

Sayers, Margery

From: Brian Messineo <bmessineo@timberlakehomes.com>
Sent: Monday, September 18, 2017 8:36 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Brian Messineo
901 Parma Ct
Davidsonville, MD 21035
bmessineo@timberlakehomes.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Deborah Callahan, L <debby@goodier.com>
Sent: Monday, September 18, 2017 7:34 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Deborah Callahan
100 W Pennsylvania Ave
Towson, MD 21204
debby@goodier.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Sangita Doshi <stdoshi@hotmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 17, 2017 10:41 PM
To: CouncilMail
Cc: Kittleman, Allan
Subject: WRITTEN TESTIMONY FOR COUNCIL BILL 61

I have been a resident of Howard County for 5 years and a small business owner in Howard County for 3 years. My husband and I relocated from Charlotte, NC 5 years ago with our two boys. Our decision to reside in Howard County was a calculated one. We spent an inordinate amount of time researching and comparing the public school systems in Maryland, looking at specific neighborhoods that had the qualities we desired, and deciding which schools we wanted our children to attend. After 4 years of renting in River Hill and further research, we excitedly moved to Sykesville and settled into our current home and neighborhood last year. We thought that we were finally able to provide stability to our children while being close to family.

We currently have a 5th grader at West Friendship ES and an 8th grader at Mt. View MS, who are lucky enough to go to school with their cousins. Though, as a result of deficiencies in the APFO, my children are currently in the plans to be redistricted to schools that are 3X further than their current neighborhood schools and different than those of their cousins.

As a mom and advocate for Howard County children, I find it appalling that a lack of planning from our county officials has resulted in a proposed school redistricting plan that displaces so many children. The lack of strict regulations in APFO has had a trickle-down effect and will continue to do so unless we do something about it now. It is shameful to have our children and teachers in "learning cottages" for prolonged periods of time, where weather and sub par conditions can adversely affect their education and possibly their health. These "temporary" trailers are partly due to lack of foresight and regulations to development in Howard County.

By implementing a better plan for infrastructure funding and growth, we can mitigate the amount of school redistricting in the future. We can also ensure that all children in the county will have adequate access to medical care (i.e. Doctors and beds at hospitals) as well as adequate roads for ambulance, police, and fire rescue access.

Personally, for my children, I am concerned that if the county doesn't do a better job of controlling and planning for the development of schools, my children will be forced to redistrict yet again, or that county service levels will decline, as the county attempts to address shortfalls in funding and infrastructure.

I am requesting that Council Bill 61 is amended with the following provisions to more fairly and equitably balance well-planned growth and effective mitigation for our public infrastructure.

- School capacity limits -- INCLUDING high schools -- to be set at 100%. Schools are closed to new development at that new level.
- Mitigation (funding, additional time or both) begins when a school reaches 95% capacity.
- No reductions to the current wait time for housing allocations or school tests.
- APFO needs to be reviewed every 4 years.
- Increase real estate transfer tax by 1.0%
- APFO needs to include measures for public safety, emergency services, recreation and other community facilities.

I am looking for responsible leadership from my county officials. I would like for you and your peers to think hard about balancing growth with appropriate funding of public facilities to match that growth. Leaders that think ahead and work to promote responsible growth in the county will be receiving my vote in future elections.

Regards,

Sangita Doshi

12718 Milo Ct.

Sykesville, MD 21784

Sangita Doshi

stdoshi@hotmail.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Alexandra Cratin <alexandracratin@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 17, 2017 9:14 PM
To: CouncilMail
Cc: Kittleman, Allan
Subject: WRITTEN TESTIMONY FOR COUNCIL BILL 61

Hello county council members,

I am a Howard county resident, mother of two in elementary school, and live in Ellicott City. I am writing to you to express my deep concern for my community: it's safety, growing population, and lack of adequate APFO guidelines. With the growing number of housing developments and shrinking space for the children in our schools, I am concerned with my children's safety particularly at school assemblies and other events at school. I have witnessed multiple times students, parents, and staff crammed into areas like the cafeteria where the maximum capacity of the space is well over its limit. My daughter has 28 kids in her class and last year she was crammed into the smallest classroom in the whole school because they had run out of room. My kids are very bright and luckily do not need any special treatment but they do deserve a SAFE environment at school and because of a weak APFO, new construction in the area has allowed too many new students to enter our schools at too fast of a rate. The schools have not been able to keep up with these incoming families and student safety is now a serious issue.

I am requesting that Council Bill 61 is amended with the following provisions to more fairly and equitably balance well-planned growth and effective mitigation for our public infrastructure.

