

**APFO Recommended Motions Parking Lot**  
**As of March 6, 2025**

<b>SCHOOLS</b>		
<b>Number</b>	<b>Motion</b>	<b>Member</b>
1	I am not sure about the exact phraseology, but the concept would be to direct that impact fees imposed and collected from construction/development in districts with overcapacity schools be required to be used to address overcrowding at the impacted schools, or immediately adjacent schools that would address overcrowding at the impacted schools.	Aaron Casagrande
2	Change years of wait for school's test - schools that are at or over 115% of capacity, the years of wait shall increase from 4 to 5 years; if during the wait period capacity drops below 115% and under the then applicable capacity testing, the years of wait shall revert back to 4 years.	Aaron Casagrande
3	Capital improvement master plans to plan for the addition of schools in areas of the county over capacity or where the county is aiming to direct substantial future development.	Aaron Casagrande
4	I am not sure about the exact phraseology, but the concept would be to direct that impact fees imposed and collected from construction/development in districts with overcapacity schools be required to be used to address overcrowding at the impacted schools, or immediately adjacent schools that would address overcrowding at the impacted schools.	Aaron Casagrande
5	if Howard County will continue to have a different school allocation measurement than the state; the two measurements should not differ by more than 10% in order for an item to be used concurrently with the housing unit allocations. If more than a 10% difference between the measurements, the county would be encouraged to take the smaller measurement.	Antoinne Wright
6	if it's not possible for a project to pass the school test due to enrollment blockage, enact a Payment in Lieu of Taxes (PILOT) provision similar to the special affordable housing opportunity provision (16.1103e.6)	Antoinne Wright
7	tiered measurement (over time?) for the purpose of adopting changes to the school capacity APFO (<96% / 96.1-98% / 98.1-99.9% / 100% / 100.1-105% / 105.1-107.5% / 107.6-109.9% / 110-112.5% / 112.6-115% / +115%); then, a projection of utilization, and it's estimated growth/decline, would be better able to be used as a measurement for school capital planning; my thinking here is that the closer that a school is to 100% utilization, the higher weighted value it can be when it comes to making/establishing budgetary actions by the county	Antoinne Wright
8	Waiting Period Reduction (16.1105c.7): reduce the maximum waiting periods by two years	Antoinne Wright
9	allocation is not available (16.1105c.2): the list of applications waiting for housing unit allocations should be granted an economic incentive (for example, some type of Payment in Lieu of Taxes (PILOT) agreement automatically enacted) once placed into this tentative/not available to be allocated category, to which they could stay for no more than two years before this project moves into an available allocation	Antoinne Wright
10	eliminate the application of the schools test if after two years of enrollment capacity being +115% for a mixed use development project where the residential ratio of use is +70% and not age restricted and assigns +49% of residential units in an affordable classification	Antoinne Wright
11	*APFO testing – The maximum waiting period for a project failing open-closed school charts is 6years.	Brent Loveless
12	*APFO testing – A project that fails 4 APFO chart tests will be eligible to proceed after five years if affected utilization at all three levels <105% and after six years if utilization <110%	Brent Loveless
13	*HCPSS – Capacity tests – The maximum capacity utilization for elementary schools shall be 100% utilization.	Brent Loveless

