

**APF Review Task Force  
Recommendations Summary**

Current Voting Procedure

After a motion has been proposed and seconded, the Chair shall call for a vote. In order for the motion to pass, two-thirds of the total designated voting members, as named in EO 5-2015 and EO 8-2015, must vote in the affirmative. As of December 16, 2015, this formula equates to 15 voting members.

December 16, 2015

*Motions Passed*

**MOTION:**

- (1) Change program capacity at which a school is deemed open to 110%;
- (2) If projected enrollment lies between 110% and 115% of program capacity then developer can move forward if it pays a public school facilities surcharge double the amount in current law; if projected enrollment is over 115% and up to 120% of program capacity then developer can move forward if it pays a public school facilities surcharge triple the amount in current law;
- (3) The developer's wait time for the allocations and schools test combined shall not exceed 5 years contingent on the receipt of allocations within the 5 year time period; the last development plan shall be allowed to be processed at the developer's risk;
- (4) All existing Howard County dwelling units excluding MIHU and age-restricted dwelling units shall pay an annual fee (\$25 for apartment/condominium; \$50 for townhouse; \$75 for single family detached) that is dedicated to public school capital budget;
- (5) In an effort to identify efficiencies and better utilize existing space, HCPSS shall reduce its capital budget request by 2% per year for the next 5 fiscal years excluding revenue from the surcharge and the household fee in this motion

**VOTE: 17-0-1**

**OPPOSITION VIEW:** Fiscal projections not yet available

*Motions Failed*

**MOTION:**

- (1) Maintain current definition of an open school as below 115% of program capacity;
- (2) If projected enrollment lies between 115% and 120% of program capacity then developer can move forward if it pays a public school facilities surcharge twice the amount currently in law

**VOTE: 10-8**

**OPPOSITION VIEW:** Doubling the surcharge doesn't offset costs associated with capacity increase; a capacity standard that exceeds 100% is unacceptable; Task Force has already voted to put additional pressure on growth management by exempting MIHUs from allocations test

**MOTION:**

- (1) Change program capacity at which a school is deemed open to 110%;
- (2) If projected enrollment lies between 110% and 115% of program capacity then developer's wait time will decrease to two years if it pays a public school facilities surcharge double the amount currently in law;
- (3) If projected enrollment lies between 115% and 120% of program capacity then developer's wait time will decrease to two years if it pays a public school facilities surcharge triple the amount currently in law

**VOTE: 7-9-2**

**OPPOSITION VIEW:** Increased revenue is contingent on capacity resting between 110% and 120%; a reduction in capacity will close more schools thereby halting development and preventing the County from collecting additional surcharge revenue