

ALL APFO Committee Votes as of July 16, 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 July 16, 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 July 16, 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 Dommu	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 July 16, 2025

24*	16	Apply the UPP model to senior housing on the base senior housing surcharge rate.	Tood Arterburn	Paul Gleichauf	7	1	P
<p>*2 abstentions Mr. Scherer and Mr. Wright. Mr. Casagrande was absent for the vote.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Vote 23 Opposition View: Brent Loveless because of intentional overcrowding</p> <p>Vote 23 Opposition View: Brent Loveless because there is no rational nexus.</p>							
25	17	Move to adopt the AHWG definition for Affordable Housing and its housing unit application.	Jen Mallo	Laura Jones	10	2	P
<p>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.</p>							
26*	19	Rename the UPP to the School Over capacity Utilization Payment (SOUP)	Jeremy Dommu	Laura Jones	6	5	P
27	19	Have the SOUP and School Surcharge set when the buildings permit is applied for.	Paul Gleichauf	Dan Lubeley	12	0	P
28**	19	Request that the Office of School planning include enrolled students figure for three years of prior use & occupancy permits as a new data point in the Annual School Capacity Chart and call that a 3-year occupancy enrollment figure new students from the prior 3 years.	Lisa Markovitz	Brent Loveless	10	1	P
29	19	The school surcharge basis must be solely the impact of adding an additional average household to HCPSS regardless of externalities. The impact is based on the current actual proportional cost per seat in HCPSS mitigated using one-time fees progressively applied using a per sqft basis. The mitigation level shall automatically adjust with Inflation index and basis values reviewed yearly.	Brent Loveless	Lisa Markovitz	1	11	F

ALL APFO Committee Votes as of July 16, 2025

30	19	Establish an APFO review committee within one year (12 months) after a General Plan Adoption and every three years thereafter.	Aaron Casagrande	Lisa Markovitz	12	0	P
31	19	Committee recommends that the Council consider requiring mitigation efforts/payments in lieu when EMS and/or fire response times exceed or are expected to exceed nationally accepted response time standards as the result of new development, with a particular focus on high density and/or senior living development. Input should be sought from the County Fire Dept. regarding the amount of the fee to be directed to them.	Lisa Markovitz	Aaron Casagrande	10	2	P
Vote 26 – Phil Scherer was not present for this vote. The opposition votes to this motion did not feel it was necessary to rename this proposal.							
Vote 28 - Todd Arterburn voted present on this motion. Jen Mallo opposed because she did not support a Plan B recommendation.							
Vote31***- Todd Arterburn and John Browne did not vote in favor of this motion because it adds too much additional costs to the already overburdened fees for new construction.							
32	20	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	Brent Loveless	4	6	F
33*	20	Recommend that if the SOUP plan is not adopted, to differentiate wait times and fees to charge/put more wait for more crowded areas than less.	Lisa Markovitz	Paul Gleichauf	6	3	P
34	20	Allocation Tests (based on 16.1105c.2) - if an allocation is not available the list of applications waiting for housing unit allocations should be granted a onetime 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 stand for no more than two years before this project goes into an available allocation.	Antoine Wright	Brent Loveless	1	9	F
35	20	Allocation Tests - In order to better address missing middle housing units, and affordable housing units, which respond to smaller unit yields should have a weighted or modified allocations APFO test)	Antoine Wright	None	0	0	NA

ALL APFO Committee Votes as of July 16, 2025

36	20	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.	Antoine Wright	Antoine Wright	4	7	F
37	20	Storm drainage – Create a Storm drainage test for growth mitigation for each watershed in Howard County.	Brent Loveless	None	0	0	NA
38	20	Limit the use of school surcharge funds to one-time capital expenditures or payments on existing debt but not to support the issuance of new debt.	Brent Loveless	Paul Gleichauf	10	0	P
* Vote 33 – The prevailing opposition did not support a Plan B recommendation.							
39	21	Using the agreed upon affordable housing definition apply the Affordable Housing Column of the APFO Allocation Chart: • Housing and Community Development Board reviews/approves density bonus that is proportional to the number of affordable units proposed beyond the required number of MIHU/LIHU/DIHU per the base zoning district as a way of utilizing the Affordable Housing Allocation Column.	Lisa Markovitz	Laura Jones	8	2	P
40	21	Student yield – AFPO Student yield impacts from 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	None	NA	NA	NA
41	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	None	NA	NA	NA
42	21	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	None	NA	NA	NA

ALL APFO Committee Votes as of July 16, 2025

43	21	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	None	NA	NA	NA
44	21	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	None	NA	NA	NA
45	21	Housing Unit Allocations – Re-initiate the removal of “rolling unused allocations” to provide predictability.	Brent Loveless	Lisa Markovitz	6	4	P
46	21	Require the results of the mandatory fiscal year report on school surcharges and any related SOUP be posted on the County website within 30-days after being presented to the State Delegation	Brent Loveless	Lisa Markovitz	10	0	P
47	21	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	Lisa Markovitz	3	5	F

Vote 39 – The opposition did not vote in favor of this motion because it was a lot of information that seemed a complex and did not have enough information on how the column would ultimately work.

Vote 45 – The opposition did not vote in favor of this motion because it takes cuts off potential units from the development pipeline whose surcharge can be used to offset the seat capacity issue.