**APFO Recommended Motions Parking Lot**  
**As of March 6, 2025**

14	*HCPSS – Capacity tests – The maximum capacity utilization for middle schools shall be 100% utilization.	Brent Loveless
15	*HCPSS – Capacity tests – The maximum capacity utilization for High schools shall be 100% utilization.	Brent Loveless
16	*HCPSS – Capacity tests – The maximum capacity utilization for elementary schools shall be 95% utilization to provide adequate resources between capital projects and redistricting.	Brent Loveless
17	*HCPSS – Capacity tests – The maximum capacity utilization for middle schools shall be 95% utilization to provide adequate resources between capital projects and redistricting.	Brent Loveless
18	*HCPSS – Capacity tests – The maximum capacity utilization for High schools shall be 95% utilization.to provide adequate resources between capital projects and redistricting.	Brent Loveless
19	*Local school capacity has been the standard measure for HCPSS utilization since inception. Any shift of measurement to a different standard will require a mandatory change of utilization thresholds to establish equivalent levels of service prior to the change.	Brent Loveless
20	*Student yield – AFPO Student yield impacts form new construction developed by the DPZ must apply the student yield from adding an additional household in perpetuity rather than the measured impact from first year of occupancy.	Brent Loveless
21	*Student Yield – HCPSS is to include report criteria in the feasibility study showing impacts of class size changes to capacity utilization over a 10-year period. This is to include actual and forecast changes from school revaluations.	Brent Loveless
22	*HCPSS School Capacity – APFO capacity utilization test threshold limits should be aligned each fiscal year with the HCPSS K-12 school capacity level published in the yearly feasibility chart. (I.E the 100% utilization threshold standard)	Brent Loveless
23	*HCPSS final redistricting results will be applied within two council sessions to an additional out of phase APFO test for newly created constrained attendance areas. This test will not count toward the tally of APFO closed school tests and status will default to the findings of the next most recent fiscal study release upon next Fiscal year APFO chart adoption.	Brent Loveless
24	*Introduce an additional test – School with a Facility Condition Index below 85% are considered closed for open-closed tests. Logic – capacity requiring significant additional per-seat costs do not have mitigation presently.	Brent Loveless
25	<p>Move to recommend that Howard County modify the APFO schools test to adopt a Utilization Premium Payment to establish a new source of revenue for school capital projects and deferred school maintenance.</p> <p><b>Detail:</b> As we learned from Montgomery County presentation at the 11/20 meeting, a developer in Montgomery County has to pay a premium payment which is assessed in addition to school impact tax for residential units proposed in overutilized school areas. In MoCo, this fee takes the place of a waiting period. We can consider adopting UPP and either keeping, adjusting, or eliminating the waiting bin, as part of a separate motion. In MoCo, the amount of this fee is calculated using several inputs: Payment Factor based on tiers, adequacy standards, and the projected number of students the development is estimated to yield. If we move to recommend the premium payment method, we can also, as a secondary matter, dive into the details how to define the factors used to determine the fee/tiers/standards, etc. used to calculate UPP payments but as a preliminary matter, I want to first make a general motion to adopt UPP.</p>	Jeremy Dommu

**APFO Recommended Motions Parking Lot**  
***As of March 6, 2025***

<b>26</b>	<p>Include both spaces and students enrolled in preschool, regional special education, and other similar programs in the local capacity and local student enrollment numbers.</p> <p><b>Detail:</b> <i>For schools with preschool or other such programs, this will increase both that school's capacity as well as enrollment. It will bring local capacities more in line with SRC while still allowing Howard County flexibility to define capacity calculations based on our own unique local considerations.</i></p>	Jeremy Dommu
<b>27</b>	Increase the capacity test percentages so that new construction/revitalization can take place	Jon Browne
<b>28</b>	Decrease the 4-year wait period for new construction that falls in a school zone over capacitated	Jon Browne
<b>29</b>	consider a fee for building in "closed" areas if those monies are lock-boxed for those schools impacted	Laura Jones
<b>30</b>	Amending Title 16 section 1103 (c) (3) –Current language defines requirements in HCPSS capacity chart – In annual capacity chart include what the most recent projected enrollment data was from the past 3 years and add the actual enrollment data for those periods.	Lisa Markovitz
<b>31</b>	<p>Amending Title 16 section 1103 (c) (3) (iii) – Current language of requirement - ANY PROJECTED INCREASE IN ENROLLMENT, AN INDICATION OF WHAT PORTIONS OF THE INCREASE ARE ATTRIBUTED TO SALES OR RENTAL, TURNOVER OF EXISTING RESIDENTIAL UNITS, NEW DEVELOPMENT.</p> <p>Add – Include enrolled students for three years past the occupancy permits of new construction as new. Do not include in resales any homes not sold in the last three years. THIS TREATS THE SOURCING DATA REQUIREMENTS THE SAME FOR THE CATEGORIES OF NEW AND REALES AND GIVES CONSISTENT DATA, WHICH IS PARAMOUNT FOR PLANNING.</p>	Lisa Markovitz
<b>32</b>	<p>Compromise idea – for existing exemptions of defined low-income, pilot, etc., projects from apfo tests, remove council hearing requirement. AND Exempt MIHU projects, not just units, that have at least double what is required AND LIHU projects from ALLOCATIONS test.</p> <p>AND If ES is over 110% and/or MS is over 115%, and/or HS is over 120% project pays per unit 1.5X current fees.</p> <p>AND all projects can pay 2X fees to shorten max wait by 2 years, not to ever be less than 2 years.</p>	Lisa Markovitz
<b>33</b>	Slide the fee schedules to charge more for types of units that produce more students, and less for those that produce less. But prior to implementation have a review of last 3 years of projected versus actual enrollment to carefully apply source data. Each year do not implement any discounts that are not more than offset by the higher charges. Suggested amounts - 30% differentials.	Lisa Markovitz
<b>34</b>	Consider raising adequacy cap number on schools	Pascal Crosley
<b>35</b>	Adjust the timing of the APFO waiting bins to reduce waiting times if there are no funded school capacity projects in constrained school districts	Paul Gleichauf
<b>36</b>	Exempt smaller unit sizes from the APFO schools test, given the reduced student yield.	Paul Gleichauf

