FY23-27	0	270,000	0	0	0	0	0	270,000
		Existing Balances	60,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
VEM21C Total			60,000	270,000	0	0	0	0	0	270,000
FR0 Total			7,723,953	2,264,527	1,926,248	1,916,760	1,907,125	2,033,146	2,095,981	12,143,787
Fire and Emergency Medical Services Department (FB0)										
20600C	FIRE APPARATUS	Existing Balances	21,828	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
20600C Total			21,828	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
20630C	FIRE APPARATUS	Existing Balances	54,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
20630C Total			54,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
206AMC	AMBULANCE VEHICLES - FEMS	Approved FY22 CIP for FY23-27	0	3,994,668	3,257,191	3,452,622	3,659,780	3,879,366	0	18,243,626
		Mayor's Proposed FY23 Change	0	2,150,975	(651,439)	(1,035,787)	1	0	4,112,128	4,575,878

Project No.	Project Title	Allotment Scenario	Available Allotment (3-16-22)	FY 2023	FY 2024	FY 2025	FY 2026	FY 2027	FY 2028	6-Year Total
		Existing Balances	7,437,407	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
206AMC Total			7,437,407	6,145,643	2,605,752	2,416,835	3,659,780	3,879,366	4,112,128	22,819,504
206AVC	ADMINISTRATIVE VEHICLES - FEMS	Approved FY22 CIP for FY23-27	0	232,248	189,372	200,734	212,778	225,544	0	1,060,676
		Mayor's Proposed FY23 Change	0	125,057	(37,875)	(60,220)	0	1	239,077	266,040
		Existing Balances	337,089	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
206AVC Total			337,089	357,305	151,497	140,514	212,778	225,545	239,077	1,326,716
206CVC	COMMAND VEHICLES - FEMS	Approved FY22 CIP for FY23-27	0	638,682	520,772	552,018	585,139	620,248	0	2,916,859
		Mayor's Proposed FY23 Change	0	343,906	(104,155)	(165,605)	0	0	657,463	731,609
		Existing Balances	873,609	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
206CVC Total			873,609	982,588	416,617	386,413	585,139	620,248	657,463	3,648,468
206LTC	LADDER TRUCKS - FEMS	Approved FY22 CIP for FY23-27	0	2,477,313	2,019,963	2,141,161	2,269,631	2,405,809	0	11,313,877
		Mayor's Proposed FY23 Change	0	1,333,938	(403,993)	(642,348)	1	0	2,550,157	2,837,754
		Existing Balances	3,595,520	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
206LTC Total			3,595,520	3,811,251	1,615,970	1,498,813	2,269,631	2,405,809	2,550,157	14,151,631
206PTC	PUMPERS - FEMS	Approved FY22 CIP for FY23-27	0	3,532,649	2,880,468	3,053,296	3,236,493	3,430,683	0	16,133,588
		Mayor's Proposed FY23 Change	0	1,902,195	(576,094)	(915,989)	0	0	3,636,524	4,046,637
		Existing Balances	5,130,174	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
206PTC Total			5,130,174	5,434,844	2,304,374	2,137,307	3,236,493	3,430,683	3,636,524	20,180,225
206RSC	RESCUE SQUAD VEHICLES - FEMS	Approved FY22 CIP for FY23-27	0	1,083,824	883,734	936,758	992,964	1,052,541	0	4,949,821
		Mayor's Proposed FY23 Change	0	583,598	(176,747)	(281,027)	1	0	1,115,694	1,241,518
		Existing Balances	3,122,252	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
206RSC Total			3,122,252	1,667,422	706,987	655,731	992,964	1,052,541	1,115,694	6,191,339
206RVC	OTHER RESPONSE VEHICLES - FEMS	Approved FY22 CIP for FY23-27	0	4,741,407	1,846,373	2,475,717	691,528	1,935,924	0	11,690,949
		Mayor's Proposed FY23 Change	0	2,553,066	(369,275)	(742,715)	0	0	2,052,080	3,493,156
		Existing Balances	9,004,257	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Committee's FY23 Recommendation	0	(250,000)	0	0	0	0	0	(250,000)
206RVC Total			9,004,257	7,044,473	1,477,098	1,733,002	691,528	1,935,924	2,052,080	14,934,105

Project No.	Project Title	Allotment Scenario	Available Allotment (3-16-22)	FY 2023	FY 2024	FY 2025	FY 2026	FY 2027	FY 2028	6-Year Total
BRM22C	ENGINE COMPANY 7	Approved FY22 CIP for FY23-27	0	2,500,000	10,500,000	0	0	0	0	13,000,000
		Existing Balances	750,200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
BRM22C Total			750,200	2,500,000	10,500,000	0	0	0	0	13,000,000
BRM29C	TRAINING ACADEMY REDEVELOPMENT STUDY (MA	Mayor's Proposed FY23 Change	0	500,000	0	0	0	0	0	500,000
		Existing Balances	500,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
BRM29C Total			500,000	500,000	0	0	0	0	0	500,000
BRM39C	GENERATOR REPLACEMENT	Mayor's Proposed FY23 Change	0	1,500,000	0	0	0	0	0	1,500,000
BRM39C Total			0	1,500,000	0	0	0	0	0	1,500,000
FEP00C	FEMS SAFETY EQUIPMENT PURCHASES	Existing Balances	915	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
FEP00C Total			915	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
FMF01C	FLEET MAINTENANCE RESERVE FACILITY	Approved FY22 CIP for FY23-27	0	18,000,000	7,500,000	12,500,000	0	0	0	38,000,000
		Mayor's Proposed FY23 Change	0	0	27,500,000	12,250,000	0	0	0	39,750,000
		Existing Balances	2,357,741	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Committee's FY23 Recommendation	1,510,000	(1,510,000)	0	0	0	0	0	(1,510,000)
FMF01C Total			3,867,741	16,490,000	35,000,000	24,750,000	0	0	0	76,240,000
LC537C	ENGINE COMPANY 23 RENOVATION	Existing Balances	3,781,243	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
LC537C Total			3,781,243	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
LC837C	RELOCATION OF ENGINE COMPANY 26	Mayor's Proposed FY23 Change	0	3,500,000	0	0	0	0	0	3,500,000
		Existing Balances	11,312,051	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
LC837C Total			11,312,051	3,500,000	0	0	0	0	0	3,500,000
LCE00C	LIFESAVING CARDIAC EQUIPMENT FUND	Existing Balances	4,224,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
LCE00C Total			4,224,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
LE537C	ENGINE 14 MAJOR RENOVATION	Existing Balances	11,857	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
LE537C Total			11,857	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
LF239C	FEMS SCHEDULED CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS	Mayor's Proposed FY23 Change	0	3,500,000	0	0	0	0	0	3,500,000
		Existing Balances	2,459,470	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
LF239C Total			2,459,470	3,500,000	0	0	0	0	0	3,500,000



Project No.	Project Title	Allotment Scenario	Available Allotment (3-16-22)	FY 2023	FY 2024	FY 2025	FY 2026	FY 2027	FY 2028	6-Year Total
NFB01C	NEW FIRE BOAT-1	Approved FY22 CIP for FY23-27	0	0	0	0	12,290,000	0	0	12,290,000
		Mayor's Proposed FY23 Change	0	0	0	0	2,383,587	1,525,000	0	3,908,587
		Existing Balances	1,250,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NFB01C Total			1,250,000	0	0	0	14,673,587	1,525,000	0	16,198,587
FB0 Total			57,733,613	53,433,526	54,778,295	33,718,615	26,321,900	15,075,116	14,363,123	197,690,575
Homeland Security and Emergency Management Agency (BN0)										
BRM26C	HSEMA EMERGENCY OPERATIONS CENTER RENOVA	Existing Balances	3,759,557	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
BRM26C Total			3,759,557	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
BN0 Total			3,759,557	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Metropolitan Police Department (FA0)										
BAR01C	BIDIRECTIONAL AMPLIFIERS FOR RADIO COVER	Approved FY22 CIP for FY23-27	0	938,553	0	0	0	0	0	938,553
		Existing Balances	2,250,612	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
BAR01C Total			2,250,612	938,553	0	0	0	0	0	938,553
BRM09C	EVIDENCE IMPOUND LOT RENOVATION	Existing Balances	6,947,933	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
BRM09C Total			6,947,933	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
BRM10C	ADA UPGRADES (1D SUB & 4D SUB) MPD STATI	Existing Balances	171,963	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
BRM10C Total			171,963	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
BRM11C	POR & TEST FIT OF MPD PATROL DISTRICTS	Existing Balances	500,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
BRM11C Total			500,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
BRM19C	7TH DISTRICT HQS RENOVATION	Approved FY22 CIP for FY23-27	0	2,750,000	0	5,000,000	15,000,000	10,000,000	0	32,750,000
		Mayor's Proposed FY23 Change	0	(2,750,000)	0	(1,290,000)	4,800,000	(760,000)	0	0
		Existing Balances	250,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
BRM19C Total			250,000	0	0	3,710,000	19,800,000	9,240,000	0	32,750,000
BRM20C	DETENTION AREA RENOVATIONS	Existing Balances	2,217,848	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
BRM20C Total			2,217,848	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
EPI20C	MPD--DISASTER RECOVERY	Existing Balances	710,872	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
EPI20C Total			710,872	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Project No.	Project Title	Allotment Scenario	Available Allotment (3-16-22)	FY 2023	FY 2024	FY 2025	FY 2026	FY 2027	FY 2028	6-Year Total
FAV01C	MOTOR CYCLES, SCOOTERS & TRAILERS - MPD	Approved FY22 CIP for FY23-27	0	207,968	164,775	169,718	174,810	180,054	0	897,323
		Mayor's Proposed FY23 Change	0	111,983	(32,955)	(50,916)	1	0	185,455	213,568
		Existing Balances	355,522	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
FAV01C Total			355,522	319,950	131,820	118,802	174,810	180,054	185,455	1,110,891
FAV02C	WRECKERS & TRAILERS - MPD	Approved FY22 CIP for FY23-27	0	276,126	218,777	225,340	232,100	239,063	0	1,191,405
		Mayor's Proposed FY23 Change	0	148,683	(43,756)	(67,602)	0	0	246,235	283,561
		Existing Balances	112,819	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
FAV02C Total			112,819	424,809	175,021	157,738	232,100	239,063	246,235	1,474,966
FAV03C	UNMARKED VEHICLES - MPD	Approved FY22 CIP for FY23-27	0	978,028	1,130,673	1,164,593	822,091	846,753	0	4,942,136
		Mayor's Proposed FY23 Change	0	526,630	(226,135)	(349,378)	1	0	872,156	823,275
		Existing Balances	150,448	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
FAV03C Total			150,448	1,504,658	904,538	815,215	822,091	846,753	872,156	5,765,411
FAV04C	MARKED CRUISERS - MPD	Approved FY22 CIP for FY23-27	0	5,367,596	4,252,613	4,380,212	4,511,619	4,646,967	0	23,159,007
		Mayor's Proposed FY23 Change	0	2,889,944	(850,507)	(1,314,064)	1	0	4,786,376	5,511,750
		Existing Balances	1,498,898	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Committee's FY23 Recommendation	0	0	(1,500,000)	0	0	0	0	(1,500,000)
FAV04C Total			1,498,898	8,257,540	1,902,106	3,066,148	4,511,619	4,646,967	4,786,376	27,170,756
FAV05C	OTHER MARKED VEHICLES - MPD	Approved FY22 CIP for FY23-27	0	851,716	674,821	695,066	715,918	737,395	0	3,674,915
		Mayor's Proposed FY23 Change	0	458,616	(134,964)	(208,520)	1	0	759,517	874,650
		Existing Balances	(655,800)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
FAV05C Total			(655,800)	1,310,332	539,857	486,546	715,918	737,395	759,517	4,549,565
FAVH2C	HELICOPTER REPLACEMENT	Existing Balances	4,842,894	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
FAVH2C Total			4,842,894	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
FDA01C	FIRSTNET DISTRIBUTED ANTENNA SYSTEM DEPL	Existing Balances	675,260	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
FDA01C Total			675,260	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
HRB30C	MPD/CCTV HARDWARE REPLACEMENT	Approved FY22 CIP for FY23-27	0	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	0	2,500,000
		Mayor's Proposed FY23 Change	0	0	0	0	0	0	500,000	500,000

Project No.	Project Title	Allotment Scenario	Available Allotment (3-16-22)	FY 2023	FY 2024	FY 2025	FY 2026	FY 2027	FY 2028	6-Year Total
		Existing Balances	490,357	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
HRB30C Total			490,357	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	3,000,000
HRBKAC	CCTV STREETLIGHT	Existing Balances	250,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
HRBKAC Total			250,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NWI01C	NETWORK & WIFI UPGRADE FOR IMPROVED PUBL	Approved FY22 CIP for FY23-27	0	700,000	0	0	0	0	0	700,000
		Mayor's Proposed FY23 Change	0	806,847	0	0	0	0	0	806,847
NWI01C Total			0	1,506,847	0	0	0	0	0	1,506,847
PDB23C	CCTV/SHOTSPOTTER INTEGRATION	Mayor's Proposed FY23 Change	0	1,768,000	0	0	0	0	0	1,768,000
		Existing Balances	431,697	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PDB23C Total			431,697	1,768,000	0	0	0	0	0	1,768,000
PEQ22C	SPECIALIZED VEHICLES - MPD	Existing Balances	58,212	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PEQ22C Total			58,212	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PL110C	MPD BUILDING RENOVATIONS/CONSTRUCTION	Mayor's Proposed FY23 Change	0	3,000,000	0	0	0	0	0	3,000,000
		Existing Balances	7,108,546	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PL110C Total			7,108,546	3,000,000	0	0	0	0	0	3,000,000
PLT10C	CRIME FIGHTING TECHNOLOGY	Existing Balances	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PLT10C Total			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
WAM40C	DATA WAREHOUSE & ANALYTICS MODERNIZATION	Existing Balances	415	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
WAM40C Total			415	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
FA0 Total			28,368,496	19,530,689	4,153,342	8,854,449	26,756,538	16,390,232	7,349,739	83,034,989
Office of Neighborhood Safety and Engagement (NS0)										
NS021C	RENOVATION AND MODERNIZATION OF ONSE BLD	Mayor's Proposed FY23 Change	0	1,250,000	0	0	0	0	0	1,250,000
		Existing Balances	1,908,536	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NS021C Total			1,908,536	1,250,000	0	0	0	0	0	1,250,000
NS0 Total			1,908,536	1,250,000	0	0	0	0	0	1,250,000
Office of the Attorney General (CB0)										
EN240C	INFORMATION SYSTEMS - CHILD SUPPORT ENFO	Approved FY22 CIP for FY23-27	0	1,524,516	0	0	0	0	0	1,524,516

Project No.	Project Title	Allotment Scenario	Available Allotment (3-16-22)	FY 2023	FY 2024	FY 2025	FY 2026	FY 2027	FY 2028	6-Year Total
		Existing Balances	1,414,691	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
EN240C Total			1,414,691	1,524,516	0	0	0	0	0	1,524,516
EN601C	OAG-IT INFRASTRUCTURE UPGRADES	Existing Balances	759,989	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
EN601C Total			759,989	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CB0 Total			2,174,680	1,524,516	0	0	0	0	0	1,524,516
Office of the Chief Medical Examiner (FX0)										
FX0FRC	OCME FACILITY RENOVATION AT THE CFL	Approved FY22 CIP for FY23-27	0	500,000	0	0	0	0	0	500,000
		Existing Balances	872,214	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
FX0FRC Total			872,214	500,000	0	0	0	0	0	500,000
FXEERC	EQUIPMENT REPLACEMENT AT THE CFL	Approved FY22 CIP for FY23-27	0	268,000	0	0	0	0	0	268,000
		Mayor's Proposed FY23 Change	0	432,000	0	0	0	0	0	432,000
		Existing Balances	1,206,304	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
FXEERC Total			1,206,304	700,000	0	0	0	0	0	700,000
FX0 Total			2,078,518	1,200,000	0	0	0	0	0	1,200,000
Office of Unified Communications (UX0)										
AFC02C	IT HARDWARE 911/311 SYSTEMS	Approved FY22 CIP for FY23-27	0	100,000	2,745,000	790,000	250,000	2,000,000	0	5,885,000
		Mayor's Proposed FY23 Change	0	0	0	0	0	0	100,000	100,000
		Existing Balances	576,005	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AFC02C Total			576,005	100,000	2,745,000	790,000	250,000	2,000,000	100,000	5,985,000
CERCEC	UCC ELECTRICAL RECONFIGURATION	Existing Balances	5,924,150	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CERCEC Total			5,924,150	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DCCUCC	911/311 DISPATCH CONSOLES	Existing Balances	238,777	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DCCUCC Total			238,777	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DWB02C	IT SOFTWARE (911/311 APPLICATIONS)	Approved FY22 CIP for FY23-27	0	0	1,454,336	0	0	0	0	1,454,336
		Existing Balances	54,931	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DWB02C Total			54,931	0	1,454,336	0	0	0	0	1,454,336
UC2TDC	IT AND COMMUNICATIONS UPGRADES	Approved FY22 CIP for FY23-27	0	1,450,000	0	0	1,515,000	1,100,000	0	4,065,000