- School capacity limits -- INCLUDING high schools -- to be set at 100%. Schools are closed to new development at that level.
- Mitigation (funding, additional time, or both) begins when a school reaches 95% capacity.
- NO reductions to the current wait time for housing allocations or school tests.
- APFO needs to be reviewed every 4 years.
- Increase real estate transfer tax to account for resale contributions.
- APFO needs to include measures for public safety, emergency services, recreation, and other community facilities.

In recent years, I have become more involved and aware of not only politics across the globe but because my own children are being affected by a weak APFO, I am now more involved in local politics, specifically the council members that are up for reelection in 2018. I will be strongly swayed by the outcome of the APFO legislation and its outcome will determine my vote.

I hope that changes are made to ensure that our communities have better planning in place for the future. This is an urban issue but the county has a rural mentality and it's time to adjust to the growth as soon as possible.

Thank you very much for your time,

Alexandra Cratin
3018 Pebble Beach Dr.
Ellicott City, MD 21042

Sent from my iPhone

Sayers, Margery

From: Ben Dinsmore, P.E. <bdinsmore@gtaeng.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 17, 2017 7:59 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Ben Dinsmore P.E.
9739 Polished Stone
Columbia, MD 21046
bdinsmore@gtaeng.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Lisa Harbaugh <lharbaugh2@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 17, 2017 5:55 PM
To: CouncilMail
Cc: Kittleman, Allan
Subject: WRITTEN TESTIMONY FOR COUNCIL BILL 61

I am concerned about the current level of development in Howard County that brings tax revenue, businesses, and new residents to our county but doesn't adequately fund the critical infrastructure necessary to support a growing population such as schools, fire, police and emergency services.

I grew up and attended Howard County public schools from kindergarten through 12th grade. As adults my husband and I have chosen to settle in Howard County and raise our family here. I am especially worried that if the county does not do a better job controlling and planning for development, the school system will pay the price with overcrowded schools and students forced to redistrict multiple times.

My children attend Manor Woods Elementary School which is significantly over crowded. The quality of their education suffers as they learn in packed classrooms and lose outdoor space to an increased number of portable classrooms. The school is over capacity and yet new development continues within the immediate school district. How, in good conscience, can county leaders expect schools already over capacity to absorb the additional students that new development will bring?

I am requesting that Council Bill 61 is amended with the following provisions to more fairly and equitably balance well-planned growth and effective mitigation for our public infrastructure.

- School capacity limits -- INCLUDING high schools -- to be set at 100%. Schools are closed to new development at that level.
- Mitigation (funding, additional time, or both) begins when a school reaches 95% capacity.
- NO reductions to the current wait time for housing allocations or school tests.
- APFO needs to be reviewed every 4 years.
- Increase real estate transfer tax by 1.0%.
- APFO needs to include measures for public safety, emergency services, recreation, and other community facilities.

The reputation of Howard County Public Schools is a major draw to the area for new residents and those like my family that choose to remain and raise the next generation here. Uncontrolled growth will absolutely have a detrimental impact on the school system. I hope the county council will take the appropriate actions outlined above to preserve the critical infrastructure and quality of life in Howard County. Like many other residents, this is a priority for me and my family; the outcome of Council Bill 61 will influence my vote in future elections.

Thank you,

Lisa Harbaugh

2901 Evergreen Way

Ellicott City, MD 21042

Sayers, Margery

From: Jeffrey Caruso <jeffc06@carusohomes.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 17, 2017 5:02 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey Caruso
3404 Burgh Ln
Edgewater, MD 21037
jeffc06@carusohomes.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Al Sorrell <alsorrell@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 17, 2017 3:19 PM
To: CouncilMail
Cc: Kittleman, Allan
Subject: Written Testimony for Council Bill 61

As a senior citizen (71) who has lived in Howard County for almost 30 years, I'm concerned about all of the development in Howard County which brings increased demands on our infrastructure, including schools, traffic and emergency services, but which don't seem to be funding that required infrastructure fairly. A perfect example of this growth are the condos and apartments behind Turf Valley off Marriottsville Road.

In reading the comparative contributions for different counties, I'm appalled that Howard County seems to kowtow to the developer, building, and real estate interests in the county. Instead, we are faced with ever-increasing property tax payments.

I am requesting that Council Bill 61 is amended with the following provisions to more fairly and equitably balance well-planned growth and effective mitigation for our public infrastructure.

- School capacity limits -- INCLUDING high schools -- to be set at 100%. Schools are closed to new development at that level.
- Mitigation (funding, additional time, or both) begins when a school reaches 95% capacity.
- NO reductions to the current wait time for housing allocations or school tests.
- APFO needs to be reviewed every 4 years.
- Increase real estate transfer tax to account for resale contributions.
- APFO needs to include measures for public safety, emergency services, recreation, and other community facilities.