**APFO Recommended Motions Parking Lot**  
***As of March 6, 2025***

<b>37</b>	Exempt Affordable Housing, Accessible Housing, and Minor Subdivisions from APFO school adequacy requirements.	Paul Gleichauf
<b>38</b>	Include seats in portables in the school capacity count for HCPSS (given Programmatic changes such as reduced class size, full day kindergarten, and universal pre-K driving increases in level of service.)	Paul Gleichauf
<b>39</b>	Remove the elementary school “regional capacity” provision that close all schools in a region if the aggregate capacity measure is above the threshold	Paul Gleichauf
<b>40</b>	Revise school capacity thresholds to 115% for all schools (ES, MS, HS)	Paul Gleichauf
<b>41</b>	A project should be released from APFO hold if, on the date of the third test, HCPSS has not either redistricted to relieve the overcrowding, or submitted in the budget and had a capital project approved to add the seats needed to relieve the overcrowding. If the HCPSS isn’t going to do anything to relieve overcrowding with the time granted it, the project should proceed. Delaying projects with no move toward remedy is unjust and could be constituted as a taking.	Todd Arterburn
<b>42</b>	At present, HCPSS has 100% control of both the numerator and denominator of the capacity charts. According to Jeff Bronow’s chart, it took seven years for HCPSS to catch up to the new enrollment realities. At the same time, HCPSS controls the school capacity denominator. We should revert to SRC rather than LRC and take the denominator out of HCPSS hands. That is the number used by the State in other calculations, i.e. state contributions to operating budgets and capital projects, and should be used in the capacity charts as well. We note that HCPSS represents that LRC, like SRC, is formulaic, but then added that there are instances where an individual school’s LRC is adjusted for one reason or another. This can have the effect of closing a school without proper oversight and can be done arbitrarily and capriciously by the school system. Using SRC removes this as an issue.	Todd Arterburn
<b>43</b>	There should be no “rounding up.” In past years, HCPSS has used the number of projected students at a schools, divided that by the number of LRC seats and turned it into a percentage. If this percentage was greater than a whole number (i.e. 114.3%), it would round it up and then close the school on the charts EVEN IF THE CAPACITY WAS 1150 STUDENTS AND THERE WERE 1143 STUDENTS ENROLLED. This practice takes property rights from a landowner without justification.	Todd Arterburn
<b>44</b>	The County Council and County Executive, as the elected officials representing all the taxpayers of the County (not just parents with schoolchildren), must be actively involved in the process of producing the charts, and should be able to challenge every number on the chart and seek proper revisions, in cases of error or misinterpretation.	Todd Arterburn
<b>45</b>	Given that HCPSS has stated that there are three ways to resolve overcrowding at a school – redistricting (which they said was often “a bridge too far” due to the politics), brick-and-mortar additions (which due to their budgeting and construction complexity and have been rarely used to resolve overcrowding), or modular classrooms (which is nearly always the HCPSS solution). If two of the three means of dealing with overcrowding are seldom used due to politics and/or inconvenience, then the only one that is used (modulars) should count toward capacity. You can’t take away property rights because it’s politically difficult or inconvenient for you to do otherwise.	Todd Arterburn
<b>46</b>	APFO should require a no less than every three-year system-wide redistricting. At present, we have more seats available than students enrolled, even if we use LRC. HCPSS should be expected to respect the reality that their redistricting inaction constitutes a constitutional taking and puts the County at risk of a lawsuit.	Todd Arterburn