Project No.	Project Title	Allotment Scenario	Available Allotment (3-16-22)	FY 2023	FY 2024	FY 2025	FY 2026	FY 2027	FY 2028	6-Year Total
		Mayor's Proposed FY23 Change	0	100,000	0	0	0	0	0	100,000
		Existing Balances	4,316,718	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Committee's FY23 Recommendation	(500,000)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
UC2TDC Total			3,816,718	1,550,000	0	0	1,515,000	1,100,000	0	4,165,000
UC302C	MDC REPLACEMENT FOR MPD & FEMS	Approved FY22 CIP for FY23-27	0	0	0	0	0	10,000,000	0	10,000,000
		Mayor's Proposed FY23 Change	0	0	0	0	0	1,317,005	0	1,317,005
		Existing Balances	9,843,129	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
UC302C Total			9,843,129	0	0	0	0	11,317,005	0	11,317,005
UC303C	MPD/ FEMS RADIO REPLACEMENT	Approved FY22 CIP for FY23-27	0	6,067,486	0	10,192,446	3,987,381	770,000	0	21,017,313
		Mayor's Proposed FY23 Change	0	4,978,598	0	0	0	0	0	4,978,598
		Existing Balances	1,187,071	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
UC303C Total			1,187,071	11,046,084	0	10,192,446	3,987,381	770,000	0	25,995,911
UC304C	911/311 RADIO CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE	Mayor's Proposed FY23 Change	0	1,750,000	0	0	0	0	0	1,750,000
		Existing Balances	12,946,084	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
UC304C Total			12,946,084	1,750,000	0	0	0	0	0	1,750,000
UX0 Total			34,586,865	14,446,084	4,199,336	10,982,446	5,752,381	15,187,005	100,000	50,667,252
GRAND TOTAL			196,196,280	106,649,342	69,057,221	57,472,270	66,237,944	170,685,499	152,408,843	622,511,119

**F. TRANSFERS IN FROM OTHER COMMITTEES TABLE**

<i><b>Sending Committee</b></i>	<i><b>Amount</b></i>	<i><b>FTEs</b></i>	<i><b>Receiving Agency</b></i>	<i><b>Amount</b></i>	<i><b>FTEs</b></i>	<i><b>Program / Activity / Project</b></i>	<i><b>Purpose</b></i>	<i><b>Operating (Recurring/ One-Time) or Capital</b></i>
<i><b>Committee on Government Operations &amp; Facilities</b></i>	\$106,347	0	Office of the Attorney General	\$106,347	1	5400/5408	New Workers' Rights Paralegal FTE	Recurring operating
	\$155,868	0		\$155,868	1	6100/6113	New Public Corruption Trial Attorney FTE	Recurring operating
	\$200,000	0	Office of Victim Services & Justice Grants	\$200,000	0	2000/2010	Enhancement for reentry grants	Recurring operating
	\$300,000	0		\$300,000	0	4000/4010	Enhancement to supplement FY23 funding for hospital-based violence intervention programs	Recurring operating
<i><b>Committee on Labor &amp; Workforce Development</b></i>	\$656,299	0	Office of the Attorney General	\$656,299	2	5400/5408	Two new Paid Family Leave Enforcement Trial Attorney FTEs	One-time operating (27-month positions, beginning in FY23)
	\$3,000,000	0	Office of Victim Services & Justice Grants	\$3,000,000	0	3000/3010	Enhancement for access to justice grants (eviction diversion): \$1,500,000 local recurring and \$1,500,000 ARPA one-time in FY23	Recurring and one-time operating
<i><b>Committee on Recreation, Libraries, &amp; Youth Affairs</b></i>	\$70,000	0	Office of Neighborhood Safety & Engagement	\$70,000	0	2000/2030	Enhancement for Leadership Academies	Recurring operating

## G. TRANSFERS OUT TO OTHER COMMITTEES TABLE

<i>Receiving Committee</i>	<i>Amount</i>	<i>FTEs</i>	<i>Receiving Agency</i>	<i>Amount</i>	<i>FTEs</i>	<i>Program / Activity / Project</i>	<i>Purpose</i>	<i>Operating (Recurring /One-Time) or Capital</i>
<b>Committee of the Whole</b>	\$1,500,000	0	District of Columbia Public Schools	\$1,500,000	0	Project No. SK1PBC (Peabody Playground Modernization)	Schoolyard upgrades, including new play equipment, seating, shade structures, signage, and hardscaping	Capital in FY24
	\$60,000	0	Department of Buildings	\$60,000	0	1000/1040/40	Fund the fiscal impact of Sec. 4(c)-(e) of L22-287, the “Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs Omnibus Amendment Act of 2018”, to update the agency’s systems to send out automatic notifications to ANCs when a property owner appeals a designation of vacant	One-time operating
	\$20,000	0		\$20,000	0	1000/1040/40	Fund the fiscal impact of Sec. 4(c)-(e) of L22-287, the “Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs Omnibus Amendment Act of 2018”, to purchase non-permanent stickers	Recurring operating
<b>Committee on Business and Economic Development</b>	\$350,000	0	Business Improvement Districts Transfer	\$350,000	0	1000/1100/50	Expand the service area of the Southwest Business Improvement District south of M Street, SW	Recurring operating
<b>Committee on Government Operations &amp; Facilities</b>	\$510,000	0	Department of General Services	\$510,000	0	Project No. EA710B (Eastern Market)	Capital improvements, including water heater, sewage pumps, fire alarm system, and overage from prior FY projects (for FY23)	Capital in FY23
	\$500,000	0		\$500,000	0	8000/8001/32	Enhancement for Board of Elections rent	Recurring operating
<b>Committee on Health</b>	\$118,000	0	Department of Behavioral Health	\$118,000	1	6700/6702/12 & 14	Fund the fiscal impact of L22-139, the “Maternal Mental Health Task Force Establishment Act of 2018”	One-time operating
	\$200,000	0		\$200,000	0	6600/6625/41	Fund a pilot program for trauma counseling after natural or human-made disasters such as house fires and structure collapses	One-time operating

<i>Receiving Committee</i>	<i>Amount</i>	<i>FTEs</i>	<i>Receiving Agency</i>	<i>Amount</i>	<i>FTEs</i>	<i>Program / Activity / Project</i>	<i>Purpose</i>	<i>Operating (Recurring /One-Time) or Capital</i>
<i>Committee on Housing &amp; Executive Administration</i>	\$60,000	0	Real Property Tax Appeals Commission	\$60,000	0	2000/2010/41	Fund the fiscal impact of Sec. 4(c)-(e) of L22-287, the “Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs Omnibus Amendment Act of 2018”, to update the agency’s systems to send out automatic notifications to ANC’s when a property owner appeals a designation of vacant	One-time operating
<i>Committee on Recreation, Libraries, &amp; Youth Affairs</i>	\$1,250,000	0	Department of Parks & Recreation	\$1,250,000	0	Project No. QN702C (Athletic Field and Park Improvements)	Renovation of Kingsman Field, basketball courts, and Kingsman Dog Park, including regrading to allow for proper drainage in both the dog park and adjacent basketball courts, new groundcover material to align with DPR’s current standard for dog parks, new functional fencing, new grass for Kingsman Field, additional lighting, and new way-finding signage	Capital in FY23



**H. REVENUE ADJUSTMENTS TABLE**

<b><i>Agency</i></b>	<b><i>Fund Type</i></b>	<b><i>Amount</i></b>	<b><i>Use</i></b>	<b><i>BSA Subtitle</i></b>
N/A	Local	\$349,153	Recognize revenues to fund the fiscal impact of the Committee on Business & Economic Development's proposed subtitle, the "Community for Creative Non-Violence Real Property Tax Relief Amendment Act of 2022"	"Community for Creative Non-Violence Real Property Tax Relief Amendment Act of 2022" (CBED)

**I. BUDGET SUPPORT ACT SUBTITLE FUNDING TABLE**

<b>Subtitle</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>Attributes</b>	<b>Amount</b>	<b>FTEs</b>
“Metropolitan Police Department Budget and Staffing Transparency Amendment Act of 2022”	Metropolitan Police Department	CSG 41/Program AMP1/Activity 1040: \$550,000 (one-time)  CSG 11/Program 6001/Activity 6010: \$104,489 (recurring)  CSG 14/Program 6001/Activity 6010: \$19,121 (recurring)	\$123,610 (recurring)  \$550,000 (one-time)	1
“Office of Unified Communications Telecommunicator CPR Program Amendment Act of 2022”	Office of Unified Communications	CSG 15/Program 1000/Activity 1087: \$6,314 (one-time)  CSG 15/Program 2000/Activity 2010: \$31,570 (one-time)  CSG 15/Program 2000/Activity 2020: \$25,256 (one-time)  CSG 40/Program 5000/Activity 5020: \$27,500 (one-time)  CSG 40/Program 5000/Activity 5020: \$5,000 (recurring)	\$90,640 (one-time)  \$5,000 (recurring)	0
“Special Education Attorneys for Emerging Adult Defendants Amendment Act of 2022”	Office of Victim Services & Justice Grants	CSG 50/Program 2000/Activity 2010: \$300,000 (grant to support special education attorneys for emerging adult defendants with disabilities)	\$300,000 (recurring)	0
“Subject-to-Appropriations Repeals and Modifications Amendment Act of 2022”	See Section J	See Section J	See Section J	See Section J

**J. FUNDING OF BILLS PREVIOUSLY PASSED SUBJECT TO APPROPRIATIONS TABLE**

<i>Bill/Law Number</i>	<i>Section</i>	<i>Agency</i>	<i>Program/Activity</i>	<i>Amount</i>	<i>FTEs</i>	<i>Notes</i>
L22-139, the “Maternal Mental Health Task Force Establishment Act of 2018”	Entire law	Department of Behavioral Health	6700/6702/12 & 14	\$118,000 (one-time)	1	The Committee on Health is including a subtitle to revive this law and repeal its subject-to-appropriations language. The fiscal impact is for one FTE to coordinate the Task Force’s activities and draft the final report.
L22-287, the “Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs Omnibus Amendment Act of 2018”	Sec. 4(c)-(e)			\$60,000 (one-time)	0	Update systems to send out automatic notifications to ANC’s when a property owner appeals a designation of vacant
		Department of Buildings	1000/1040/40	\$20,000 (recurring)	0	Purchase non-permanent stickers
		Real Property Tax Appeals Commission	2000/2010/41	\$60,000 (one-time)	0	Update systems to send out automatic notifications to ANC’s when a property owner appeals a designation of vacant

## II. FISCAL YEAR 2022 REVISED LOCAL BUDGET ACTS, FISCAL YEAR 2023 LOCAL BUDGET ACT, AND FISCAL YEAR 2023 FEDERAL PORTION BUDGET REQUEST ACT RECOMMENDATIONS

On March 16, 2022, Chairman Phil Mendelson introduced, at the request of Mayor Muriel Bowser, the following budget measures:

- [B24-0717](#), the “Fiscal Year 2022 Revised Local Budget Adjustment Emergency Act of 2022”/[B24-0718](#), the “Fiscal Year 2022 Revised Local Budget Adjustment Temporary Act of 2022”;
- [B24-0719](#), the “Fiscal Year 2022 Second Revised Local Budget Emergency Act of 2022”/[B24-0720](#), the “Fiscal Year 2022 Second Revised Local Budget Temporary Act of 2022”;
- [B24-0716](#), the “Fiscal Year 2023 Local Budget Act of 2022”; and
- [B24-0715](#), the “Fiscal Year 2023 Federal Portion Budget Request Act of 2022”.

The Committee makes the following recommendations on these measures, in addition to the budget recommendations found in the Committee Budget Adjustments Table (Attachment A).

***“Fiscal Year 2022 Revised Local Budget Emergency Act of 2022”/  
“Fiscal Year 2022 Revised Local Budget Temporary Act of 2022”***

The Committee is not making additional recommendations on this legislation.

***“Fiscal Year 2022 Second Revised Local Budget Emergency Act of 2022”/  
“Fiscal Year 2022 Second Revised Local Budget Temporary Act of 2022”***

The Committee is not making additional recommendations on this legislation.

***“Fiscal Year 2023 Local Budget Act of 2022”***

The Committee recommends that the Committee of the Whole identify:

1. Additional funding for the Access to Justice Initiative, as follows:
  - a. \$3 million recurring for the Civil Legal Counsel Projects Program; and
  - b. \$3 million recurring for Access to Justice grants;
2. An additional \$3 million in capital funding in FY23 to enhance the design budget for Project No. CRB01C (New Correctional Facility);
3. Additional recurring funding to supplement the Committee’s enhancements for victim services and reentry grants in the Office of Victim Services and

Justice Grants, including funding for capacity building for providers, domestic violence housing, and the District's network of Hospital-Based Violence Intervention Programs;

4. \$2 million to fund promotions at the Office of the Attorney General;
5. \$100,000 for the Criminal Justice Coordinating Council to fund community listening and work sessions to further develop its forthcoming gun violence prevention strategic plan;
6. Funding to support transitioning Cure the Streets sites from the Litigation Support Fund to local funds (at a cost of approximately \$834,000 in recurring dollars per site);
7. A new Youth Rehabilitation Act Coordinator FTE at the Department of Youth and Rehabilitation Services to support the coordination and implementation of the Youth Rehabilitation Act and the District-wide response to addressing the needs of emerging adults; and
8. A new Pro Bono Coordinator FTE in the Mayor's Office of Legal Counsel to pair with the Committee's Print of [B24-0298](#), the "Pro Bono Legal Representation Expansion Amendment Act of 2022".

***"Fiscal Year 2023 Federal Portion Budget Request Act of 2022"***

The Committee is not making additional recommendations on this legislation.

**III. FISCAL YEAR 2023 BUDGET SUPPORT ACT RECOMMENDATIONS**

On March 16, 2022, Chairman Phil Mendelson introduced, at the request of Mayor Muriel Bowser, [B24-0714](#), the “Fiscal Year 2023 Budget Support Act of 2022”. The bill contains three subtitles on which the Committee is providing recommendations. The Committee is also proposing nine new subtitles.

**A. RECOMMENDATIONS ON BUDGET SUPPORT ACT SUBTITLES  
PROPOSED BY THE MAYOR**

The Committee provides comments on the following subtitles of the “Fiscal Year 2023 Budget Support Act of 2022”, as proposed by the Mayor:

1. Title III. Subtitle A. Automated External Defibrillator Incentive Program . 53
2. Title III. Subtitle B. Emergency Medical Services Transport Contracts ..... 57
3. Title III. Subtitle D. School Safety and Security ..... 62

## 1. TITLE III. SUBTITLE A. AUTOMATED EXTERNAL DEFIBRILLATOR INCENTIVE PROGRAM

### a. Purpose, Effect, and Impact on Existing Law

As proposed, this subtitle would amend the Public Access to Automated External Defibrillator Act of 2000, effective April 27, 2001 (D.C. Law 13-278; D.C. Official Code § 7-2371.01 *et seq.*), to clarify the authority of the Fire and Emergency Medical Services Department (“FEMS”) to operate the District’s public automated external defibrillator (“AED”) program, including AED deployment strategies and coordination with District government agencies. Additionally, the subtitle would also authorize the Mayor to issue rebates to a property owner or lessee of a building in the District who purchases and installs an AED in a publicly-accessible location in the building and registers that AED with FEMS.

### b. Committee Reasoning

The Committee recommends adoption of this subtitle, with minor changes. Beginning in January 2011, FEMS began submitting cardiac arrest data to the Cardiac Arrest Registry to Enhance Survival (“CARES”), which is a national data registry that was developed to help communities determine standard outcome measures for out-of-hospital cardiac arrests and allow for quality improvement efforts and benchmarking capability to improve care and increase survival rates. FEMS is responsible for creating a record for each out-of-hospital cardiac arrest case in the District and entering seventy-seven data elements, while hospitals that receive cardiac arrest patients transported by FEMS are responsible for entering twenty-eight data elements. Clarifying FEMS’ role in the District’s public AED program will help the agency better collect the data needed for submission to CARES and develop strategies to increase cardiac arrest survival rates.