Please consider the needs of the senior citizens living on fixed income as you go forward with these considerations.

Thanks,

Almon Sorrell
2910 Mount Snow Court
Ellicott City, MD 21042

Al Sorrell
AlSorrell(at)yahoo.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Janet Pointe <jlpointe@verizon.net>
Sent: Sunday, September 17, 2017 2:38 PM
To: CouncilMail
Cc: Kittleman, Allan; Fox, Greg
Subject: WRITTEN TESTIMONY FOR COUNCIL BILL 61

Importance: High

Dear Howard County Council Members:

My wife and I have lived in Turf Valley Overlook since 2008. Her family has resided in HoCo since 1994, with her brother graduating from Mt. Hebron HS. We chose HoCo as the place to start and raise our family based on our direct knowledge and experience of the quality of schools and quality of life in the County. Over the past 5 years, however, we have grown increasingly concerned about the fragile balance of quality of schools, and the tangible degradation of quality of life, directly resulting from the unchecked, rampant development allowed by our inadequate APFO.

We have a 7 year old just starting 2nd grade, and a 3 year old yet to enter HCPSS and are discouraged that, although our neighborhood seems set to remain with its current school assignments this time, both children will experience redistricting at the next round, and possibly again after that, causing them unnecessary disruption to the bonds they have begun to build with young friends and with the educators at our current assigned ES, Manor Woods. The continuing development of Turf Valley with no concrete plans to provide a much needed and justified, dedicated Elementary School to the area, causes stress as we ponder whether we might have to move to provide stability for our children.

Since the beginning of the year, we have also learned a great deal more about APFO and are concerned about several details that affect not only parents of school age children, like us, but all residents of HoCo.

- The nominal fees collected from developers do not adequately support the general and, specifically, school population growth that results
- We are concerned that property taxes will be increased to make up for the shortfall
- Without better control of and planning for development, our schools will be forced to redistrict again every 2-3 years
- The current APFO does not include a test provision for critical services (fire, police, emergency) and infrastructure (traffic, roads) which are increasingly stressed by increased development, posing a great potential for reduced safety and quality of life in HoCo
- Increased traffic on Rte 40 causes growing commute times and has resulted in ever louder traffic noise, running from earlier in the morning to later in the evening

We are therefore requesting that Council Bill 61 is amended with the following provisions to more fairly and equitably balance well-planned growth and effective mitigation for our public infrastructure.

- School capacity limits - INCLUDING high schools - to be set at 100%. Schools are closed to new development at that level.
- Mitigation (funding, additional time, or both) begins when a school reaches 95% capacity.
- NO reductions to the current wait time for housing allocations or school tests.

- APFO needs to be reviewed every 4 years.
- Increase real estate transfer tax to account for resale contributions.
- APFO needs to include measures for public safety, emergency services, recreation, and other community facilities.

Since earlier this year, we have become regular viewers of both the HoCo Board of Education and County Council meetings, and understand the various interests represented and their influence on the decision makers. It is our hope that the County Council listen to its voting constituents - tax paying HoCo residents - over outside influencers and choose to make the necessary changes to APFO to bring adequate measures of control to development and preserve for all of us the qualities we all value in Howard County.

Sincerely,

Jason and Janet Pointe
2942 Timber Trails Ct
Ellicott City, MD 21042

Sayers, Margery

From: Conner Thompson <conner@zanderhomes.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 17, 2017 8:42 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Conner Thompson
104 Sandy Beach Dr
Pasadena, MD 21122
conner@zanderhomes.com

Sayers, Margery

From: DIANE BUTLER <politicodiane@msn.com>
Sent: Saturday, September 16, 2017 11:39 PM
To: CouncilMail; Fox, Greg; Sigaty, Mary Kay; Terrasa, Jen; Weinstein, Jon; Ball, Calvin B
Subject: CB 61

Howard County Council,

So, this is what the builders are sending you. (Taken directly from their website).

“I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.”

Let me make a few comments! This bill does not represent the full year's work on the APFO task force. As, in my earlier testimony, the “developers and friends” did not vote in good faith with the rest of the committee and even tried to exclude ideas that received a majority of votes. The process had its difficulties and I have outlined them very carefully in my previous communications with you. The 1,000 business members of MBIA do not get to make decisions for the 300,000 something citizens of this county. This bill is not reasonable for our children, our drivers, our safety, or our public resources.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties.