**APFO Recommended Motions Parking Lot**  
**As of March 6, 2025**

<b>47</b>	Recommend a revision of the 2018 percentages (115% high school, 110% middle school, 105% elementary school, 105% elementary school region), removing the arbitrary elementary regions entirely, eliminating any HS test (which aren't relevant now anyway with the addition of the 13 <sup>th</sup> high school), rolling back ES to 110%, and leaving MS at 110%.	Todd Arterburn
<b>48</b>	Investigate a buyout option for projects stuck in APFO hold, that would generate additional capital quickly. This buyout option would be in addition to the school surcharge, which now sits at ~9%, and would be paid when a project receives a technically complete letter from the County (it couldn't wait for the building permit application). This would be similar to a PILOT (Payment in Lieu of Taxes) used in certain County districts, like downtown Columbia.	Todd Arterburn
<b>49</b>	Exempt multi-story multi-family elevator apartment projects <= 2 bedrooms from any APFO tests. According to Bronow's charts, they generate an exceedingly low number of students. They would still have to pay the school surcharge.	Todd Arterburn
<b>50</b>	Exempt LIHTC and MIHU projects (subsidized housing) from APFO. They too would still have to pay the school surcharge. We may be required by the State to do this anyway.	Todd Arterburn
<b>51</b>	Change the name of the school surcharge and call it a development impact fee. Review and revise the enabling legislation and broaden how the funds may be spent to enable investments (capital spending) on more types of projects that might be needed to support new development.	Todd Arterburn
<b>52</b>	Exempt minor infill projects and small major infill projects <10 units, including SFD and SFA. These generate a miniscule number of new students. According to Bronow, a 10-unit SFD project delivers 5 new students divided between ES, MS and HS, which peak over a 7-year horizon. There is no justification to hold up these projects to alleviate school overcrowding.	Todd Arterburn
<b>53</b>	Exempt for sale SFA/multi-family condos of <= 2 bdr from APFO. Restrict the owner's ability to rent to units for at least 5 years. This is the type of housing needed in the county to create pathways to ownership and should be encouraged.	Todd Arterburn
<b>54</b>	For any project initiated within an open school area, to reserve a percentage of impact fees for capital improvements to schools immediately impacted by the project. For any project initiated under a waiver in a closed school area, to reserve a larger percentage of impact fees for capital improvements to schools immediately impacted by the project.	Vynessa Pantano
<b>55</b>	Consider increasing percentage of transfer/recordation tax allocated to schools to address revenue for deferred maintenance.	Vynessa Pantano

**ROADS**

<b>Number</b>	<b>Motion</b>	<b>Member</b>
<b>56</b>	the definition for "minimum level of service" or "traffic" should expand for including all transportation modalities supported by the facilities intended audiences (walk, bike, roll, drive) (16.1101e, 16.1101g)	Antoinne Wright
<b>57</b>	the test for adequate road facilities. (16.1101b): revise this test to include evaluating for the expected/projected level of service for automotive and multi model traffic.	Antoinne Wright