In the District, the survival rate for out-of-hospital cardiac arrests was about 4.6% in FY20.<sup>2</sup> FEMS has been a leader in attempting to increase cardiac survival rates and has done so by promoting the effectiveness of bystander CPR and public AED use. The rate of bystander intervention by CPR decreased dramatically during the COVID-19 public health emergency, as residents stayed indoors and were understandably worried about contracting COVID-19. As FEMS restarts its Hands on Hearts program to increase bystander intervention by CPR rates, the Committee commends its efforts to also focus on the need to expand the use of AEDs. The Committee understands that the use of an AED within minutes of an out-of-hospital cardiac arrest can dramatically increase the likelihood of survival, but AEDs are not as commonly used or readily available. The Committee heard testimony from FEMS at its budget oversight hearing that the incidence of cardiac arrest is higher in those

---

<sup>2</sup> *Fiscal Year 2020 Utstein Survival Report*, Fire and Emergency Medical Services Department (April 22, 2021), <https://fems.dc.gov/sites/default/files/dc/sites/fems/FY%202020%20Utstein%20Report.pdf>.

neighborhoods that also have the lowest number of AEDs. FEMS also testified that in FY21, there were 916 cardiac arrest incidents in the District, 83% of which occurred among Black residents.

Nonetheless, AEDs can cost about \$1,000 per unit, which can be prohibitively expensive for some landlords, places of worship, and small businesses across the District. FEMS testified that it will prioritize the purchase and installation of AEDs in those neighborhoods with the lowest number of AEDs, which are predominantly in Wards 1, 4, 5, 7, and 8. To incentivize the availability and use of AEDs, and therefore increase out-of-hospital cardiac arrest survival rates and advance racial equity, the Committee supports the creation of a rebate program to help property owners or lessees of buildings in the District purchase and install AEDs for public use.

**c. Section-by-Section Analysis**

Sec. XXX1. States the short title.

Sec. XXX2. Amends the Public Access to Automated External Defibrillator Act of 2000, effective April 27, 2001 (D.C. Law 13-278; D.C. Official Code § 7-2371.01 *et seq.*), to:

(a) Clarify FEMS' role in overseeing all efforts to improve and maintain access by the public to AEDs, and other minor changes; and

(b) Create the Automated External Defibrillator Incentive Program, which permits the Mayor to issue rebates not to exceed \$400 for each AED installed in a building, with a maximum rebate of up to \$750 per building, to a property owner or lessee who purchases and installs an AED in a publicly-accessible location in the interior of a building, registers the AED with FEMS, and submits a rebate claim that includes such information and documentation as may be required by the Mayor.

**d. Legislative Recommendations for the Committee of the Whole**

Sec. XXX1. Short title.

This subtitle may be cited as the “Automated External Defibrillator Incentive Program Amendment Act of 2022”.

Sec. XXX2. The Public Access to Automated External Defibrillator Act of 2000, effective April 27, 2001 (D.C. Law 13-278; D.C. Official Code § 7-2371.01 *et seq.*), is amended as follows:

(a) Section 3 (D.C. Official Code § 7-2371.02) is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (a) is amended as follows:



(A) Paragraph (2) is amended by striking the semicolon and inserting the phrase “; and” in its place.

(B) Paragraph (3) is repealed.

(C) Paragraph (4) is amended to read as follows:

“(4) Any person who uses an AED to provide emergency care or treatment on a person in cardiac arrest shall call 9-1-1 as soon as possible.”.

(2) A new subsection (b-1) is added to read as follows:

“(b-1) The Department shall:

“(1) Oversee all efforts to improve and maintain access by the public to AEDs, including by setting AED deployment strategies and liaising with District government agencies; and

“(2) Review each case in which an AED is used.”.

(3) Subsection (c) is amended by striking the phrase “Chief of the Fire and Emergency Medical Services Department (“Chief of the Department”) or his or her designee” and inserting the phrase “Chief of the Department, or the Chief’s designee,” in its place.

(b) A new section 5a is added to read as follows:

“Sec. 5a. Automated external defibrillator incentive program.

“(a) The Mayor may issue rebates to a property owner or lessee of a building in the District who, after October 1, 2022:

“(1) Purchases and installs an AED in a publicly accessible location in the interior of a building owned or leased by the property owner or lessee, respectively, within 150 feet from the building’s entrance;

“(2) Registers the AED with the Fire and Emergency Medical Services Department;

“(3) Submits a rebate claim that includes such information and documentation as may be required by the Mayor; and

“(4) Meets any additional requirements and criteria established by rules issued by the Mayor pursuant to section 6.

“(b)(1) The rebates issued pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall not exceed \$400 for each AED installed in a building, with a maximum rebate of up to \$750 per building.

“(2) Notwithstanding paragraph (1) of this subsection, the amount of a rebate shall not exceed the purchase price of the AED.

“(c) Rebates issued pursuant to this section shall:

“(1) Be contingent upon the availability of funds; and

“(2) Not be considered income for purposes of District income tax.”.

#### **e. Fiscal Impact**

The fiscal impact for this subtitle is included in the financial plan. FEMS’ proposed FY23 budget includes \$250,000 of recurring funding to provide rebates for the purchase and installation of AEDs in publicly accessible areas, in addition to

\$98,000 of recurring funding to hire one full-time employee to manage the new Automated External Defibrillator Incentive Program.

## **2. TITLE III. SUBTITLE B. EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES TRANSPORT CONTRACTS**

### **a. Purpose, Effect, and Impact on Existing Law**

As proposed, this subtitle would amend Section 1(d)-(g) of An Act To classify the officers and members of the fire department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, approved June 20, 1906 (34 Stat. 314; D.C. Official Code § 5-401(d)-(g)), to repeal the requirements that the Fire and Emergency Medical Services Department (“FEMS”) and third-party providers for basic life support (“BLS”) transport submit quarterly and biannual reports to the Council. Additionally, the subtitle would repeal Section 3073 of the Emergency Medical Services Transport Contract Authority Amendment Act of 2016, effective October 8, 2016 (D.C. Law 21-160; 63 DCR 10775), which sunsets FEMS’ authority to contract with a third-party provider for BLS transport on September 30, 2023. The subtitle would thereby allow FEMS to contract with American Medical Response (“AMR”), the District’s private third-party provider, in perpetuity.

As amended by the Committee, the subtitle would instead require the third-party provider to submit an annual report to the Council with information that is more readily obtainable and pertinent to the Committee’s oversight responsibilities. Additionally, the Committee’s subtitle would still require FEMS to provide an annual report to the Council with information that assesses its emergency medical services transport operations. The Committee maintains the repeal of the sunset clause on FEMS’ authority to contract with a third-party provider for BLS transport.

### **b. Committee Reasoning**

The Committee first granted FEMS the authority to contract with a third-party provider for BLS transport in the Fiscal Year 2017 Budget Support Act of 2016, effective October 8, 2016 (D.C. Law 21-160; 63 DCR 10775). At that time, FEMS was experiencing critical shortfalls and fundamental challenges with responding to calls for service. FEMS’ call volume far outpaced its resources and capability to respond, which put patients at risk. The goals for permitting a third-party arrangement for BLS transport were to stabilize FEMS and improve unit availability, response times, vehicle maintenance and repair, training for providers, and patient care.

The Committee has since seen FEMS make incredible improvements to stabilize its emergency medical services (“EMS”) operations. FEMS first entered into a fixed term price contract with AMR on October 11, 2016. The contract with AMR is still ongoing and has led to a cost-effective and efficient use of resources for low acuity patients, freeing up FEMS providers for more acute medical emergencies at a significantly reduced cost to the District.

On April 19, 2018, FEMS launched the Right Care, Right Now Nurse Triage Line (“NTL”). The goals of the NTL are to improve patients’ health outcomes and preserve FEMS resources for patients with life threatening injuries and illnesses. Under the NTL, individuals who call 9-1-1 may be transferred to a nurse if they call with non-emergency injuries or illnesses. The nurse then asks the caller questions and talks through the symptoms the caller is experiencing to determine what type of care is needed. The aim is to divert the caller to a community care clinic, urgent care clinic in the caller’s neighborhood, or to self-care, thereby safeguarding FEMS and hospital resources.

Since its launch four years ago, the NTL has been especially beneficial to FEMS and District residents. During a six-month period of the COVID-19 public health emergency in 2020, FEMS reported that more than 11% of EMS calls were sent to a nurse for further screening to determine if transport to a hospital emergency department was appropriate. The NTL has since expanded to include pediatrics and has proved instrumental to FEMS during a surge of COVID-19 cases in the District caused by the Omicron variant in the winter of 2021/2022. FEMS was able to divert approximately 20% of EMS calls to the NTL during this period when a significant number of its paramedics and emergency medical technicians were unable to report to work because they also became infected with or exposed to COVID-19. The Committee witnessed FEMS withstand a significant and potentially debilitating test of its EMS operations.

With these improvements and investments, the Committee believes that FEMS’ EMS capabilities have improved substantially due to its relationship with AMR. The Committee therefore now supports FEMS’ authority to contract with a third-party provider for BLS transports going forward. It is clear to the Committee that FEMS’ relationship with AMR is an integral component of FEMS’ overall EMS response today. Should the contracting authority be revoked, it would be exceedingly difficult for FEMS to develop the staff required to make up for the work of the third-party provider. FEMS would also have to significantly ramp up training facility space, encounter a labor market with a significant shortage of available healthcare providers, and approximately double its ambulance fleet. Nonetheless, if FEMS is to have this authority without a sunset, the Council must still be able to exercise its oversight responsibilities, and the Committee subtitle therefore reverses the repeal of the law’s reporting requirements and reinstates them, albeit in a modified format more applicable to the state of EMS today. Continued annual reporting by both FEMS and the third-party provider will ensure that proper Council oversight into EMS operations is not impeded.

### **c. Section-by-Section Analysis**

Sec. XXX1. States the short title.

- Sec. XXX2. Amends Section 1 of An Act To classify the officers and members of the fire department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, approved June 20, 1906 (34 Stat. 314; D.C. Official Code § 5-401), to:
- (a) Change the information required and the frequency of reports submitted to the Council by a third-party BLS provider;
  - (b) Repeal the requirement that FEMS submit a biannual report to the Council;
  - (c) Require FEMS to submit an annual report to the Council and specify the information to be included in such annual report;
  - (d) Repeal the requirement that the Office of Unified Communications submit a biannual report to the Council;
  - (e) Repeal the requirement that FEMS submit an annual report to the Council that evaluates performance under a contract with a third-party BLS provider; and
  - (f) Define the term “advanced life support”.
- Sec. XXX3. Repeals Section 3073 of the Emergency Medical Services Transport Contract Authority Amendment Act of 2016, effective October 8, 2016 (D.C. Law 21-160; 63 DCR 10775), thereby extending the ability of FEMS to contract with a third-party BLS provider in perpetuity.

**d. Legislative Recommendations for the Committee of the Whole**

Sec. XXX1. Short title.

This subtitle may be cited as the “Emergency Medical Services Transport Contracts Amendment Act of 2022”.

Sec. XXX2. Section 1 of An Act To classify the officers and members of the fire department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, approved June 20, 1906 (34 Stat. 314; D.C. Official Code § 5-401), is amended as follows:

(a) Subsection (d) is amended as follows:

(1) The lead-in language is amended by striking the phrase “a biannual” and inserting the phrase “an annual” in its place.

(2) Paragraph (3) is repealed.

(3) Paragraph (5) is repealed.

(4) Paragraph (6) is repealed.

(5) Paragraph (7) is amended to read as follows:

“(7) The range of third-party contractor ambulances available for Department use throughout a 24-hour period;”.

(6) Paragraph (9) is amended by striking the semicolon and inserting the phrase “; and” in its place.

(7) Paragraph (10) is amended by striking the semicolon and inserting a period in its place.

(8) Paragraph (11) is repealed.

(9) Paragraph (12) is repealed.

(b) Subsection (e) is repealed.

(c) A new subsection (e-1) is added to read as follows:

“(e-1) No later than January 31 of each year, the Mayor shall provide to the Council a report that includes the following information for the previous fiscal year:

“(1) The number of calls dispatched;

“(2) The number of patients transported via Department Basic Life Support, Advanced Life Support, and by the third-party contractor;

“(3) The average hospital drop time per month that the Department’s and the third-party contractor’s ambulances remained out of service while waiting to transfer the care of a patient to a healthcare facility;

“(4) The number of patients who used the Department’s transport service twice or more during the reporting period, including the number of times the patient used transport services during the previous 12 months;

“(5) The number of total in-service training hours provided to Department uniformed employees;

“(6) In-service time, or “up-time,” data for Department ambulances, engines, and ladder trucks;

“(7) Aggregate Department response time data;

“(8) Aggregate patient care and outcomes data;

“(9) Changes to protocols or policies to reroute non-emergency calls;

“(10) An assessment of the number of units, the number of personnel, the amount of training, and associated costs required to provide pre-hospital medical care and transportation without the use of third parties; and

“(11) Other key performance indicators and workload measures as appropriate.”.

(d) Subsection (f) is repealed.

(e) Subsection (g) is repealed.

(f) Subsection (h) is amended as follows:

(1) Paragraph (1) is redesignated as paragraph (1A).

(2) A new paragraph (1) is added to read as follows:

“(3) “Advanced life support” means a level of medical care provided by pre-hospital emergency medical services at the paramedic level and in accordance with the national scope of practice for an advanced level provider.”.

Sec. XXX3. Section 3073 of the Emergency Medical Services Transport Contract Authority Amendment Act of 2016, effective October 8, 2016 (D.C. Law 21-160; 63 DCR 10775), is repealed.

**e. Fiscal Impact**

The fiscal impact for this subtitle has been included in the financial plan. FEMS' FY23 proposed budget sufficiently funds its third-party BLS contract.

### 3. TITLE III. SUBTITLE D. SCHOOL SAFETY AND SECURITY

#### a. Purpose, Effect, and Impact on Existing Law

This proposed subtitle would repeal section 102(e) of the School Safety and Security Contracting Procedures Act of 2004, effective April 13, 2005 (D.C. Law 15-350; D.C. Official Code § 5-132.02(e)), which requires the Metropolitan Police Department's ("MPD") School Safety Division ("SSD") to gradually reduce its staffing levels beginning July 1, 2022 and completely cease operations by July 1, 2025. The proposed subtitle would thus re-establish SSD as a permanent division within MPD, with no sunset date on its operations and no limitations on its staffing levels.

#### b. Committee Reasoning

The Committee strikes this subtitle.

Councilmember Kevin Chavous introduced the School Safety and Security Contracting Procedures Act of 2004, effective April 13, 2005 (D.C. Law 15-350; 52 DCR 2005), in the wake of the killing of James Richardson, a Ballou Senior High School student.<sup>3</sup> Councilmember Chavous feared that "an increasing level of violence within DC public schools is an indication of an increasing level of youth and gang violence in District of Columbia neighborhoods" that is now "spilling into school buildings."<sup>4</sup> His proposal, then, was to "give direct supervision of school security to the chief law enforcement and security agency in the District, thereby insuring 'unity of command' for security throughout the city."<sup>5</sup> Then-City Administrator Robert Bobb, who at the public hearing on the bill testified on behalf of Mayor Williams, argued that:

"It makes sense that MPD, as the chief law enforcement and security agency in the District, should have direct supervision over school security. I firmly believe that unity of command is essential for a comprehensive approach to safety and security throughout the entire city."<sup>6</sup>

While the Committee on the Judiciary at the time ultimately approved the bill for passage, its report on the measure included important context. First, the committee report noted that the Committee "began its consideration of the issue of school security with the premise that where this function is housed within in the

---

<sup>3</sup> Committee on the Judiciary, Report on Bill 15-725, the "Metropolitan Police Department School Safety and Security Act of 2004" at 1 (June 23, 2004), [https://lims.dccouncil.us/downloads/LIMS/13287/Committee\\_Report/B15-0725-COMMITTEEREPORT.pdf](https://lims.dccouncil.us/downloads/LIMS/13287/Committee_Report/B15-0725-COMMITTEEREPORT.pdf) [hereinafter "Committee Report for Bill 15-725"].

<sup>4</sup> *Id.* at 4.

<sup>5</sup> *Id.* at 1.