If our APFO was working correctly we would not need a high schools test, but since some of our high schools are reaching 140% capacity the APFO is obviously not working. The developer impact fees are abysmally low in comparison to other overcrowded counties. Check the facts. And just why, might I ask, would anyone be in favor of overcrowded schools for our children?

Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

We might not be able to meet our Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals. So, what? We haven't been able to meet our Adequate Public Facilities goals, either. Yet I do not hear the MBIA upset over those missed goals. Maybe Plan Howard 2030 was unreasonable, especially after the Smart Growth changes. Maybe we need way more commercial goals than housing goals. Maybe we need to revise Plan Howard 2030, instead of following a dying horse down the road, and flogging it. Once again, this was not a fair and reasonable compromise. If we had fully funded the necessary school budget this year we would have had to fire the entire police force, and fire department forces anyway. Maybe we need a very serious look at what has been done to this county in the past and how we are going to actually fix it, not continue down the wrong road. Maybe the citizens of this county are on to something!

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Your service is to the citizens of the county, not the MBIA. I realize it is not this simple, but this letter from the MBIA is a slap in the face to the citizens of this county!

Diane Butler (One of the 23 members of the task force)

Sayers, Margery

From: DIANE BUTLER <politicodiane@msn.com>
Sent: Saturday, September 16, 2017 10:53 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: Seriously

This is the Maryland Building Industry Association's answer to the citizens request to not have our schools totally overcrowded. Shameful! What can't we have a county without overcrowded schools? Why can't the citizens of Howard County have an APFO that provides Adequate Public Facilities? It is up to you County Council to do the right thing for the citizens of this county! Add the amendments!

HERE IS THE ENTIRE "ACTION ALERT" posted on the MBIA Website:
Howard County Under Threat of Development Shutdown

The development industry is under attack in Howard County and we need your support! County activists are attempting to amend CB-61 (a bill to update the Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance regulations) in a way that would immediately shut down more than 75 percent of the County to new development for five years by lowering the APF schools test to 100 percent. They are also seeking to add a high school APF test and significantly raise school impact fees.

The amendments that are being sought (if introduced and passed) would effectively create a moratorium on nearly all residential development in Howard County for five years! There have already been two hearings on CB-61 and the opposition supporting an amendment has had an overwhelming presence in both of those meetings.

On Monday, September 18 at 7 pm, the County Council will once again hear testimony on this bill and we HAVE to show the Council Members that our industry is united on this - the potential consequences of inaction are dire! Please use the link below to immediately send the attached letter to the Howard County Council and County Executive. The letter asks the Council to support Council Bill 61 as drafted and to oppose any amendments.

Sayers, Margery

From: Adam Sharp <usafadam@me.com>
Sent: Saturday, September 16, 2017 10:26 PM
To: CouncilMail; Kittleman, Allan
Subject: WRITTEN TESTIMONY FOR COUNCIL BILL 61

Dear Sirs and Madams,

My wife and I just moved to Howard County from Anne Arundel County in May of 2017, buying a house that was built in 1990. A major factor for us was the quality of the schools. We had heard of the redistricting issues but did not realize just how frequent and severe they were, nor of how the County itself through both action and inaction was contributing to the root causes of the overcrowding occurring in the County.

I was shocked when I learned that Howard County spent taxpayer money to market its schools outside of the County and even internationally. Given the high rate of influx already occurring in the County, such an expenditure of funds is a gross misuse of taxpayer money.

I then learned that the County furthermore fails to impose sufficient impact fees on developers, motivating them to not only build more here as opposed to other Maryland Counties with higher impact fees, but also disproportionately imposing the cost of new County residents on pre-existing residents in the form of increased taxes that must make up for the lack of the sufficient charging of impact fees on developers.

Our very first year here, we faced the threat of redistricting and our boys will be placed in a school system where this threat will re-surface every 2-3 years. In addition, the school they attend is overcrowded as they begin, already utilizing four pods and performing some classes outdoors!

I am requesting that Council Bill 61 is amended with the following provisions to more fairly and equitably balance well-planned growth and effective mitigation for our public infrastructure.

- Ηοωαρδ Χουντιγ σηουλδ increase developer impact fees.
- School capacity limits -- INCLUDING high schools — need to be set at 100%. Schools are closed to new development at that level.
- Mitigation (funding, additional time, or both) must begin when a school reaches 95% capacity.
- Τηερε σηουλδ βε NO reductions to the current wait time for housing allocations or school tests.
- APFO needs to be reviewed every 4 years.
- APFO needs to include measures for public safety, emergency services, recreation, and other community facilities.