**APFO Recommended Motions Parking Lot**  
**As of March 6, 2025**

<b>58</b>	Traffic to Be Considered in Determining Adequacy (16.1101e): this part of the ordinance only considers road traffic that is generated; it should also include multi modal traffic and add a walk/ bicycle test (level of service?) to determine this.	Antoinne Wright
<b>59</b>	if the facility offers bike/roll amenity or is adjacent to existing bike/role amenity, the facility should be tested and aim for a level three or better level of stress measurement ( <a href="https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/8f01552b8ff745d8902476a7c569f64c/">https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/8f01552b8ff745d8902476a7c569f64c/</a> )	Antoinne Wright
<b>60</b>	*Transit – Eliminate the 4-unit or less exemption from traffic tests due to the potential for significant density increasing variability impacts from Missing Middle Housing proposals.	Brent Loveless
<b>61</b>	*Transit – Transit Demand Management mitigation substitutes must provide the equivalent traffic benefit and must contribute within 75% of a traditional widening solution.	Brent Loveless
<b>62</b>	*Parking – A new test for parking adequacy is required to support significant projects that have not demonstrated long term transit maturity.	Brent Loveless
<b>63</b>	Review traffic count changes since the pandemic. If telecommuting and hybrid work practices have reduced traffic counts as compared to prior to the pandemic, explore amending the roads test to match the lower traffic volumes seen given the rise in remote work.	Paul Gleichauf
<b>64</b>	Add test for bicycle capacity	Paul Gleichauf
<b>APFO ADJACENT</b>		
<b>Number</b>	<b>Motion</b>	<b>Member</b>
<b>65</b>	actively reduce housing unit allocations yearly based on the actual allocated units of the previous financial year with a +/- capped threshold equal to no more than a fixed percentage calculated from the total of the last two fiscal year’s finished housing projects	Antoinne Wright

**APFO Recommended Motions Parking Lot**  
***As of March 6, 2025***

66	reduce the time mixed use (“missing middle”) housing projects allocated in activity centers must wait to pass an allocation test by one (1) year	Antoinne Wright
67	reduce the time phased mixed use (“missing middle”) housing projects allocated in activity centers must wait to pass allocation test before the phased development can begin	Antoinne Wright
68	housing units/affordable housing units, which correspond to smaller unit yields should have a modified school and road test (similar to what’s being proposed here <a href="https://apps.howardcountymd.gov/olis/LegislationDetail?legislationId=13722&amp;legislationNumber=CB18-2025">https://apps.howardcountymd.gov/olis/LegislationDetail?legislationId=13722&amp;legislationNumber=CB18-2025</a> )	Antoinne Wright
69	*APFO review cycle – Change to election cycle of once every 4 years for consistent timing.	Brent Loveless
70	*APFO review cycle – A minimum of one APFO review criteria (roads, parks, police, funding etc.) is to be reviewed by committee each year.	Brent Loveless
71	*APFO report – IG provide an independent yearly report concurrent with DPZ state planning mandated report on the status of public infrastructure, changes in standards, and APFO areas for process improvement.	Brent Loveless
72	*Missing Middle Phase In – due to the extreme variability of infrastructure impact scenarios, missing middle projects are to be treated to the same with APFO mitigation controls as single-family homes. The results to be analyzed for effectiveness in the next APFO committee within 5 years.	Brent Loveless

**APFO Recommended Motions Parking Lot**  
***As of March 6, 2025***

73	*Affordable housing - Recapture the market rate mitigation fees from 60/40 split affordable housing projects – continue to exempt units replaced as part of the project.	Brent Loveless
74	*Technical – Housing Unit Allocations – Language in the General Plan and others repeats a theme of “targeted” development, while present housing unit code contains multiple unlimited exemptions. Remove either the “targeted” language, or cap the maximum number of units exempted in housing allocations.	Brent Loveless
75	*Housing Unit Allocations – Re-initiate the removal of “rolling unused allocations” to provide predictability.	Brent Loveless
76	*Education – Other – Define and report mandated capital expenses to support community college, library and other capital expenses per capita. Initiate a mitigation program.	Brent Loveless
77	*Recreation and Parks – Define and report mandated capital expenses to support per-capita population increases. Initiate a mitigation program	Brent Loveless
78	*Hospital Capacity – Define and Report County capital projects related with per-capita growth. – Initiate a mitigation program.	Brent Loveless
79	*Bridge Improvement – Define and report county share of bridge improvements related with growth – Initiate a mitigation program.	Brent Loveless