<sup>6</sup> *Id.* at 4.



government is not nearly as important as how well the mission of providing safety and security to District of Columbia Public School (DCPS) students is achieved.”<sup>7</sup> This comment suggests that while MPD oversight of school security was, at the time, a model for school security on which the Mayor and Council reached consensus, there exist other frameworks for ensuring students are safe. Secondly, the Committee presciently highlighted a “great deal of legitimate concern . . . from students, parents[,] and educators” on SSD’s creation.<sup>8</sup> Specifically, community members feared “that giving MPD control over school security will result in a police state atmosphere within schools whereby students will be at constant risk of being arrested or mistreated by MPD officers.”<sup>9</sup> DCPS students testified that “putting police officers with guns inside schools would only lead to more tension and violence.”<sup>10</sup> Other witnesses at the public hearing “emphasized the need to combat violence within DC public schools by addressing its root causes, including poverty, the deteriorating family life of students, substance abuse and mental health problems, and other social ills,” and that the proposed creation of SSD was “a ‘band aid’ approach to solving these problems.”<sup>11</sup>

Nevertheless, the School Safety and Security Contracting Procedures Act of 2004, passed on December 21, 2004, established SSD with a primary focus on hiring, training, and deploying school resource officers to District of Columbia Public Schools (“DCPS”) schools.<sup>12</sup> SSD was also responsible for coordinating resources and sharing information between MPD and “school-specific safety teams,” as well as providing recommendations to the “Mayor, Council, and the DCPS Chancellor regarding the impact of school closings, consolidations, grade reconfigurations, use of swing space during school reconstruction, and gang and crew violence on the safety and well-being of children.”<sup>13</sup> The School Safe Passage Emergency Zone Amendment Act of 2010 extended SSD’s duties to also cover public charter schools.<sup>14</sup>

However, since SSD was created, the expectations surrounding, and the appetite for, police in schools have undergone significant change, as discussed at length last year. For example, the Council’s Police Reform Commission (“PRC”), first established by the Comprehensive Policing and Justice Reform Second Emergency Amendment Act of 2020, effective July 22, 2020 (D.C. Act 23-0336; 67 DCR 9148), issued a report critical of police in schools:

---

<sup>7</sup> *Id.* at 3.

<sup>8</sup> *Id.* at 4.

<sup>9</sup> *Id.*

<sup>10</sup> *Id.* at 5.

<sup>11</sup> *Id.*

<sup>12</sup> School Safety and Security Contracting Procedures Act of 2004, effective April 13, 2005 (D.C. Law 15-350; 52 DCR 2005), <https://lims.dccouncil.us/Legislation/B15-0725>; D.C. Official Code § 5–132.02.

<sup>13</sup> D.C. Official Code § 5–132.02(c).

<sup>14</sup> School Safe Passage Emergency Zone Amendment Act of 2010, effective October 2, 2010 (D.C. Law 18-232; 57 DCR 4504).

“The daily presence of police officers in schools is antithetical to environments meant to foster learning and positive development. Youth of color in particular often do not feel comfortable, valued, or safe in educational spaces where they are interacting with representatives of a system that generally views Black and Brown people as a threat. Indeed, a panel of youth told this Commission that instead of fostering safety in school, officers often escalate altercations, create a hostile atmosphere, and cause anxiety among young people by their mere presence, especially since they carry guns.”<sup>15</sup>

The PRC recommended that the District “replace police, who, by design, are trained primarily in coercion and crime control, with professionals who are skilled and trained in helping young people navigate the opportunities and challenges of life in the classroom, schoolyard, and beyond.” Notably, Robert Bobb, who had testified on behalf of Mayor Williams in support of the School Safety and Security Contracting Procedures Act of 2004, served as co-chair of the PRC. In light of the PRC’s recommendations and similar demands from a wide group of stakeholders during the June 10, 2021 budget oversight hearing for MPD, the Committee approved a subtitle for inclusion in the Fiscal Year 2022 Budget Support Act of 2021, effective November 14, 2021 (D.C. Law 24-45; 68 DCR 10163), that would responsibly scale down police from DCPS and public charter schools.

Specifically, that subtitle – the Reducing Law Enforcement Presence in Schools Amendment Act of 2021 – required that SSD annually reduce its staffing levels and cease operations by July 1, 2025. Under the statute, SSD’s sworn and civilian staffing would be capped at 60 personnel by July 1, 2022, 40 personnel by July 1, 2023, and 20 personnel by July 1, 2024. By July 1, 2025, SSD would dissolve completely, and MPD would no longer staff DCPS and public charter schools with school resource officers. The Mayor’s proposed subtitle would now reverse course only a few months later by repealing these target dates for reduced staffing and allowing the SSD to exist in perpetuity.

The Committee proposed the gradual dissolution of SSD in response to both the PRC’s recommendation to remove police from schools and a groundswell of support that has since crystallized around that proposal. Unfortunately, even as late as February 2022 – with less than five months before the first deadline for reduced staffing – key stakeholders felt frustrated by the lack of communication from MPD regarding the phaseout. At the February 17, 2022 performance oversight hearing for MPD, Shannon Hodge of the D.C. Charter School Alliance lamented that “charter school leaders have not received any official communication about those cuts or how those cuts will affect their school communities, leaving them little time to plan for

---

<sup>15</sup> D.C. Police Reform Commission, *Decentering Police to Improve Public Safety: A Report of the DC Police Reform Commission* at 17 (April 1, 2021), <https://dccouncil.us/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/Police-Reform-Commission-Full-Report.pdf> [hereinafter “PRC Report”].

the type of staffing and programmatic shifts that such a change will create.” At the same hearing, Danielle Robinette, speaking on behalf of the Children’s Law Center, voiced similar concerns, stating that it “is unclear if schools have been consulted on the redistribution plan or if school leaders are aware what the plan is.”

Nevertheless, during the Committee’s March 30, 2022 MPD budget oversight hearing, Chief Contee reassured the Committee that MPD “is on pace right now to be in compliance with . . . the legislation to reduce the size of the School Safety Division.” Several public witnesses later reiterated their support for removing police from schools. For example, Danielle Robinette testified that “schools should be a safe space where students can learn and grow in a trauma-informed environment that supports their educational and socio-emotional learning goals.”

In the face of continued public support for decentering the role of police in schools, and without evidence from the Executive to the contrary, the Committee sees no reason to reverse course on a policy decision the Council so recently unanimously made. Furthermore, the Committee encourages MPD to proactively communicate its plans to, and work more closely with, District schools.

**c. Fiscal Impact**

This subtitle, as proposed, does not have a fiscal impact.

**B. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR NEW BUDGET SUPPORT ACT SUBTITLES**

The Committee recommends that the following nine new subtitles be included in the “Fiscal Year 2023 Budget Support Act of 2022”:

1. Title –. Subtitle –. Access to Justice Initiative ..... 67
2. Title –. Subtitle –. Attorney General Civil Investigations Clarification ..... 69
3. Title –. Subtitle –. Comprehensive Cognitive Health Training for First Responders ..... 75
4. Title –. Subtitle –. Criminal Code Reform Commission ..... 80
5. Title –. Subtitle –. Metropolitan Police Department Budget and Staffing Transparency ..... 85
6. Title –. Subtitle –. Office of Unified Communications Telecommunicator CPR Program ..... 91
7. Title –. Subtitle –. Office of Victim Services and Justice Grants Transparency ..... 94
8. Title –. Subtitle –. Special Education Attorneys for Emerging Adult Defendants ..... 99
9. Title –. Subtitle –. Subject-to-Appropriations Repeals and Modifications ... 104

## 1. TITLE –. SUBTITLE –. ACCESS TO JUSTICE INITIATIVE

### a. Purpose, Effect, and Impact on Existing Law

This subtitle would amend the Access to Justice Initiative Establishment Act of 2010, effective September 14, 2011 (D.C. Law 19-21; D.C. Official Code § 4-1701.01 *et seq.*), to make minor changes to the statute for the District’s Access to Justice Initiative (“ATJI”) and Loan Repayment Assistance for Poverty Lawyers (“LRAP”) Program.

### b. Committee Reasoning

The Committee’s subtitle makes three changes to the statute. First, the subtitle ensures that the Access to Justice Initiative – like its sister funds for the Civil Legal Counsel Projects Program and the LRAP – is non-lapsing. Second, the subtitle raises the LRAP participant income cap from \$90,000 to \$100,000 to account for inflation and the rising cost of living in the District. This increase will also help ensure senior attorneys who are so critical to the District’s civil legal services providers remain in public interest positions as they advance in their careers and salaries. Third, the subtitle allows the D.C. Bar Foundation, which administers the LRAP, to award monthly assistance in excess of \$1,000 per month (the current cap) to those LRAP participants whose loans would be ineligible for Public Service Loan Forgiveness, either because they are private loans or do not otherwise meet the federal guidelines but still meet the LRAP’s criteria. All three changes were made in consultation with the D.C. Bar Foundation.

### c. Section-by-Section Analysis

Sec. XXX1. States the short title.

Sec. XXX2. Amends the Access to Justice Initiative Establishment Act of 2010, effective September 14, 2011 (D.C. Law 19-21; D.C. Official Code § 4-1701.01 *et seq.*), to:

(a) Ensure the budget for the ATJI is non-lapsing;

(b) Adjust the maximum income cap for participants in the LRAP;  
and

(c) Raise the per-month loan repayment assistance payment cap under limited circumstances.

**d. Legislative Recommendations for the Committee of the Whole**

Sec. XXX1. Short title.

This subtitle may be cited as the “Access to Justice Initiative Amendment Act of 2022”.

Sec. XXX2. The Access to Justice Initiative Establishment Act of 2010, effective September 14, 2011 (D.C. Law 19-21; D.C. Official Code § 4-1701.01 *et seq.*), is amended as follows:

(a) Section 301(a) (D.C. Official Code § 4-1703.01(a)) is amended by striking the phrase “budget for ATJ.” and inserting the phrase “budget for ATJ, shall be nonlapsing, and interest earned by the Bar Foundation on grant funds shall remain available for use by the Bar Foundation for the purposes of the Initiative, without fiscal year limitation.” in its place.

(b) Section 403 (D.C. Official Code § 4-1704.03) is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (a)(4) is amended by striking the phrase “less than “\$90,000”” and inserting the phrase “less than \$100,000” in its place.

(2) Subsection (b) is amended as follows:

(A) Strike the phrase “in his or her” and insert the phrase “in the law student’s” in its place.

(B) Strike the phrase “that he or she” and insert the phrase “that the applicant” in its place.

(c) Section 404(c) (D.C. Official Code § 4-1704.04(c)) is amended to read as follows:

“(c) Participants in the LRAP shall not receive loan repayment assistance under the LRAP in excess of \$1,000 for a single month; except, that:

“(1) The Office of Victim Services and Justice Grants may by rulemaking increase the award limits in this subsection to reflect changes in reasonable education expenses; and

“(2) The Bar Foundation may use the funds to repay any or all of the loan principal or interest of those applicants whose loans would not otherwise be eligible for Public Service Loan Forgiveness.”.

**e. Fiscal Impact**

The fiscal impact for this subtitle has been included in the financial plan. The LRAP can absorb the Committee’s adjustment to the payment cap, and the Committee has also identified one-time funding, should the D.C. Bar Foundation wish to exercise its enhanced monthly assistance authority.

## 2. TITLE –. SUBTITLE –. ATTORNEY GENERAL CIVIL INVESTIGATIONS CLARIFICATION

### a. Purpose, Effect, and Impact on Existing Law

This subtitle amends Chapter 39 of Title 28 of the District of Columbia Official Code and the Attorney General for the District of Columbia Clarification and Elected Term Amendment Act of 2010, effective May 27, 2010 (D.C. Law 18-160; D.C. Official Code § 1-301.81 *et seq.*), to authorize the Office of the Attorney General (“OAG”) to use written questions with sworn responses to investigate consumer protection violations and financial exploitation of elders and vulnerable adults.

### b. Committee Reasoning

OAG’s investigations of consumer fraud and financial abuse enable it to uncover wrongdoing that harms District residents. For example, OAG has brought consumer protection cases for price gouging during the pandemic, for landlords’ misrepresentations about their compliance with anti-discrimination laws, and for violations of Facebook users’ data privacy. And OAG’s elder abuse investigations have uncovered proof that, for instance, a property manager at a senior residential building had stolen more than \$100,000 from residents to pay for luxury shopping sprees and that a local man had siphoned more than \$50,000 from his elderly neighbor by taking a so-called loan and never paying him back.

Currently, OAG has authority to investigate violations of the Consumer Protection Procedures Act (CPPA), D.C. Code § 28-3901 *et seq.*, and portions of the Abuse, Neglect, and Financial Exploitation of Vulnerable Adults and the Elderly Act, §§ 22-937, 22-938, using statutorily prescribed methods. These methods consist of subpoenas for the production of documents and materials and the taking of sworn, in-person testimony from witnesses.<sup>16</sup> Although these are powerful tools, investigations that rely solely on subpoenas and live testimony can be incredibly expensive and cumbersome, often requiring extensive staff time to review reams of documents. For example, OAG recently brought suit against Grubhub for charging hidden fees and misleading District residents about support for local restaurants at the height of the pandemic. OAG’s investigation spanned nine months and four separate subpoenas that produced more than 4,000 pages of documents. The investigation was repeatedly delayed due to Grubhub’s need for more time to gather responsive documents, and it ultimately required the devoted attention of three attorneys to gather the necessary information.

In contrast, when investigating other types of violations, such as under the False Claims Act and the District’s antitrust laws, OAG is authorized to use targeted written questions to uncover wrongdoing. In those instances, OAG can issue written

---

<sup>16</sup> D.C. Official Code §§ 28-3910, 1-301.88d, 1-301.88e.

questions to businesses and individuals, who must respond with sworn written answers.<sup>17</sup> These written questions, known as interrogatories, enable OAG to establish basic facts – like the number of workers at a particular business or an individual’s dates of employment – without having to rely on time-consuming and expensive document review.

Authorizing written questions in consumer fraud and financial exploitation investigations will allow OAG to curb demands for additional staff and increased agency resources necessary to undertake these inquiries.

**c. Section-by-Section Analysis**

Sec. XXX1. States the short title.

Sec. XXX2. Amends Chapter 39 of Title 28 of the District of Columbia Official Code to:

(a) Allow the Attorney General to require sworn answers in writing to written interrogatories in consumer protection matters and prescribe for types of service; and

(b) Clarify that the Attorney General has related rulemaking authority that falls within its jurisdiction.

Sec. XXX3. Amends the Attorney General for the District of Columbia Clarification and Elected Term Amendment Act of 2010, effective May 27, 2010 (D.C. Law 18-160; D.C. Official Code § 1-301.81 *et seq.*), to:

(a) Make corresponding changes to the Attorney General’s authority to require sworn answers in writing to written interrogatories in investigations into unfair, deceptive, unconscionable, or fraudulent trade practices by or between a merchant or consumer, prescribe for types of service, and authorize the Attorney General to seek fines for refusal to comply and costs of the action and reasonable attorneys’ fees; and

(b) Provide similar authority in cases of criminal abuse and neglect of vulnerable adults.

---

<sup>17</sup> D.C. Official Code §§ 2-381.07, 28-4505.



**d. Legislative Recommendations for the Committee of the Whole**

Sec. XXX1. Short title.

This subtitle may be cited as the “Attorney General Civil Investigations Clarification Amendment Act of 2022”.

Sec. XXX2. Chapter 39 of Title 28 of the District of Columbia Official Code is amended as follows:

(a) Section 28-3910 is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (a) is amended to read as follows:

“(a)(1) In the course of an investigation to determine whether to seek relief under § 28-3909, the Attorney General for the District of Columbia may:

“(A) Subpoena witnesses;

“(B) Administer oaths;

“(C) Examine an individual under oath;

“(D) Require sworn answers in writing to written interrogatories;

and

“(E) Compel production of records, books, papers, contracts, and other documents, verified by a sworn certificate of completion.

“(2) Service of any document issued pursuant to this section may be made by mail, electronic mail, or any other method reasonably calculated to give actual notice; provided, that the Superior Court of the District of Columbia may exercise jurisdiction over the recipient to compel a response consistent with the due process clause of the United States Constitution.

“(3) Information or evidence obtained under this section shall not be admissible in a later criminal proceeding against the person who provides the information or evidence, except with respect to sworn statements that are themselves the basis for a subsequent perjury prosecution.”.

(2) Subsection (b) is amended to read as follows:

“(b) A subpoena or request for interrogatories issued pursuant to subsection (a)(1) of this section shall be issued in accordance with section 110a of the Attorney General for the District of Columbia Clarification and Elected Term Amendment Act of 2010, effective October 22, 2015 (D.C. Law 21-36; D.C. Official Code § 1-301.88d).”.

