

**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 9, 2015, this formula equates to 15 voting members.

December 9, 2015

Motions Failed

MOTION: Change years of wait for schools test - schools that are at or over 120% of capacity, the years of wait shall increase from 4 to 5 years; if during the wait period capacity drops below 120%, the years of wait shall revert back to 4 years

VOTE: 13-7

OPPOSITION VIEW: Total wait time already exceeds 4 years once development plan approval and allocation wait time are factored in; heightened overcapacity does not result in lower quality education, which makes a further slowing down of development unwarranted

MOTION: Adjust student enrollment calculation for schools test – enrollment count shall include both pre-kindergarten and special education students; capacity shall include relocatable space
--

VOTE: 3-16-1

OPPOSITION VIEW: The term ‘relocatable’ is not fully defined in the motion; this motion has the effect of lowering a school’s capacity rate by classifying ‘relocatables’ as permanent space; ‘relocatables’ pose public safety, fire safety, and physical safety dangers to students; special education students are currently counted in capacity and disaggregating them for purposes of the schools test is in contrast to the inclusion model under which they are taught
--

MOTION: Eliminate elementary school regions test and replace it with an adjacent (i.e.,

contiguous borders) schools test in which the capacity utilization of the school being tested and all adjacent elementary schools are totaled for a test of overall capacity utilization. If grouping is greater than 115%, then the school is deemed closed; if grouping is less than 100% and individual school exceeds 115%, then the school is deemed open

VOTE: 3-17

OPPOSITION VIEW: School capacity at adjacent schools is unrelated to the capacity at the school being tested.

MOTION: Insert in APFO specific language from Howard County Design Manual, Volume III, Chapter 4 relating to grade separation

VOTE: 14-5

OPPOSITION VIEW: General reference to Howard County Design Manual already exists in APFO's grade separation provision

MOTION: Remove exemption from roads test for minor subdivisions

VOTE: 10-7-1

OPPOSITION VIEW: Minor subdivisions produce an insignificant number of cars; cost to developers/homeowners of procuring traffic study is onerous

MOTION: Require that a planned traffic remediation project must be in construction before being able to be used as remediation of a failed traffic test in or near its location

VOTE: 12-7

OPPOSITION VIEW: This provision could lead to project delays for reasons beyond the developers control as they have no authority over when government funding will be allocated and construction will begin on a remediation project

Vote to amend, "Require that a planned traffic remediation project must be in construction before being able to be used as remediation of a failed traffic test in or near its location"

MOTION: Project does not need to be in construction, but funding must be secured
VOTE: 12-6-1
OPPOSITION VIEW: This provision could lead to project delays for reasons beyond the developers control as they have no authority over when government funding will be allocated and construction will begin on a remediation project

MOTION: Require the County to prepare a formal second opinion of a Traffic Study that includes a review of all roads-related APFO rules to ensure compliance before approving development plan
VOTE: 9-9-1
OPPOSITION VIEW: Additional reviews are already part of DPZ's approval processes; citizens/outside parties can always procure an additional test and submit those results to DPZ