**APFO Recommended Motions Parking Lot**  
***As of March 6, 2025***

<b>80</b>	*Fire/EMS - Define and report Service improvements related with growth, particularly related with NFPA response times in career stations and cistern adequacy in rural company service areas.	Brent Loveless
<b>81</b>	*Judicial – Define and report capital improvements to courthouse and sheriffs’ functions related with growth – Initiate a mitigation program.	Brent Loveless
<b>82</b>	*General County - Define and report mandated county capital projects related with per-capita growth. – Initiate a mitigation program.	Brent Loveless
<b>83</b>	*Maintenance – All APFO standards and mitigation are to include supporting infrastructure to include fleet, central office, storage, and other capital expenditures related to normal use.	Brent Loveless
<b>84</b>	*Police - Define and report mandated county capital projects related with per-capita growth such as office, fleet, lab, storage– Initiate a mitigation program.	Brent Loveless
<b>85</b>	*Road, Resurfacing, Sidewalk, traffic - Define and report mandated county capital projects related with per-capita growth. Report to IG county funded pre-emption of developer capacity projects.	Brent Loveless
<b>86</b>	*Road, Resurfacing, Sidewalk, traffic – Immediately review and implement an update to the basis of the Road Excise tax.	Brent Loveless

**APFO Recommended Motions Parking Lot**  
***As of March 6, 2025***

87	*Road, Resurfacing, Sidewalk, traffic – Implement off-siting mitigation penalty of 10% per mile of remediation distance from an unsatisfactory condition.	Brent Loveless
88	*Intersection capacity – (state delegation) – Implement a state-jurisdiction APFO to manage road adequacy on state roads servicing the county.	Brent Loveless
89	*State APFO – (state delegation) – Implement APFO standards for state capital projects impacted by per-capita and per-sqft growth.	Brent Loveless
90	*Sewer – Implement a yearly review of capacity growth and mitigation for large scale project eventuality	Brent Loveless
91	*Water – Implement a yearly review of capacity growth, and quality mitigation for large scale project eventuality	Brent Loveless
92	Mitigation Fees – School – (State Delegation) – Require the results of the mandatory fiscal year report on school surcharges to be included in the yearly HCPSS feasibility study	Brent Loveless
93	*Mitigation Fees – School – (State Delegation) – Require the phaseout of one-time school surcharge funding to be used for reoccurring bond debt.	Brent Loveless

**APFO Recommended Motions Parking Lot**  
***As of March 6, 2025***

94	*Mitigation Fees – School – (State Delegation) – Regional pre-k capacity requirements spanning multiple attendance areas needs to be accounted for within mitigation calculations and applied by elementary school region.	Brent Loveless
95	*Mitigation Fees – School – (State Delegation) – The school surcharge mitigation fee CPI history, exemption description, exemption forgone revenue and formula calculation must be published in the yearly feasibility study. The basis point for fee should be recalculated yearly to reflect the impact of adding capacity of an indefinite-use permanent seat of reoccurring use per average household added by development on a 10-year rolling average.	Brent Loveless
96	*Mitigation Fees – School – (State Delegation) – Dedicated fund usage - Require a cap on funds able to be transferred from capital expansion projects to operational capital expenses.	Brent Loveless
97	*Mitigation fees – School – (State Delegation) create a new dedicated fund alongside the Housing Opportunities Trust Fund – The Forgone Public Infrastructure Fund is to be created and managed by the council and HCPSS with IG oversight. The entity shall report yearly on cumulative forgone revenues from underestimated surcharges and will assess an additional school public development surcharge to offset lost revenues from APFO exemptions.	Brent Loveless
98	*Mitigation Fees – School – (State Delegation) – Mitigation fees are generally limited by law up to, but not above, the impact of development. The state should prioritize assessing the maximum justifiable impact fees prior to implementing “pay to play” allowing exasperation of issues where inadequate capacity exists with the same maximum net collection recapture.	Brent Loveless
99	*Finance – Perform a yearly comprehensive review of all leased capital facilities, TIF and PPP agreements that recharacterize or treat traditional capital expenditures for development impacts differently. Each APFO metric will be adjusted yearly by the council to reflect the differences for the desired effect of adequacy.	Brent Loveless
100	*APFO definition – The purpose of an Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance is to ensure adequate public facilities delivered at a consistent standard concurrent with planned development. Adequacy controls may and should be complimentary to geographic smart growth objectives. APFO standards are not intended to be compromised or balanced to reach fixed growth targets or unlimited growth exemptions. APFO can meet concurrency objectives through a variety of controls and mitigation, however the application and intensity of these methods must be tested and adjusted regularly to ensure effectiveness.	Brent Loveless