(b) Section 28-3913 is amended by striking the phrase “rules necessary to carry out this chapter” and inserting the phrase “rules concerning matters under the jurisdiction of subordinate agencies that are necessary to carry out this chapter. The Attorney General may issue rules concerning matters under its jurisdiction that are necessary to carry out this chapter.” in its place.

Sec. XXX3. The Attorney General for the District of Columbia Clarification and Elected Term Amendment Act of 2010, effective May 27, 2010 (D.C. Law 18-160; D.C. Official Code § 1-301.81 *et seq.*), is amended as follows:

(a) Section 110a (D.C. Official Code § 1-301.88d) is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (a) is amended to read as follows:

“(a)(1) In an investigation into unfair, deceptive, unconscionable, or fraudulent trade practices by or between a merchant or consumer, as defined in D.C. Official Code § 28-3901, the Attorney General or the Attorney General’s designee may:

“(A) Subpoena witnesses;

“(B) Administer oaths;

“(C) Examine an individual under oath;

“(D) Require sworn answers in writing to written interrogatories;

and

“(E) Compel production of records, books, papers, contracts, and other documents, verified by a sworn certificate of completion.

“(2) Service of any document issued pursuant to this section may be made by mail, electronic mail, or any other method reasonably calculated to give actual notice; provided, that the Superior Court of the District of Columbia may exercise jurisdiction over the recipient to compel a response consistent with the due process clause of the United States Constitution.”.

(2) Subsection (b) is amended by striking the phrase “Subpoenas issued” and inserting the phrase “Subpoenas or requests for interrogatories issued” in its place.

(3) Subsection (d) is amended to read as follows:

“(d) In the case of refusal to comply fully with a subpoena or request for interrogatories issued pursuant to this section or § 28-3910, the Attorney General may petition the Superior Court of the District of Columbia for an order requiring compliance and, where appropriate, imposing a fine payable to the District. In assessing any fine for incomplete or inadequate compliance with the subpoena, the court shall consider the income and assets of the person or entity being fined to ensure that the monetary fine meaningfully deters inadequate compliance. Any failure to obey the order of the court may be treated by the court as contempt.”.

(4) Subsection (e) is amended as follows:

“(e) Any person to whom a subpoena or request for interrogatories has been issued pursuant to this section or § 28-3910 may exercise the privileges enjoyed by all witnesses, and may move to quash or modify the subpoena or request for interrogatories in the Superior Court of the District of Columbia on grounds including:

“(1) The Attorney General failed to follow or satisfy the procedures set forth in this section; or

“(2) Any grounds that exist under statute or common law for quashing or modifying a subpoena or request for interrogatories.”.

(5) A new subsection (f) is added to read as follows:

“(f) In any action in the Superior Court of the District of Columbia pertaining to a subpoena or a request for interrogatories issued pursuant to this section, the Attorney General shall be entitled to recover the costs of the action and reasonable attorneys’ fees.”.

(b) Section 110b (D.C. Official Code § 1-301.88e) is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (a) is amended to read as follows:

“(a)(1) Notwithstanding section 110a, and subject to the requirements of this section, for the purposes of seeking relief under sections 207 and 208 of the Criminal Abuse and Neglect of Vulnerable Adults Act of 2000, effective November 23, 2016 (D.C. Law 21-166; D.C. Official Code §§ 22-937 and 22-938), the Attorney General or the Attorney General’s designee may:

“(A) Subpoena witnesses;

“(B) Administer oaths;

“(C) Examine an individual under oath;

“(D) Require sworn answers in writing to written interrogatories;

and

“(E) Compel production of records, books, papers, contracts, and other documents, verified by a sworn certificate of completion.

“(2) Service of any document issued pursuant to this section may be made by mail, electronic mail, or any other method reasonably calculated to give actual notice; provided, that the Superior Court of the District of Columbia may exercise jurisdiction over the recipient to compel a response consistent with the due process clause of the United States Constitution.”.

(2) Subsection (b) is amended as follows:

(A) Paragraph (1) is amended by striking the phrase “Subpoena authority” and inserting the word “Authority” in its place.

(B) Paragraph (2) is amended by striking the phrase “subpoena authority” and inserting the word “authority” in its place.

(3) Subsection (c) is amended by striking the phrase “the authority to issue a subpoena” and inserting the word “authority” in its place.

(4) Subsection (d) is amended by striking the phrase “The power to issue subpoenas” and inserting the word “Powers” in its place.

(5) Subsection (e) is amended by striking the word “Subpoenas” and inserting the phrase “Subpoenas and requests for interrogatories” in its place.

(6) Subsection (g) is amended to read as follows:

“(g) In the case of refusal to obey a subpoena or request for interrogatories issued under this section, the Attorney General may petition the Superior Court of the District of Columbia for an order requiring compliance, and, where appropriate, imposing a fine payable to the District. Any refusal to obey the order of the court may be treated by the court as contempt. In any action in the Superior Court of the District of Columbia pertaining to a subpoena issued under this section, the Attorney General shall be entitled to recover the costs of the action and reasonable attorneys’ fees.”.

(7) Subsection (h) is amended to read as follows:

“(h) Any person to whom a subpoena or request for interrogatories has been issued pursuant to this section may exercise the privileges enjoyed by all witnesses, and may move to quash or modify the subpoena or request for interrogatories in the Superior Court of the District of Columbia on grounds including:

“(1) The Attorney General failed to follow or satisfy the procedures set forth in this section:

“(2) The Attorney General lacked the authority to issue the subpoena or request for interrogatories under this section; or

“(3) Any other grounds that exist under statute or common law for quashing or modifying a subpoena or request for interrogatories.”.

**e. Fiscal Impact**

The fiscal impact for this subtitle has been included in the financial plan.

### **3. TITLE -. SUBTITLE -. COMPREHENSIVE COGNITIVE HEALTH TRAINING FOR FIRST RESPONDERS**

#### **a. Purpose, Effect, and Impact on Existing Law**

This subtitle would amend Title II of the Omnibus Police Reform Amendment Act of 2000, effective October 4, 2000 (D.C. Law 13-160; D.C. Official Code § 5-107.01 *et seq.*), to require the Metropolitan Police Department (“MPD”) to develop and operate a training program, in coordination with the Department of Health, the Department of Aging and Community Living, and the Office of Attorney General, that includes initial instruction and continuing education on identifying, and interacting with individuals living with, Alzheimer’s and other dementias, and risks such individuals face, like wandering and elder abuse.

This subtitle would also amend the Omnibus Public Safety Agency Reform Amendment Act of 2004 (D.C. Law 15-194; D.C. Official Code § 5-441) to require the Fire and Emergency Medical Services Department (“FEMS”) to develop and provide initial instruction and continuing education on best practices for identifying, and interacting with individuals living with, Alzheimer’s and other dementias, and risks such individuals face, like wandering and elder abuse. The development of initial instruction and continuing education may be inclusive of training already provided by FEMS and similarly requires coordination with the Department of Health, the Department of Aging and Community Living, and the Office of Attorney General.

#### **b. Committee Reasoning**

In the District, it is estimated that approximately 8,900 individuals aged 65 and older are living with Alzheimer’s Disease.<sup>18</sup> Prevalence studies have shown that older Black residents are about twice as likely to have Alzheimer’s or other dementias as older White residents.<sup>19</sup> The characteristic symptoms of Alzheimer’s Disease or other dementias are difficulties with memory, language, problem-solving, and other thinking skills.<sup>20</sup> Individuals with Alzheimer’s or other dementias may exhibit behaviors that could invite encounters with law enforcement or other first responders, such as: wandering; showing signs of anxiety, fear, or hostility; making a false claim; engaging in indecent exposure; and shoplifting.<sup>21</sup> Residents with Alzheimer’s or other dementias could also be victims of elder abuse, but may unaware they are victims and may not know how to – or be able to – report it.<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> *Washington, DC – State Overview*, Alzheimer’s Association, <https://www.alz.org/professionals/public-health/state-overview/washington-d-c>.

<sup>19</sup> *2022 Alzheimer’s Disease Facts and Figures*, Alzheimer’s Association, at 25, <https://www.alz.org/media/Documents/alzheimers-facts-and-figures.pdf>.

<sup>20</sup> *Id.* at 5.

<sup>21</sup> *Fact Sheet: Dementia Training for First Responders*, Alzheimer’s Impact Movement (Mar. 2020), <https://alzimpact.org/media/serve/id/62509d151b706>.

<sup>22</sup> *Id.*

When confronted by law enforcement or other first responders, individuals with Alzheimer's or other dementias may present as uncooperative, disruptive, and combative when they have difficulty communicating and understanding what is happening during the interaction.<sup>23</sup> Furthermore, law enforcement and other first responders may not be aware that they are interacting with an individual with Alzheimer's or other dementias, potentially leading to more confusion and escalation.<sup>24</sup> For example, in June 2020, Karen Garner, a resident of Loveland, Colorado with dementia, walked out of a Walmart store without paying for her items.<sup>25</sup> The employees of the store took the merchandise that Ms. Garner had taken, valued at \$13.88, and called the police.<sup>26</sup> As Ms. Garner was walking home, police found her, threw her to the ground to arrest her, and placed her in jail.<sup>27</sup> Ms. Garner suffered a dislocated and fractured shoulder as a result of this use of force.<sup>28</sup>

Required training for law enforcement and other first responders on the best practices for identifying, and interacting with individuals living with, Alzheimer's or other dementias, and risks such individuals face, is an important and effective way to prevent a situation that Ms. Garner faced in Colorado from occurring here in the District. Additionally, training will help law enforcement and first responders recognize symptoms of Alzheimer's and other dementias, understand behavioral changes so they can tailor and choose the most appropriate response, communicate effectively, and refer the individual to the best available community resources.

The Committee understands that MPD does not currently address Alzheimer's or other dementias in its training curriculum. FEMS, on the other hand, does address Alzheimer's or other dementias through course material provided to recruits and through continuing education hours requirements for existing members. The Committee looks forward to working with MPD to ensure this important training is implemented and provided to all sworn members. The Committee also intends for this subtitle to strengthen and reinforce any existing training curriculum or continuing education at FEMS. The Committee is cognizant that members of both MPD and FEMS must internalize training on a variety of subjects and hopes MPD and FEMS develop or perfect their training regimen in a way that makes this training the most impactful for members and District residents living with Alzheimer's or other dementias.

---

<sup>23</sup> *Id.*

<sup>24</sup> *Id.*

<sup>25</sup> Shelly Bradbury, *Loveland agrees to \$3 million settlement over violent arrest of 73-year-old with dementia*, Denver Post (Sept. 8, 2021), <https://www.denverpost.com/2021/09/08/loveland-karen-garner-settlement-police-brutality/>.

<sup>26</sup> *Id.*

<sup>27</sup> *Id.*

<sup>28</sup> *Id.*

**c. Section-by-Section Analysis**

Sec. XXX1. States the short title.

Sec. XXX2. Amends Title II of the Omnibus Police Reform Amendment Act of 2000, effective October 4, 2000 (D.C. Law 15-205; D.C. Official Code § 1-327.51 *et seq.*), to:

(a) Require MPD to provide continuing education to best practices for identifying, and interacting with individuals living with, Alzheimer's or other dementias, and risks such individuals face, like wandering and elder abuse; and

(b) Require MPD to develop and operate a training program, in coordination with the Department of Health, the Department of Aging and Community Living, and the Office of Attorney General that includes initial training to be completed after appointment and continuing education covering subjects related to identifying and interacting with individuals living with Alzheimer's or other dementias.

Sec. XXX3. Amends Section 202 of the Omnibus Public Safety Agency Reform Amendment Act of 2004 (D.C. Law 15-194; D.C. Official Code § 5-441), to require FEMS to develop and provide training, in coordination with the Department of Health, the Department of Aging and Community Living, and the Office of Attorney General that includes initial training to be completed after appointment and continuing education covering subjects related to identifying and interacting with individuals living with Alzheimer's or other dementias.

**d. Legislative Recommendations for the Committee of the Whole**

Sec. XXX1. Short title.

This subtitle may be cited as the "Comprehensive Cognitive Health Training for First Responders Amendment Act of 2022".

Sec. XXX2. Title II of the Omnibus Police Reform Amendment Act of 2000, effective October 4, 2000 (D.C. Law 13-160; D.C. Official Code § 5-107.01 *et seq.*), is amended as follows:

(a) Section 203 (D.C. Official Code § 5-107.02) is amended as follows:

(1) Paragraph (5) is amended by striking the phrase "; and" and inserting a semicolon in its place.

(2) Paragraph (6) is amended by striking the period and inserting the phrase “; and” in its place.

(3) A new paragraph (7) is added to read as follows:

“(7) Best practices for identifying, and interacting with individuals living with, Alzheimer’s and other dementias, and risks such individuals face, like wandering and elder abuse.”.

(b) Section 205 (D.C. Official Code § 5-107.04) is amended by adding a new subsection (f-1) to read as follows:

“(f-1) The Board shall develop and operate a training program, in coordination with the Department of Health, the Department of Aging and Community Living, and the Office of the Attorney General, that:

“(1) Includes instruction on best practices for identifying, and interacting with individuals living with, Alzheimer’s and other dementias, and risks such individuals face, like wandering and elder abuse;

“(2) Requires an initial training to be completed after appointment that covers the following topics, including:

“(A) Neurological, psychiatric, and behavioral symptoms of Alzheimer’s and other dementias;

“(B) Communication issues, including how to communicate respectfully and effectively with individuals living with Alzheimer’s or other dementias in order to determine the most appropriate response, and effective communication techniques to enhance collaboration with caregivers;

“(C) Techniques for understanding and approaching behavioral symptoms and identifying alternatives to physical restraints;

“(D) Identifying and reporting incidents of abuse, neglect, and exploitation to Adult Protective Services;

“(E) Protocols for contacting caregivers when an individual living with Alzheimer’s or other dementias is found wandering, or during emergency or crisis situations; and

“(F) Local caregiving resources that are available for individuals living with Alzheimer’s or other dementias; and

“(3) Requires continuing education covering the subjects described in paragraph (2) of this subsection.”.

Sec. XXX3. Section 202 of the Omnibus Public Safety Agency Reform Amendment Act of 2004 (D.C. Law 15-194; D.C. Official Code § 5-441), is amended by adding new subsections (d) and (e) to read as follows:

“(d) The Fire Chief, in close coordination with the Medical Director, shall develop and provide for members of the Operations Division instruction on best practices for identifying, and interacting with individuals living with, Alzheimer’s and other dementias, and risks such individuals face, like wandering and elder abuse. Such instruction may be inclusive of existing or planned curricula required by licensing or certifying bodies; provided, that the curriculum:

“(1) Requires initial training to be completed after appointment that covers the following topics, including:



“(A) Neurological, psychiatric, and behavioral symptoms of Alzheimer’s and other dementias;

“(B) Communication issues, including how to communicate respectfully and effectively with individuals living with Alzheimer’s or other dementias in order to determine the most appropriate response, and effective communication techniques to enhance collaboration with caregivers;

“(C) Techniques for understanding and approaching behavioral symptoms and identifying alternatives to physical restraints;

“(D) Identifying and reporting incidents of abuse, neglect, and exploitation to Adult Protective Services;

“(E) Protocols for contacting caregivers when an individual living with Alzheimer’s or other dementias is found wandering, or during emergency or crisis situations; and

“(F) Local caregiving resources that are available for individuals living with Alzheimer’s or other dementias; and

“(2) Requires continuing education covering the subjects described in paragraph (1) of this subsection.

“(e) The Fire Chief, in close coordination with the Medical Director, shall, in developing the curriculum described in subsection (d) of this section, coordinate with the Department of Health, the Department of Aging and Community Living, and the Office of the Attorney General.”.

**e. Fiscal Impact**

The fiscal impact for this subtitle has been included in proposed budgets of both MPD and FEMS.

#### 4. TITLE -. SUBTITLE -. CRIMINAL CODE REFORM COMMISSION

##### a. Purpose, Effect, and Impact on Existing Law

This subtitle amends the District of Columbia Government Comprehensive Merit Personnel Act of 1978, effective March 3, 1979 (D.C. Law 2-139; D.C. Official Code § 1-604.06(b)(25)), and the Criminal Code Reform Commission Establishment Act of 2016, effective October 8, 2016 (D.C. Law 21-160; D.C. Official Code § 3-151 *et seq.*), to modify the process for selecting, and setting the salary for, the executive director of the Criminal Code Reform Commission (“CCRC”). Current law requires that the Council set the executive director’s salary through legislation. This subtitle instead designates the Chairman of the Council as the personnel authority for the CCRC’s executive director who would, in turn serve as the personnel authority for any other CCRC staff. The subtitle also makes several clarifying, but non-substantive, changes to the CCRC’s structure and authority.

