

ALL APFO Committee Votes as of May 7, 2025

		APFO Committee Voting					
Vote #	Meeting #	Motion Wording	Motion Made By	Seconded By	Pass Tally	Opposition Tally	P/F
1	13	Eliminate the schools adequacy test from APFO	Todd Arterburn	Xavian Esson	7	8	F
2	13	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	Antoine Wright	1	13	F
3	13	HCPSS – Capacity tests – The maximum capacity utilization for middle schools shall be 100% utilization.	Brent Loveless	Antoine Wright	2	13	F
4	13	HCPSS – Capacity tests – The maximum capacity utilization for High schools shall be 110% utilization.	Dan Lubeley	Brent Loveless	6	9	F
5	13	Capacity tests – The maximum capacity utilization for middle schools shall be 95% utilization to provide adequate resources between capital projects and redistricting.	Brent Loveless	None	0	0	NA
6	13	Capacity tests – The maximum capacity utilization for middle schools shall be 100% utilization.	Brent Loveless	None	0	0	NA
7	13	Capacity tests – The maximum capacity utilization for elementary schools shall be 95% utilization to provide adequate resources between capital projects and redistricting.	Brent Loveless	None	0	0	NA
8	13	HCPSS – Capacity tests – The maximum capacity utilization for elementary schools shall be 100% utilization.	Brent Loveless	Vynessa Pantano	5	10	F

ALL APFO Committee Votes as of May 7, 2025

9	13	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.	Jeremy Dommu	Jen Mallo	Tabled Motion	NA	NA
10	14	Move to allow amendments of motions from APFO committee members not just the member who made the original member	Paul Gleichauf	Jen Mallo	14	1	P
11	14	Move to Adopt Robert's Rules Basics	Laura Jones	Brent Loveless	15	0	P
12	14	AMENDMENT 1 TO MOTION 11: Replace the APFO schools test with a Utilization Premium Payment (UPP) fee modeled after the system used in Montgomery County, so that instead of a required wait time, developers of residential units are charged an additional fee calculated by applying a UPP factor to Howard County's existing school surcharge fee when the development's impact on the projected school utilization of the assigned schools exceeds adequacy thresholds. The payment factor percentages are to use a similar tier percentage as Montgomery County and the adequacy thresholds (utilization and seat deficit standards) should be developed using the Montgomery County approach tailored to Howard County data.	Jeremy Dommu	Laura Jones	12	3	P
13	14	AMENDMENT 2 TO MOTION 11: to modify the prior original motion that surcharge replaces surcharge, that similar that replaces same and that tailored to Howard County data is added.	Dan Lubeley	Laura Jones	15	0	P
14	14	AMENDMENT 3 TO MOTION 11: After the words (adequacy and threshold) as derived by Howard County LRC.	Lisa Markovitz	Jen Mallo	7	8	F
Vote.70.Opposition.View;The.opposition.view.not.supportive.because.of.a.previous.motion.to.solidify.LRC.as.part.of.the.criteria.for.the.adequacy.testing.did.not.pass;Members.who.did.not.vote.in.favor.wanted.to.make.sure.the.LRC.was.maintained.as.the.standard.of.measurement;Another.opposing.viewpoint.was.from.a.member.that.all.the.school.PTAs.in.Howard.County.did.not.want.this;							

ALL APFO Committee Votes as of May 7, 2025

15	15	Remove the seat deficit component to our UPP	Laura Jones	Dan Lubeley	14	0	P
16	15	Revise the school capacity figures in the original UPP model to use the 105, 110, and 115 % for school assessments (specific to TIER I, II, III) with the understanding that if new information is provided that this motion is revisited. This will apply to E, M, HS.	Paul Gleichauf	Jen Mallo	14	0	P
17	15	TIER I UPP for ES is 16 2/3%, TIER I UPP for MS is 10% and TIER I UPP for HS is 13 1/3%	Jeremy Domu	Jen Mallo	6	7	F
18	16	Proceed with the UPP model using 40% premium payment for TIER I, 80% TIER II, and 120% TIER III using the 6,3,4 distribution.	Paul Gleichauf	Jen Mallo	10	1	P
19	16	Continuing with APFO utilization used as APFO SCHOOL capacity = 3rd year of enrollment projection over the school capacity at LRC.	Jen Mallo	Paul Gleichauf	11	0	P
20	16	Move to rename “APFO road test” to “APFO multimodal transportation test” for all instances in the Howard County Subdivision Regulations and Howard County Design Manual	Phil Scherer	Antoine Wright	11	0	P
21	16	Move to adopt pedestrian crossings at APFO intersections test to the APFO multimodal transportation test as outlined in the 4/25/25 “Proposed APFO Multimodal Transportation Tests” memo	Phil Scherer	Antoine Wright	11	0	P
22	16	Move to adopt ADA access to existing nearby bus stops test to the APFO multimodal transportation test as outlined in the 4/25/25 “Proposed APFO Multimodal Transportation Tests” memo.	Phil Scherer	Laura Jones	10	0	P
23	16	Apply the UPP model to affordable housing and the affordable housing column on the base surcharge rate.	Jon Browne	Jen Mallo	10	1	P

ALL APFO Committee Votes as of May 7, 2025

24*	16	Apply the UPP model to senior housing on the base senior housing surcharge rate.	Tood Arterburn	Paul Gleichauf	7	1	P
<div>*2 abstentions Mr. Scherer and Mr. Wright. Mr. Casagrande was absent for the vote.</div> <div>Vote 18 Opposition View: Brent Loveless was not supportive of this motion because there would be a deficit in the per pupil seat cost generated by using this formula in the UPP.</div> <div>Vote 23 Opposition View: Brent Loveless because of intentional overcrowding</div> <div>Vote 23 Opposition View: Brent Loveless because there is no rational nexus.</div>							
25	17	Move to adopt the AHWG definition for Affordable Housing and its housing unit application.	Jen Mallo	Laura Jones	10	2	P
<div>Vote 25 Opposition View: Aaron Casagrande was not supportive... Brent Loveless was not supportive because it would harm the people it is trying to serve because the regional medium income level is more appropriate.</div>							