**APFO Recommended Motions Parking Lot**  
***As of March 6, 2025***

101	*Capital budget – Each county department with capital budget expenses shall provide a mandated report prior to FY budget work sessions to the county council and IG to include at least one KPI or per-capita standard that defines the minimum level of infrastructure required per capita or per size of development where applicable. The standards will be compared to at least one national standard authority with the largest applied base. The report will show a minimum of previous 10 years of capital spending including overages or deficits to provide adequate infrastructure at the provided standard. The report will contain the history of APFO related that has been legislated to prevent reductions of service levels or cost burdens to other county devices.	Brent Loveless
102	How various commercial buildings pay permit/impact fees should be revised (e.g.: warehouses)	Laura Jones
103	Consider more flexible zoning for ADUs	Laura Jones
104	Focus more on multi-unit home ownership opportunities, senior housing and manufactured housing options.	Laura Jones
105	Since older neighborhoods also contribute to all of these issues, how to equally share these costs with new construction? It seems unbalanced that all of the costs should be borne by new construction.	Laura Jones
106	To incentivize homeowners, business owners to move closer to newer more efficient products	Laura Jones
107	New Fee based on Fire Station Response Time – When a fire station’s response times are over 8 minutes and 46 seconds for 80% or more of the time at the time of planned incoming new units to the geographic districted area of that fire station, a Fire fee of \$5000 per unit, in addition to any other applicable fees, as scheduled, will apply to units as follows. All units over 200 in a project, or in a combined staged project OR all units planned if over 500 have been approved in the last three years. These funds should be earmarked for fire department use directly or put into a land acquisition/redevelopment plan for a new station. 8 minutes 46 seconds for 80% of the time, is a limit that the County has as a goal. When that goal is not reached, there is emphasis on change, funding analyses, etc.	Lisa Markovitz
108	Remove the APFO Allocations chart. Serves no purpose given current schools test.	Paul Gleichauf
109	Require Howard County Board of Education to share its methodology for projecting school capacity to the County Executive and County Council and initiate a meeting immediately after a project is granted a waiver in a closed school area to discuss impact of project and how to disperse additional capacity/utilization impacts to reduce that impact.	Vynessa Pantano