##### b. Committee Reasoning

Current law requires that the executive director of the CCRC be appointed by Chairman of the Council for a term of 3 years, and that the executive director “be paid a rate of compensation as may be established from time to time by the Council.”<sup>29</sup> At the same time, however, the D.C. Code also states that “the personnel authority is the Criminal Code Reform Commission.”<sup>30</sup> Read together, the Committee interprets these provisions as requiring the Council to set the salary for the CCRC’s executive director who may, in turn, acting on behalf of the CCRC, determine the salaries for CCRC’s staff. Richard Schmechel served as the CCRC’s executive director since the CCRC began operating on October 8, 2016, and he resigned from his position effective March 26, 2022. In that time, his salary was initially set by the Council in 2016 but was not revisited in the intervening years.<sup>31</sup>

On April 5, 2022, the Council passed emergency and temporary legislation confirming the Chairman’s appointment of Jinwoo Park as CCRC’s next executive director. At the same time, the Council also readjusted Mr. Park’s salary to \$170,000, inclusive of fringe, on an emergency and temporary basis.<sup>32</sup> The awkwardness of the Council itself publicly setting an agency director’s salary without any opportunity to revise it without further legislative action over time compels the need to revise the

---

<sup>29</sup> D.C. Official Code § 3-151(c).

<sup>30</sup> D.C. Official Code § 1-604.06(b)(25).

<sup>31</sup> See Criminal Code Reform Commission Executive Director Salary Emergency Act of 2016, effective October 31, 2016 (D.C. Act 21-526; 63 DCR 13607), [https://lims.dccouncil.us/downloads/LIMS/36587/Signed\\_Act/B21-0907-SignedAct.pdf](https://lims.dccouncil.us/downloads/LIMS/36587/Signed_Act/B21-0907-SignedAct.pdf).

<sup>32</sup> See the Executive Director of the Criminal Code Reform Commission Jinwoo Park Emergency Appointment Resolution of 2022, approved April 5, 2022 (enrolled version of PR24-433), <https://lims.dccouncil.us/downloads/LIMS/49264/Introduction/PR24-0675-Introduction.pdf>.

statute. The Committee anticipates that with such a complicated mechanism, the position will remain at a low salary for the foreseeable future.

Instead of maintaining the current process for setting the director's salary, the Committee is persuaded to streamline the process. First, it is worth noting the long delay between when the Council first set the CCRC director's salary and the most recent adjustment. The Committee finds that the administrative burden of requiring legislative action for a salary change outweighs any benefits of the current system. Since the Chairman of the Council is already responsible for appointing the CCRC's executive director, the subtitle goes one small step further and designates the Chairman as the CCRC's personnel authority over the executive director. The CCRC, whose authority rests with the executive director, would remain the personnel authority for any other agency staff. The CCRC no longer has a functioning Advisory Board, and it is therefore without governing authority for its most senior position.

The subtitle also makes a number of clarifying changes to the CCRC's authority and removes outdated references in its establishing statute. For example, the subtitle simplifies the language used to describe the CCRC's status as an independent agency. The subtitle also clarifies that while the CCRC's Advisory Group dissolved as of March 31, 2021, the CCRC's executive director may still consult former members of the Advisory Group, or their respective agencies, when fulfilling the agency's mission. Finally, the subtitle clarifies the CCRC's authority to access documents, property, and other materials held by another District agency. The revised language is modeled after similar authority granted to the Police Complaints Board.<sup>33</sup>

### **c. Section-by-Section Analysis**

Sec. XXX1. States the short title.

Sec. XXX2. Amends section 406(b)(25) of the District of Columbia Government Comprehensive Merit Personnel Act of 1978, effective March 3, 1979 (D.C. Law 2-139; D.C. Official Code § 1-604.06(b)(25)), to designate the Chairman of the Council as the CCRC's personnel authority for the CCRC's executive director and make the CCRC's executive director the personnel authority for all other CCRC staff.

Sec. XXX3. Amends the Criminal Code Reform Commission Establishment Act of 2016, effective October 8, 2016 (D.C. Law 21-160; D.C. Official Code § 3-151 *et seq.*), to:

---

<sup>33</sup> D.C. Code § 5-1104(d-3)(3)(A).

- (a) Simplify the designation of the CCRC as an independent agency, require that the Chairman consult with the chairperson of the Council committee with jurisdiction over the CCRC when selecting the CCRC's executive director, and eliminate obsolete provisions naming the first executive director of the agency and exempting that individual from the District's residency requirement;
- (b) Clarify that the CCRC may, on its own initiative, provide legal or policy analysis of proposed legislation or best practices, and clarify the CCRC's authority to request documents and property from other District agencies;
- (c) Use gender-neutral language when describing the Advisory Group's membership, and clarify that the CCRC's executive director may consult former members of the Advisory Group or their respective agencies to fulfill the agency's mission; and
- (d) Remove an incorrect reference to the Criminal Code Revision Commission.

**d. Legislative Recommendations for the Committee of the Whole**

Sec. XXX1. Short title.

This subtitle may be cited as the "Criminal Code Reform Commission Amendment Act of 2022".

Sec. XXX2. Section 406(b)(25) of the District of Columbia Government Comprehensive Merit Personnel Act of 1978, effective March 3, 1979 (D.C. Law 2-139; D.C. Official Code § 1-604.06(b)(25)), is amended to read as follows:

"(25) For the Executive Director of the Criminal Code Reform Commission, the personnel authority is the Chairman of the Council, and for all other employees of the Criminal Code Reform Commission, the personnel authority is the Executive Director of the Criminal Code Reform Commission;"

Sec. XXX3. The Criminal Code Reform Commission Establishment Act of 2016, effective October 8, 2016 (D.C. Law 21-160; D.C. Official Code § 3-151 *et seq.*), is amended as follows:

(a) Section 3122 (D.C. Official Code § 3-151) is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (a) is amended by striking the phrase "agency within the District of Columbia government, consistent with the meaning of the term "independent agency" as provided in" and inserting the phrase "agency, as that term is defined in" in its place.

(2) Subsection (c) is amended to read as follows:

"(c) The Executive Director shall be appointed by the Chairman of the Council, in consultation with the chairperson of the Council committee with jurisdiction over

the Commission, subject to the approval of a majority of the Council. The Executive Director shall serve for a term of 3 years.”.

(3) Subsection (e) is amended to read as follows:

“(e) All employees of the Commission shall be, or shall become no later than 180 days after hire, District residents.”.

(b) Section 3123 (D.C. Official Code § 3-152) is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (d) is amended by striking the phrase “shall provide, upon request by the Council or on its own initiative” and inserting the phrase “shall provide, upon request by the Council, or may provide on its own initiative” in its place.

(2) Subsection (f) is amended to read as follows:

“(f)(1) The Commission may request access to all books, accounts, records, reports, findings, and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by any department, agency, or other instrumentality of the District government that are necessary to fulfill its statutory duties.

“(2) Upon such a request from the Commission, any department, agency, or other instrumentality of the District government shall provide the requested information to the Commission to the extent permitted by law.”.

(c) Section 3124 (D.C. Official Code § 3-153) is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (a) is amended as follows:

(A) Paragraph (1) is amended as follows:

(i) Subparagraph (A) is amended by striking the phrase “or his or her” and inserting the phrase “or the United States Attorney’s” in its place.

(ii) Subparagraph (B) is amended by striking the phrase “or his or her” and inserting the phrase “or the Director’s” in its place.

(iii) Subparagraph (C) is amended by striking the phrase “or his or her” and inserting the phrase “or the Attorney General’s” in its place.

(B) Paragraph (2) is amended as follows:

(i) Subparagraph (A) is amended by striking the phrase “or his or her” and inserting the phrase “or the Chairperson’s” in its place.

(ii) Subparagraph (B) is amended by striking the phrase “or his or her” and inserting the phrase “or the Deputy Mayor’s” in its place.

(2) A new subsection (g) is added to read as follows:

“(g) The Advisory Group shall expire as of March 31, 2021; provided, that nothing shall prohibit the Executive Director from soliciting the assistance of former members of the Advisory Group, or their respective agencies, in fulfilling its ongoing mission.”.

(d) Section 3126 (D.C. Official Code § 3-155) is amended as follows:

(1) The section heading is amended by striking the phrase “Code Revision Commission” and inserting the phrase “Code Reform Commission” in its place.

(2) Subsection (a) is amended by striking the phrase “Code Revision Commission” and inserting the phrase “Code Reform Commission” in its place.

(3) Subsection (b) is amended by striking the phrase “Code Revision Commission” and inserting the phrase “Code Reform Commission” in its place.

**e. Fiscal Impact**

The fiscal impact for this subtitle has been included in the financial plan. The Committee has also right-sized the salaries and fringe of all positions at the agency, beginning in FY23.

## 5. TITLE –. SUBTITLE –. METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT BUDGET AND STAFFING TRANSPARENCY

### a. Purpose, Effect, and Impact on Existing Law

This subtitle would amend section 386 of the Revised Statutes of the District of Columbia to require that the Metropolitan Police Department (“MPD”) publish, at monthly and yearly intervals, information related to its staffing and budget, including the number of officers separating from and hired by MPD, rates of pay, overtime spending, funding within the Mayor’s proposed budget dedicated to hiring personnel, and the anticipated impact of the proposed budget on force size.

### b. Committee Reasoning

The Mayor’s FY23 proposed budget would allocate \$531.5 million to MPD – what amounts to nearly one-third of the funding available for all the agencies under the Committee’s purview. Yet despite its outsized importance in the District’s budget, MPD’s operating budget is one of the most opaque.

For example, the budget book released by the Office of the Chief Financial Officer (“OCFO”) includes chapters for each agency that reflect the number of “full-time equivalents” that are funded in the proposed budget. For most District agencies, the number of full-time equivalents has a direct relationship to the number of positions funded within the agency. This is not the case for MPD, which maintains “unfunded” FTE positions on its books to allow for more flexible staffing and to account for onboarding new hires throughout the year. Whatever the intention behind that practice, it has the effect of obscuring from public consideration important aspects of the agency’s proposed budget. Furthermore, MPD frequently restructures or eliminates entirely its various divisions, called “bureaus,” as part of the budget formulation process. The FY23 proposed budget, for example, removes the School Safety Division (“SSD”) and Youth and Family Services Division (“YFSD”) from the Investigative Services Bureau and consolidates them into what would be a newly established Youth and Family Engagement Bureau.<sup>34</sup> It is not always clear, based on the budget book alone, whether such reorganizations reflect a substantive change in agency operations or simply a new accounting practice.

Fortunately, MPD’s budget chapter for FY23 reflects marked improvement over recent years in how it describes the funding dedicated to hiring in recruitment.<sup>35</sup> Specifically, the chapter states that “\$14,196,330 will enable MPD to hire 108 sworn officers, 42 cadet conversions, and 17 senior officers – supplementing personal

---

<sup>34</sup> Office of the Chief Financial Officer, *2023 FA0 Metropolitan Police Department: Chapter* (March 16, 2022),

[https://cfo.dc.gov/sites/default/files/dc/sites/ocfo/publication/attachments/fa\\_mpd\\_chapter\\_2023m.pdf](https://cfo.dc.gov/sites/default/files/dc/sites/ocfo/publication/attachments/fa_mpd_chapter_2023m.pdf).

<sup>35</sup> *Id.*

services and nonpersonal services to generate a total hiring of 347 sworn officers in FY23.”<sup>36</sup> The budget chapter also describes various hiring incentives supported by the proposed budget. When examined alongside other information MPD provides the Committee – such as monthly reports describing the current force size, attrition, and hiring – the budget has allowed the Committee to piece together the most complete picture of MPD’s staffing in recent years. This has, in turn, fueled a more nuanced public debate surrounding the appropriate level of funding for MPD.<sup>37</sup> There is, however, nothing that requires that future budget chapters contain a clear description of the amount of funding being allocated to new hire new officers or the exact number of officers that funding supports. MPD also is not required to supplement this information or provide it publicly. Furthermore, without the additional information provided by MPD directly to the Committee – including monthly reports on the current force size, the number of officers separating from MPD, and their reasons for doing so – it is difficult for the public to consider MPD’s proposed budget in the larger context of historical and recent trends related to hiring, retention, and attrition. Therefore, the Committee believes that it should simply require that MPD report out detailed information regarding its budget and staffing, almost all of which it provides in some format, albeit not publicly.

Requiring that MPD publish this information is also consistent with the Police Reform Commission’s (“PRC”) report to the Mayor and Council, which included a recommendation that the Council “require MPD to immediately publish, by line-item, its current budget and its expenditures over the past three fiscal years. MPD should engage the community to understand the kind of budget information that would be most helpful for the public, and then change its budget presentation format to reflect that.” Though its budget oversight hearing on MPD, public witnesses echoed the PRC’s demand for a more transparent budget. For example, in his written testimony, one witness noted that “it remains extraordinarily difficult to understand how the MPD spends public money, how MPD officer overtime is accrued, and why the MPD has such a spending problem that it routinely overspends its already over-generous budget.”

The Committee believes that residents with a variety of perspectives on MPD’s budget will appreciate more transparency to enable them to effectively engage with the agency and the Council during budget deliberations. Similarly, information about staffing across the District and overtime are basic data points to which the public is entitled, particularly given the outsized importance of MPD’s budget relative to the budget as a whole.

The Committee’s subtitle also includes several minor, but important, recommendations of the PRC relating to the collection and publishing of stop and

---

<sup>36</sup> *Id.*

<sup>37</sup> See, e.g., Martin Auster Muhle, *Numbers Game: Just How Many Police Officers Does D.C. Really Need?*, DCIST (April 7, 2022), <https://dcist.com/story/22/04/07/bowser-wants-4000-dc-mpd-officers/>.



frisk data by MPD. Information such as the bureau, division, unit, and if applicable, police service area, of the officer who conducted the stop, at the time it was conducted, will be helpful in tracking the concentration of police interactions.

Lastly, the Committee includes a change to the DCMR that will facilitate information-sharing among public safety cluster agencies. The Duncan Ordinance, found at 1 DCMR § 1004.1 *et seq.*, controls the release of adult arrest records. Specifically, the ordinance authorizes the disclosure of “unexpurgated adult arrest records” to law enforcement agents for law enforcement purposes.<sup>38</sup> Law enforcement agents are defined in the regulation to include “persons having cognizance of criminal investigations or of criminal proceedings directly involving the individuals to whom the requested records relate.”<sup>39</sup> The term includes judges, prosecutors, police officers, federal agents with arrest powers, clerks of court, corrections and supervision officers, as well as defense attorneys (though only with respect to records of their clients).<sup>40</sup>

As the Committee has explored comprehensive firearm violence reduction strategies, a key component of many successful violence prevention efforts is conducting regular “shooting reviews” – meetings between law enforcement, street outreach workers (a broad category that encompasses violent interrupters, credible messengers, Roving Leaders, and other individuals who have credibility with, and ties to, the communities in which they serve), and other agencies to discuss recent shootings, potential retaliatory violence, and possible interventions.<sup>41</sup>

Under the Duncan Ordinance, violence interrupters employed by the Office of Neighborhood Safety and Engagement (“ONSE”) or the Office of the Attorney General (“OAG”) are not “law enforcement agents,” nor are the agencies that provide financial, administrative, and analytical support to these violence intervention efforts, including the Criminal Justice Coordinating Council (“CJCC”), the Office of Gun Violence Prevention (“OGVP”) and the Office of Victim Services and Justice Grants (“OVSJG”). These agencies are therefore not entitled to unexpurgated adult arrest records. This information-sharing barrier critically prevents the level of coordination needed for successful interventions.

To ensure that Duncan Ordinance does not thwart focused efforts to reduce gun violence, the Committee adds a new subsection that clarifies that “employees or contractors working to reduce gun violence, or serve individuals at high risk of being involved in gun violence” within CJCC, OGVP, ONSE, OAG, and OVSJG are not prevented from receiving unexpurgated adult arrest records.

---

<sup>38</sup> 1 DCMR § 1004.1.

<sup>39</sup> 1 DCMR § 1004.2.

<sup>40</sup> *Id.*

<sup>41</sup> See, e.g., Criminal Justice Coordinating Council, *Combating Violent Crime* (last visited April 20, 2022), <https://cjcc.dc.gov/page/combating-violent-crime>.

**c. Section-by-Section Analysis**

Sec. XXX1. States the short title.

Sec. XXX2. Amends section 386 of the Revised Statutes of the District of Columbia (D.C. Official Code § 5-113.01), to:

(a) Rename the section heading;

(b) Require that the record of stops maintained by MPD include a description of the subdivisions within MPD in which the officer who conducted the stop, and clarify that MPD officers should record the perceived, not actual, gender, race, and ethnicity of the individual stopped;

(c) Require that the records of stops and use of force incidents maintained by MPD also be published on its website biannually; and

(d) Require that MPD publish on a monthly basis, for the current and past five and current fiscal years, a staffing report that describes the number of sworn officers and civilian employees employed by MPD as well as the number of employees that separated from or were hired by MPD, require that MPD publish on an annual basis a spreadsheet of all full-time equivalents employed by MPD and a report on overtime spending, and require that MPD publish on an annual basis, for the current and past five and current fiscal years, certain information related to MPD's approved, revised, and actual budgets.

Sec. XXX3. Amends Section 1004 of Title 1 of the District of Columbia Municipal Regulations (1 DCMR § 1004) to allow MPD to share unexpurgated adult arrest records with employees or contractors at certain District agencies who are working to reduce gun violence or serve individuals at risk of being involved in gun violence.

**d. Legislative Recommendations for the Committee of the Whole**

Sec. XXX1. Short title.

This subtitle may be cited as the "Metropolitan Police Department Budget and Staffing Transparency Amendment Act of 2022".

Sec. XXX2. Section 386 of the Revised Statutes of the District of Columbia (D.C. Official Code § 5-113.01), is amended as follows:

(a) The section heading is amended to read as follows:

“Sec. 386. Records required to be maintained; budget and staffing transparency.”.

(b) Subsection (a)(4B) is amended as follows:

(1) A new subparagraph (A-i) is added to read as follows:

“(A-i) The bureau, division, unit, and if applicable, police service area, of the officer who conducted the stop, at the time it was conducted;”.

(2) Subparagraph (I) is amended by striking the phrase “The gender” and inserting the phrase “The perceived gender” in its place.

(3) Subparagraph (J) is amended by striking the phrase “The race or ethnicity” and inserting the phrase “The perceived race or ethnicity” in its place.

(c) A new subsection (a-1) is added to read as follows:

“(a-1) The records maintained pursuant to subsection (a)(4B) and (4C) of this section shall be published on the Metropolitan Police Department’s website biannually.”.

(d) A new subsection (c) is added to read as follows:

“(c) The Metropolitan Police Department (“MPD”) shall publish the following information on its website:

“(1) Monthly, for the prior 5 fiscal years and the current fiscal year, to date, by month:

“(A) A staffing report of the number of sworn officers and civilian employees employed by MPD, by bureau, division, unit, and if applicable, police service area and rank, with a crosswalk to compare actual staffing to funded and unfunded full-time equivalents in that bureau, division, unit, and if applicable, police service area and rank; and

“(B) The number of employees that:

“(i) Separated from MPD, by type of separation, broken down by civilian employees, cadets, cadet conversion recruits, non-cadet conversion recruits, officers, and senior police officers; and

“(ii) Were hired by MPD, broken down by civilian employees, cadets, cadet conversion recruits, non-cadet conversion recruits, officers, and senior police officers;

“(2) Annually:

“(A) A listing of all full-time equivalents at MPD, in spreadsheet format, that includes the following fields for each full-time equivalent:

“(i) Position number;

“(ii) Position title;

“(iii) Whether the position is funded or unfunded;

“(iv) Whether the position is filled or vacant;

“(v) Program;

“(vi) Activity;

“(vii) Salary; and

“(viii) Fringe; and

“(B) A report on MPD’s overtime spending, which shall include the amount spent fiscal year-to-date, by month, on overtime pay and a description of the staffing plan and conditions justifying the overtime pay; and

“(3) Annually, by the date the annual MPD budget is proposed by the Mayor and transmitted to the Council:

“(A) The approved, revised, and actual MPD budgets for the prior 5 fiscal years and the current fiscal year, the expenditures for those years, and the proposed MPD budget for the next fiscal year, in spread sheet format, broken down, at a minimum, by program, activity, comptroller source group, fund source, and service level; and

“(B) For the proposed MPD budget for the next fiscal year:

“(i) The total proposed budget for hiring personnel;

“(ii) The gross and net number of personnel MPD anticipates the proposed budget will allow it to hire, broken down by civilian employees, cadets, cadet conversion recruits, non-cadet conversion recruits, officers, and senior police officers; and

“(iii) A crosswalk identifying any proposed actual or paper changes to MPD’s internal organization, including its various bureaus, and a narrative rationale for that change.”.

Sec. XXX3. Section 1004 of Title 1 of the District of Columbia Municipal Regulations (1 DCMR § 1004), is amended by adding a new subsection 1004.10 to read as follows:

“1004.10. Nothing in this section shall prohibit the Metropolitan Police Department from providing unexpurgated adult arrest records to employees or contractors working to reduce gun violence, or serve individuals at high risk of being involved in gun violence, within the following District agencies:

“(a) The Criminal Justice Coordinating Council;

“(b) The Office of Gun Violence Prevention;

“(c) The Office of Neighborhood Safety and Engagement;

“(d) The Office of the Attorney General; and

“(e) The Office of Victim Services and Justice Grants.”.

#### **e. Fiscal Impact**

The Committee has identified \$123,610 in recurring funds for a Data Analyst FTE at MPD and \$550,000 in one-time funds for necessary database improvements.

## 6. TITLE -. SUBTITLE -. OFFICE OF UNIFIED COMMUNICATIONS TELECOMMUNICATOR CPR PROGRAM

### a. Purpose, Effect, and Impact on Existing Law

This subtitle would amend the Office of Unified Communications Establishment Act of 2004, effective December 7, 2004 (D.C. Law 15-205; D.C. Official Code § 1-327.51 *et seq.*), to require the Office of Unified Communications (“OUC”) to provide training in telecommunicator cardiopulmonary resuscitation (“t-CPR”) to all OUC call takers and dispatchers. The training program requires the use of protocols and scripts based on evidence-based and nationally-recognized guidelines, instruction on recognition protocols for out-of-hospital cardiac arrest and compression-only cardiopulmonary resuscitation (“CPR”), and continuing education.

### b. Committee Reasoning

In the United States, an estimated 350,000 out-of-hospital cardiac arrest events occur in a given year.<sup>42</sup> Cardiac arrest, which is the abrupt loss of heart function, is often fatal if the appropriate action is not taken immediately. As noted by the American Heart Association, one method to increase the chance of survival is to have CPR started by a bystander prior to the arrival of emergency medical services personnel at the scene.<sup>43</sup> Bystander intervention by CPR can lead to a two- to three-fold higher likelihood that a person in cardiac arrest will survive.<sup>44</sup>

When someone is in cardiac arrest, a bystander will almost always call 9-1-1 for help. It is in this precise moment that a 9-1-1 call taker or dispatcher can mean the difference between life and death. A t-CPR program allows for 9-1-1 call takers and dispatchers to provide instant instructions to a caller on how to perform CPR on a person in cardiac arrest. It is not only capable of assisting an untrained caller, but it also functions to remind a CPR-trained caller of how to provide high-quality CPR.

Cardiac arrest survival rates continue to lag in the District. In FY20, the Fire and Emergency Medical Services Department (“FEMS”) reported 964 out-of-hospital cardiac arrest events in the District, with a survival rate of 4.6%.<sup>45</sup> FEMS has taken significant strides in improving the cardiac arrest survival rate by focusing on the importance of early bystander CPR and the use of an AED as intervention measures. The Committee supports FEMS’ efforts to increase public use of an AED in the

---

<sup>42</sup> *Telecommunicator CPR*, American Heart Association, <https://cpr.heart.org/en/resuscitation-science/telecommunicator-cpr>.

<sup>43</sup> *Id.*

<sup>44</sup> *Id.*

<sup>45</sup> *FY 2020 Cardiac Arrest Charts and Data*, Fire and Emergency Medical Services Department (April 27, 2021), <https://fems.dc.gov/sites/default/files/dc/sites/fems/FY%202020%20Cardiac%20Arrest%20Charts%20and%20Data.pdf>.

Mayor’s proposed subtitle, the “Automated External Defibrillator Incentive Program Amendment Act of 2022.” Nonetheless, the Committee believes that OUC can also play a significant role in improving cardiac arrest survival rates. The Committee sees OUC as a critical link in the cardiac arrest chain of survival and proposes this subtitle as one in a series of methods to improve cardiac arrest outcomes in the District.

**c. Section-by-Section Analysis**

Sec. XXX1. States the short title.

Sec. XXX2. Amends the Office of Unified Communications Establishment Act of 2004, effective December 7, 2004 (D.C. Law 15-205; D.C. Official Code § 1-327.51 *et seq.*), to:

(a) Require training in t-CPR for all OUC call takers and dispatchers;

(b) Specify the content and instruction of the training program; and

(c) Define the term “telecommunicator cardiopulmonary resuscitation”.

**d. Legislative Recommendations for the Committee of the Whole**

Sec. XXX1. Short title.

This subtitle may be cited as the “Office of Unified Communications Telecommunicator CPR Program Amendment Act of 2022”.

Sec. XXX2. The Office of Unified Communications Establishment Act of 2004, effective December 7, 2004 (D.C. Law 15-205; D.C. Official Code § 1-327.51 *et seq.*), is amended by adding a new section 3205d to read as follows:

“Sec. 3205d. Telecommunicator cardiopulmonary resuscitation (“t-CPR”) training requirement.

“(a) The Office shall provide training in telecommunicator cardiopulmonary resuscitation (“t-CPR”) to all Office call takers and dispatchers.

“(b) The training required pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall:

“(1) Use protocols and scripts based on evidence-based and nationally-recognized guidelines for t-CPR; and

“(2) Include:

“(A) Recognition protocols for out-of-hospital cardiac arrest;

“(B) Compression-only cardiopulmonary resuscitation instructions; and

“(C) Continuing education.

“(c) For the purposes of this section, “telecommunicator cardiopulmonary resuscitation” means the delivery of compression or ventilation instructions to callers who are reporting suspected cases of out-of-hospital cardiac arrest.”.

**e. Fiscal Impact**

The Committee has identified \$90,640 in one-time funding and \$5,000 in recurring funding for the necessary OUC training and overtime.

## 7. TITLE -. SUBTITLE -. OFFICE OF VICTIM SERVICES AND JUSTICE GRANTS TRANSPARENCY

### a. Purpose, Effect, and Impact on Existing Law

This subtitle would require that the Office of Victim Services and Justice Grants (“OVSJG”) twice annually publish on its website information about the grant awards it has received or granted. The subtitle would also require that when the Mayor submits the annual budget to the Council, the Mayor would also publish on a publicly available website the anticipated grant awards for separate initiatives or “line-items” within each of OVSJG’s grantmaking divisions.

### b. Committee Reasoning

OVSJG serves as the District government’s pass-through agency for federal grants, federal payments, and local dollars that the agency subsequently awards to community-based organizations and other entities. In last year’s approved budget, OVSJG’s various grantmaking activities were, allocated across 5 divisions: (1) Victim Services; (2) Justice Grants; (3) Access to Justice; (4) Truancy Reduction; and (5) Targeted Services.<sup>46</sup> This year’s budget, however, includes a sixth division, the District Recovery Plan, discussed in more detail below.<sup>47</sup>

Each of these divisions disburses grants to fund several programs and initiatives. For example, funding within the Victim Services division is to fund services available to survivors of sexual assault under the Sexual Assault Victims’ Rights Amendment Act of 2014, effective November 20, 2014 (D.C. Law 20-139; 61 DCR 5913), including the DC Sexual Assault Nurse Examiner Program and sexual assault victim advocacy services, and the District’s Address Confidentiality Program established under the Address Confidentiality Act of 2018, effective July 3, 2018 (D.C. Law 22-118; 65 DCR 5064). In addition to programs and initiatives established by law, the Victim Services grants are also used to fund community-based organizations providing housing and other non-residential direct services to victims of crime. However, OVSJG’s budget chapter for the FY23 proposed budget breaks out funding within the Victim Services division into only two programs: Victim Services and Address Confidentiality.<sup>48</sup> This can be contrasted with the Targeted Services, which is broken down into four line items – Private Security Camera Program, Community Capacity Building, Safe Housing for Victims of Gun Violence, and Trauma Services – despite being the smallest grantmaking division within OVSJG.

---

<sup>46</sup> Office of the Chief Financial Officer, *2022 FOO Office of Victim Services and Justice Grants* (September 17, 2021), <https://cfo.dc.gov/node/1539301> (summarizing OVSJG’s FY22 Approved Budget).

<sup>47</sup> Office of the Chief Financial Officer, *2023 FOO Office of Victim Services and Justice Grants* (March 16, 2022), <https://cfo.dc.gov/node/1586861> (summarizing OVSJG’s FY23 Proposed Budget).

<sup>48</sup> *Id.*



A common frustration expressed by OVSJG grantees at the Committee's April 6, 2022 budget oversight hearing on the agency was that funding awards have not kept pace with the demand for services in the community. Merry O'Brien, Head of Finance & Operations at the Network for Victim Recovery of D.C., argued that "[f]lat-funding for core services since 2017 is an effective significant divestment, given the volume and scope of our work has continued to expand year-over-year." Michelle Palmer, Executive Director of the Wendt Center for Loss and Healing, noted that her organization's funding has been reduced from \$1.839 million in FY20 to \$1.38 million dollars – "nearly a 10% cut to the agency's budget at a time when victimization in our nation's capital grows."

Witnesses also repeatedly spoke to a lack of transparency with respect to how much funding is being dedicated to various initiatives within OVSJG's grantmaking divisions. Rachel Friedman, testifying on behalf of the D.C. Coalition to End Sexual Violence, expressed "concern[] that as OVSJG grows as an agency, there is an ever-widening gap in communication, transparency, and coordination." Complaints about the lack of transparency are both retrospective and forward-looking.

This is, in part, because budget books released by the Office of the Chief Financial Officer ("OCFO") often combine funding available for each of these distinct initiatives into a single line item. However, the lack of transparency has been further compounded by the Mayor's FY23 proposed budget – particularly around ARPA funds – and the agency's lack of clearly articulated priorities within each division.

Erin Pollitt, Executive Director of the D.C. Forensic Nurse Examiners, was one of several witnesses at OVSJG's budget oversight hearing who argued for the Mayor's proposed budget to include a more detailed breakdown of the funding allocated to each line-item within a grantmaking division. Specifically, she urged the Council to list:

"SAVRAA as a line-item expense in the Mayor's annual budget. Doing so would allow core service providers the ability to plan more effectively and with more certainty, rather than competing against other victim service providers annually for funding of services that the District has deemed as both critical and necessary."

The Committee agrees with Ms. Pollitt's suggestion but thinks it should go further and require that OVSJG provide an even more complete breakdown of grants received and awarded by the agency over the course of a fiscal year, as well as anticipated funding for its grantmaking divisions during the budget formulation process. As Natalia Otero, Executive Director of DC SAFE, concluded in her testimony, "[t]ransparency leads to shared accountability," and the Committee agrees. OVSJG manages tens of millions of dollars in local and federal funds and

certainly expects meticulous reporting from its grantees. It must therefore be willing to provide more centralized and transparent information itself in order to build a relationship of trust, particularly in the victim services field.

To be clear, the requirement that OVSJG report out anticipated grant funding for each division and program within the agency does not bind it to those preliminary estimates. The Committee understands that OVSJG's final grant awards are appropriately affected by a variety of factors, including the quality and scope of work of the applications it receives for funding. Rather, the goal of reporting out anticipated grant funding is to provide key stakeholders – policymakers, former, current, and prospective grantees, and the general public – a more detailed window into the agency's priorities for the following fiscal year.

In fairness to OVSJG, much of the information required by subsection (a) of the subtitle is already reported out by the agency. OVSJG published on its website a list of funding recipients for FY16–21. The latest report from FY21 lists the entity that received a grant, the name of the entity's program or initiative that was funded by the grant, a short description of the program or initiative, the award amount, and the funding source. On another webpage, OVSJG publishes a description of those funding sources, including local appropriations and federal funding streams, such as the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant, Project Safe Neighborhoods, and Violence Against Women Formula Grants. After the release of the FY23 proposed budget, OVSJG also hosted a budget presentation for interested parties, posting both a recording of a presentation and the slideshow to its website.