**APFO Recommended Motions Parking Lot**  
**As of March 6, 2025**

MISC		
Number	Motion	Member
110	Convene an AFPO review committee: (1) the first year following the adoption of every General plan and (2) 4 years later. [Note: Is this already accomplished through Section 16.1100(b)(3)(iv)(b)?]	Aaron Casagrande
111	(If this is not done already) Require the County to issue a yearly report as to which proposed projects fail the APFO testing each year and the AFCO testing criteria that fail.	Aaron Casagrande
112	Include Department of Fire & Rescue Services as a test in APFO with a mitigation option to pass the test. Mitigation is proportionate to developer's impact on fire and rescue services. The service test is based on the metrics as presented by DFRS, specifically but not limited to response times.	Aaron Casagrande
113	Impose an emergency medical services test. if Howard County Medical Center's Emergency Department experiences an average patient wait time greater than an acceptable period over a testing period then any proposed development: (1) shall be put on hold until the average wait time is less an acceptable period over a testing period; or (2) pay a fee directed to mitigate hospital wait times.	Aaron Casagrande
114	Impose a recreation facilities and parks test. Establish a metric based on the area of indoor and outdoor recreation facilities per county resident. If development would result in less than the threshold facilities, require developer to contribute funds to construct new facilities. Test would likely be focused on a certain number of miles from residence.	Aaron Casagrande
115	Amended AFCO Ordinance to allow for limited budget for Review Committee to retain consultants to advise on its work, deliberations and recommendations. Committee would continue to be staffed by the Department of Planning and Zoning.	Aaron Casagrande
116	Convene an AFPO review committee: (1) the first year following the adoption of every General plan and (2) 4 years later. [Note: Is this already accomplished through Section 16.1100(b)(3)(iv)(b)?]	Aaron Casagrande
117	Waiting Period Reduction (16.1105c.7): reduce the maximum waiting periods by two years	Antoinne Wright

**APFO Recommended Motions Parking Lot**  
**As of March 6, 2025**

118	allocation is not available (16.1105c.2): the list of applications waiting for housing unit allocations should be granted an economic incentive (for example, some type of Payment in Lieu of Taxes (PILOT) agreement automatically enacted) once placed into this tentative/not available to be allocated category, to which they could stay for no more than two years before this project moves into an available allocation	Antoinne Wright
119	eliminate the application of the schools test if after two years of enrollment capacity being +115% for a mixed use development project where the residential ratio of use is +70% and not age restricted and assigns +49% of residential units in an affordable classification	Antoinne Wright
120	<p>Move to recommend that the County increase the Transfer Tax to establish another source of revenue for school capital projects and deferred school maintenance.</p> <p><i><b>Details:</b> I envision that this would be a progressive tax in which the increased transfer tax rate applies for home sales over a high value threshold (e.g. \$750,000, \$800,000, \$1m, etc.). In this way, homes at lower and median values would not be impacted. Given that turnover of existing SFHs in a major contributor to school increases, this is a necessary source of revenue that can help close the school capacity funding gap. There has been a slow-down in resales over the past 5 years due to the pandemic and higher interest rates (which incidentally is a major cause for the HCPSS projection of flat / declining student enrollment). In consideration of Howard County’s aging population and many new age-restricted developments in the pipeline, it is reasonable to project that resales will increase over the coming years with many households without school aged children selling homes to families with school-aged children. As we know, resales of SFHs are a major driving of school enrollment growth. This transfer tax increase is needed to help close the gap in needed school capacity/maintenance funding and it can be done in a way that would only impact more expensive home sales.</i></p>	Jeremy Dommu
121	*Storm drainage – Create a test and growth mitigation for each watershed in Howard County.	Brent Loveless
122	<p>Amend Title 16 Section 1100 (b)(3)(iv) – Current language regarding when to have Apfo review – “within one year of the enactment date of the general plan”.</p> <p>Add – If comprehensive rezoning legislation has not been enacted within two years of the enactment date of the updated General Plan, then an APFO review shall be added after the enactment of Comprehensive Rezoning legislation.</p>	Lisa Markovitz
123	Continue to exempt Accessory Dwelling Units from APFO criteria. Ensure detached Accessory Dwelling Units are also exempt from APFO criteria.	Paul Gleichauf
124	Advocate for increased government funding for affordable housing, including APFO related infrastructure financing programs.	Paul Gleichauf
125	Exempt accessible units from APFO requirements.	Paul Gleichauf

**APFO Recommended Motions Parking Lot**  
***As of March 6, 2025***

<b>126</b>	Continue all current APFO Exemptions <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>o Single lot exemption in the Rural West</li><li>o Single lot for family member</li><li>o Single lot for financial hardship</li><li>o Mobile home replacement units</li><li>o Redevelopment sites replacing existing units</li><li>o No School Capacity Test for age-restricted units</li><li>o Moderate Income Housing Units do not need allocations</li><li>o Special affordable housing opportunities (by County Council resolution)</li></ul>	Paul Gleichauf
------------	--	----------------