The Committee does not dismiss or downplay the agency's work to date on releasing this information to the public. Rather, the Committee's intent is (1) to ensure that, in the future, the public continues to have the ability to see the agency's allocation of grant funds, (2) to, as much as possible, consolidate the information OVSJG publishes regarding grant awards into a single resource for grantees, applicants, and the general public to consult, and (3) recognize that transparency and accountability are key in grantmaking, particularly of such large amounts and for such critical needs.

### **c. Section-by-Section Analysis**

Sec. XXX1. States the short title.

Sec. XXX2. Requires that OVSJG biannually publish on its website certain information about the grant funds received or granted by the agency during the current fiscal year, including the funding source, the amount of funding, and any restrictions on the use of that funding; and requires that the Mayor, when submitting an annual budget to the Council, publish on a publicly available website anticipated

funding levels for certain programs or initiatives within OVSJG's various grantmaking divisions, including the Victim Services division, Justice Grants division, and the Truancy Reduction Program.

**d. Legislative Recommendations for the Committee of the Whole**

Sec. XXX1. Short title.

This subtitle may be cited as the "Office of Victim Services and Justice Grants Transparency Amendment Act of 2022".

Sec. XXX2. Office of Victim Services and Justice Grants transparency.

(a) Beginning on October 1, 2022, and quarterly thereafter, the Office of Victim Services and Justice Grants ("OVSJG") shall publish the following information, for the current fiscal year, on its website:

(1) For all grants or sub-grants awarded to or received by OVSJG:

- (A) The funding source and amount received;
- (B) The date the grant or sub-grant was awarded or received;
- (C) The duration of the grant or sub-grant;
- (D) A description of the permissible uses of, or restrictions on, the grant or sub-grant and the source of those uses or restrictions; and
- (E) The remaining balance of the grant or sub-grant.

(2) For all grants or subgrants awarded by OVSJG:

- (A) The name of the grantee or sub-grantee to whom the grant or sub-grant was awarded;
- (B) The funding source and amount awarded;
- (C) The date the grant or sub-grant was awarded;
- (D) The duration of the grant or sub-grant; and
- (E) A description of the permissible uses of, or restrictions on, the grant or sub-grant and the source of those uses or restrictions.

(b) The Mayor shall, when submitting to the Council an annual budget for the District of Columbia government as described in section 442 of the District of Columbia Charter Act, effective December 24, 1973 (87 Stat. 774; D.C. Official Code § 1-204.42), publish, at a minimum, the following information regarding the proposed budget for OVSJG on a publicly accessible website:

(1) The agency's grantmaking priorities for the proposed budget;

(2) For the Victim Services division, anticipated grant funds budgeted for each agency grantmaking priority within the division, including:

(A) Implementation of the Sexual Assault Victims' Rights Act of 2014, effective November 20, 2014 (D.C. Law 20-139; 61 DCR 5913);

(B) The housing continuum of care for victims of crime, including emergency shelters, short-term housing, and transitional housing, broken down by whether the funding or housing is tied to specific:

(i) Categories of crime, such as domestic violence, sexual violence, human trafficking, or violent crime; or

- (ii) Vulnerable populations, such as LGBTQ individuals;
- (C) Hospital-based violence intervention programs; and
- (D) Non-residential direct services for victims of crime, broken down by whether the funding is tied to specific:
  - (i) Categories of crime, such as domestic violence, sexual violence, human trafficking, or violent crime; or
  - (ii) Vulnerable populations, such as LGBTQ individuals;
- (3) For the Justice Grants division, anticipated grant funds budgeted for each agency grantmaking priority within the division, including:
  - (A) The housing continuum of care, including emergency shelters, short-term housing, and transitional housing, for returning citizens or other justice-involved populations; and
  - (B) Non-residential direct services for returning citizens or other justice-involved populations; and
  - (4) Anticipated grant funds budgeted for all other agency grantmaking priorities.

**e. Fiscal Impact**

The fiscal impact for this subtitle has been included in the financial plan.

## 8. TITLE -. SUBTITLE -. SPECIAL EDUCATION ATTORNEYS FOR EMERGING ADULT DEFENDANTS

### a. Purpose, Effect, and Impact on Existing Law

This subtitle would amend Chapter 7 of Title 16 of the District of Columbia Official Code to require the Superior Court’s Criminal Division (“Court”) to designate and appoint a panel of special education attorneys to represent indigent emerging adult defendants with disabilities. The subtitle would further provide the duties of the attorneys appointed by the Court, require the Court to maintain a register of interested attorneys and endeavor to make appointments from that register, require the Office of Victim Services and Justice Grants to issue a grant to fund the attorneys, and make clear that the availability of attorneys is contingent on appropriated funds.

### b. Committee Reasoning

Data indicate that up to 70 percent of incarcerated young people have some form of disability nationwide.<sup>49</sup> While only 8.6% of public school students have been identified as having disabilities that qualify them for special education services, youth in the juvenile justice system are much more likely to have both identified and unidentified disabilities.<sup>50</sup> They experience academic failure, school pushout, and gaps in their school enrollment at much greater rates. Here in the District, there is a disproportionate number of students with disabilities in the criminal justice system. For example, while approximately 15 percent of students District-wide have special education needs, 80 percent of students committed to the Department of Youth Rehabilitation Services (“DYRS”) have special education needs.<sup>51</sup>

Incarcerated students, whether at DYRS, the Department of Corrections (“DOC”), or the Federal Bureau of Prisons (“BOP”), have a right under federal law to continue to receive special education and related services throughout their incarceration. The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (“IDEA”), last reauthorized by Congress in 2004, requires that school districts provide special education and related services to all eligible students to enable such students to make academic progress, graduate from high school, and have workforce opportunities.<sup>52</sup> The rights afforded under this legislation include specialized instructions, support

---

<sup>49</sup> Sue Burrell and Loren Warboys, *Special Education and the Juvenile Justice System*, U.S. Department of Justice Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Juvenile Justice Bulletin, 1 (July 2000).

<sup>50</sup> *Id.*

<sup>51</sup> Committee on the Judiciary and Public Safety, *Public Hearing on B23-0039, the “Special Education Rights for Youth Defendants Amendment Act of 2019”* (July 11, 2019) (testimony of Sarah Comeau, Director of Programs/Co-Founder, School Justice Project and testimony of Elizabeth Wieser, Deputy Attorney General, Public Safety Division, Office of the Attorney General for the District of Columbia), [http://dc.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?view\\_id=2&clip\\_id=5138](http://dc.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?view_id=2&clip_id=5138).

<sup>52</sup> Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 20 U.S.C. § 1400 (2004).

services, transition services, and the right to remain in high school past the age of compulsory education.<sup>53</sup> In the District, students with disabilities have the right to remain in high school and receive special education and related services until the end of the semester during which they turn 22.

However, the reality is that these services are often seriously disrupted and neglected when the student enters the criminal justice system. Incarcerated students often have a history of academic failure in traditional schools and struggle with trauma and mental health diagnoses, along with their underlying disabilities. Many students may not appreciate their own educational rights, which is understandable given the complex nature of this area of law, and they, therefore, cannot advocate for themselves. Currently, there is also a lack of inter-agency communication across DOC, DYRS, OSSE, and other District and federal agencies that prevent emerging adults from receiving adequate educational services. Relevant information about a young person is sometimes unavailable, making it difficult to collect the necessary records to see a clear picture of their educational history, abilities and limitations, disabilities, and future paths. This can lead to inaccurate or incomplete pre-sentencing reports about a young person's needs.

Indeed, many criminal defense attorneys themselves simply do not have the specialized training or understanding of the complexities of the juvenile and adult justice systems in the District to fully advocate for their clients' education rights. As a result, incarcerated students with special education needs are many times released back into the community without having had the opportunity to continue their education inside and with few options to further pursue their education outside.

At the Committee's hearing on the permanent version of this subtitle, Sarah Comeau, Director of Programs and Co-Founder of School Justice Project, testified that special education attorneys are one part of a multifaceted solution to the "intersecting crises of educational inequity and mass incarceration".<sup>54</sup> Such attorneys can advocate for students at special education meetings, pursue additional supports and courses of action that might not be immediately obvious, obtain better outcomes in court hearings, and seek community supports for their clients.<sup>55</sup> Charles Logan, Special Counsel at the Children's Law Center, reiterated the importance of special education attorneys, noting that they can coordinate with various agencies, transfer school records, prevent disruption to a student's education plan, and help a student transition.<sup>56</sup> Kaitlin Banner, Deputy Legal Director of the Washington Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights and Urban Affairs, who previously worked as a special

---

<sup>53</sup> *Id.*

<sup>54</sup> *Id.*

<sup>55</sup> *Id.*

<sup>56</sup> *Id.* (testimony of Charles "Buck" Logan, Special Counsel, Children's Law Center).

education attorney, noted that she had seen her clients' lives completely transform as a result of her ability to enforce their special education rights on their behalf.<sup>57</sup>

Representation of students with special education needs by trained special education attorneys, as well as criminal defense attorneys, in their criminal cases, can help disrupt these patterns and increase access to services to which the students are entitled while incarcerated. For example, special education attorneys can provide a judge with a more comprehensive understanding of both the impact of the disability on the student, as well as the services the student needs to be successful both while incarcerated and upon reentry. However, despite the critical impact of their work, there is currently a dearth of special education attorneys available to represent students in criminal matters. The purpose of this subtitle is, therefore, to remedy the problem by establishing a panel of special education attorneys, coordinated by the Court, to represent "emerging adult defendants with disabilities" in criminal proceedings. By expanding the pool of potential attorneys to be appointed to students with disabilities in criminal proceedings, the subtitle increases opportunities for education and related services and has the potential to reduce recidivism, advance educational equity, and disrupt the school-to-prison pipeline.

### **c. Section-by-Section Analysis**

Sec. XXX1. States the short title.

Sec. XXX2. Amends Chapter 7 of Title 16 of the District of Columbia Official Code to:

(a) Add a new section designation; and

(b) Beginning on October 1, 2023, require the Superior Court's Criminal Division to designate and appoint a panel of special education attorneys to represent indigent emerging adult defendants with disabilities; provide the duties of attorneys so appointed; require the Court to maintain a register of interested attorneys and endeavor to make appointments from that register; require the Office of Victim Services and Justice Grants to issue a grant to fund the attorneys; make clear that the availability of attorneys is contingent on appropriated funds; and define "emerging adult defendant with a disability".

### **d. Legislative Recommendations for the Committee of the Whole**

Sec. XXX1. Short title.

---

<sup>57</sup> *Id.* (testimony of Kaitlin Banner, Deputy Legal Director of the Washington Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights and Urban Affairs).

This subtitle may be cited as the “Special Education Attorneys for Emerging Adult Defendants Amendment Act of 2022”.

Sec. XXX2. Chapter 7 of Title 16 of the District of Columbia Official Code is amended as follows:

(a) The table of contents is amended by adding a new section designation to read as follows:

“§ 16-714. Special education attorneys for emerging adult defendants panel.”.

(b) A new section 16-714 is added to read as follows:

“§ 16-714. Special education attorneys for emerging adult defendants panel.

“(a) By October 1, 2023, the Criminal Division of the Superior Court (“Court”) shall designate and appoint, according to rules it establishes, a panel of special education attorneys to represent indigent emerging adult defendants with disabilities in criminal proceedings.

“(b) An attorney appointed from the panel established in subsection (a) of this section shall represent the educational and disability rights and needs of the emerging adult defendant with a disability.

“(c) The Court shall:

“(1) Maintain a register of attorneys who have expressed an interest in being appointed to serve as special education attorneys pursuant to this section;

“(2) Endeavor to make panel appointments from the register established in paragraph (1) of this subsection; and

“(3) Only appoint attorneys to the panel after careful consideration of the qualifications of each attorney.

“(d) Beginning in Fiscal Year 2023, and annually thereafter, the Office of Victim Services and Justice Grants shall issue a grant for the purpose of funding the costs associated with this section.

“(e) The availability of special education attorneys for emerging adult defendants with disabilities pursuant to this section shall be contingent upon the availability of funds.

“(f) For the purposes of this section, the term “emerging adult defendant with a disability” means a criminal defendant under 23 years of age, or the parent, as that term is defined in 20 U.S.C. § 1401(23), of a criminal defendant under 18 years of age who is:

“(1) Charged as an adult; and

“(2) Qualifies as a child with a disability, as that term is defined in section 602(3) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, approved April 13, 1970 (84 Stat. 175; 20 U.S.C. § 1401(3)).”.



**e. Fiscal Impact**

The Committee identified \$300,000 in recurring local dollars for a grant through the Office of Victim Services and Justice Grants to provide special education legal representation to emerging adult defendants with disabilities by a legal services and advocacy organization serving older students with special education needs who are involved in the District's justice systems.

## **9. TITLE -. SUBTITLE -. SUBJECT-TO-APPROPRIATIONS REPEALS AND MODIFICATIONS**

### **a. Purpose, Effect, and Impact on Existing Law**

This subtitle modifies the applicability clause of the Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs Omnibus Amendment Act of 2018, effective April 11, 2019 (D.C. Law 22-287; 66 DCR 1650), by providing that section 4(c)-(e) of the law is no longer subject to appropriations. The Committee has transferred the necessary funding to the Committee of the Whole and the Committee on Housing & Executive Administration for the Department of Buildings and the Real Property Tax Appeals Commission, respectively.

### **b. Committee Reasoning**

See the table in Section J of this report.

### **c. Section-by-Section Analysis**

Sec. XXX1. States the short title.

Sec. XXX2. Modifies the applicability clause of the Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs Omnibus Amendment Act of 2018, effective April 11, 2019 (D.C. Law 22-287; 66 DCR 1650).

### **d. Legislative Recommendations for the Committee of the Whole**

Sec. XXX1. Short title.

This subtitle shall be cited as the “Subject-to-Appropriations Repeals and Modifications Amendment Act of 2022”.

Sec. XXX2. Section 8 of the Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs Omnibus Amendment Act of 2018, effective April 11, 2019 (D.C. Law 22-287; 66 DCR 1650), is amended as follows:

(a) Subsection (a) is amended to read as follows:

“(a) Sections 2, 3, 4(a) and (b), 5, 6, and 7 shall apply upon the date of inclusion of their fiscal effect in an approved budget and financial plan.”.

(b) Subsection (c)(2) is amended by striking the phrase “this act” and inserting the phrase “the provisions identified in subsection (a) of this section” in its place.

### **e. Fiscal Impact**

This subtitle is funded as indicated in this report.

#### IV. COMMITTEE ACTION

On Thursday, April 21, at XX:XX p.m., the Committee met virtually to consider and vote on the Mayor's proposed Fiscal Year 2023 budget for the agencies under its purview, the provisions of the Fiscal Year 2023 Budget Support Act of 2022 referred to the Committee for comment and the new subtitles proposed, and the Committee's Budget Report. Chairperson Charles Allen called the Additional Meeting to order and determined the existence of a quorum with Councilmembers Anita Bonds, Mary M. Cheh, Vincent C. Gray, and Brooke Pinto present.

Councilmember Allen first described the Committee's budget recommendations.

Councilmember Bonds...

Councilmember Cheh...

Councilmember Gray...

Councilmember Pinto...

Chairperson Allen then moved the Committee's budget recommendations, and the Committee voted 5-0 in favor.

Chairperson Allen then turned to the Committee's Budget Support Act recommendations, and he moved the Committee's recommendations. The Committee voted 5-0 in favor.

Chairperson Allen adjourned the Additional Meeting at XX:XX p.m.

#### **Council Period 24 Committee Staff:**

<i>Chief of Staff &amp; Committee Director:</i>	<i>Kate Mitchell</i>
<i>Deputy Committee Director:</i>	<i>Antonio Nunes</i>
<i>Senior Legislative Counsel:</i>	<i>Sonia Weil</i>
<i>Senior Policy Advisor:</i>	<i>Kevin Whitfield</i>
<i>Policy Advisor:</i>	<i>Anthony Thomas-Davis</i>

#### **Council Central Office Staff Assigned to the Committee:**

<i>Senior Budget Analyst:</i>	<i>Errol Spence-Sutherland</i>
<i>Assistant General Counsel:</i>	<i>Zach Walter</i>

**Office of the Chief Financial Officer, Office of Revenue Analysis, Staff  
Assigned to the Committee:**

*Fiscal Analyst:*

*Kevin Lang*

**V. ATTACHMENTS**

- A.    *Committee Budget Adjustments Table***
- B.    *Legislative Language for the Committee's Recommended Budget Support Act Subtitles***