Adam Sharp
2806 Quail Creek Ct.
Ellicott City, MD 21042

Sayers, Margery

From: Kathy Hubbard <kathy.hubbard@beazer.com>
Sent: Saturday, September 16, 2017 8:16 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Kathy Hubbard
13366 Triadelphia Rd
Ellicott City, MD 21042
kathy.hubbard@beazer.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Mr. & Mrs. Diana Van Stone <Diana@lakestonehomes.com>
Sent: Saturday, September 16, 2017 8:02 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Diana Van Stone
11619 Princess Ln
Ellicott City, MD 21042
Diana@lakestonehomes.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Robin Smith <user@voterveice.net>
Sent: Saturday, September 16, 2017 5:19 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Robin Smith
318 Leyton Rd
Reisterstown, MD 21136
rasmith.58@verizon.net

Sayers, Margery

From: Henry Seay, Jr <user@votervoice.net>
Sent: Saturday, September 16, 2017 10:43 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Henry Seay Jr
8250 Old Columbia Rd
Fulton, MD 20759
henry.seay@ymail.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Peggy White <peggywhite7718@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, September 16, 2017 10:04 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Peggy White
6031 Talbot Dr
Ellicott City, MD 21043
peggywhite7718@gmail.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Jay Baldwin <Jaybaldwin@reliablecontracting.com>
Sent: Saturday, September 16, 2017 9:42 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Jay Baldwin
2410 Evergreen Rd
Gambrills, MD 21054
Jaybaldwin@reliablecontracting.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Keith Scott <kscott@tacceramictile.com>
Sent: Saturday, September 16, 2017 8:50 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Keith Scott
7397 Washington Blvd
Elkridge, MD 21075
kscott@tacceramictile.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Leah Hargest <leahhargest@northropteam.com>
Sent: Saturday, September 16, 2017 7:49 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Leah Hargest
7803 Edmunds Way
Elkridge, MD 21075
leahhargest@northropteam.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Anastasia Booth <stasialb@hotmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, September 16, 2017 7:18 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I strongly oppose Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am a resident of Howard county, one of your constituents. I write to oppose Council Bill 61 as drafted. Substantial amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance are required. This bill represents the interests of developers who for too long have not paid their fair share towards schools and other public facilities. The bill as presented is inequitable and irresponsible and does not provide adequate funding for our schools. CB 61 does not place the residents of Howard County first.

Specifically, I am strongly in favor and am demanding lowering the school capacity test, adding a much needed high school capacity test (are you aware Howard high school is more than 500 students over capacity as of September 5, 2017) and increase school impact fees. Howard County's development fees are already among the lowest in the State of Maryland Please move forward with policy that results in a stronger APFO. Please vote to table and then amend Council Bill 61.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County and your constituents.

Sincerely,

Anastasia Booth
2787 Thornbrook Rd
Ellicott City, MD 21042
stasialb@hotmail.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Karen Herren, Esq <user@voterveice.net>
Sent: Saturday, September 16, 2017 6:03 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I OPPOSE Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am a resident of Howard county, one of your constituents. I write to oppose Council Bill 61 as drafted. Substantial amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance are required. This bill represents the interests of developers who for too long have not paid their fair share towards schools and other public facilities. The bill as presented is inequitable and irresponsible and does not provide adequate funding for our schools. CB 61 does not place the residents of Howard County first.

Specifically, I am strongly in favor and am demanding lowering the school capacity test, adding a much needed high school capacity test and increase school impact fees. My high school freshman is one of the thousands of students who are being asked to sacrifice because of the greed behind this unchecked development. My community is one of many being ripped apart by the lack of responsible planning. Howard County's development fees are already among the lowest in the State of Maryland.

Please move forward with policy that results in a stronger APFO. Please vote to table and then amend Council Bill 61.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County and your constituents.

The true test of society is how well it cares for its children. Most of the families I know who moved here from other places moved because of the schools. Your development won't matter if you destroy the schools in your quest for the mighty dollar. VOTE NO!

Sincerely,

Karen Herren
3721 Spring Meadow Dr
Ellicott City, MD 21042
karenherren@yahoo.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Beena Mathew <babraham80@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, September 16, 2017 3:09 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Beena Mathew
8732 Wellford Dr
Ellicott City, MD 21042
babraham80@gmail.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Lorraine Dunn <user@votervoice.net>
Sent: Saturday, September 16, 2017 2:13 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I do NOT support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am a resident of Howard county, one of your constituents. I write to oppose Council Bill 61 as drafted. Substantial amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance are required. This bill represents the interests of developers who for too long have not paid their fair share towards schools and other public facilities. The bill as presented is inequitable and irresponsible and does not provide adequate funding for our schools. CB 61 does not place the residents of Howard County first.

Specifically, I am strongly in favor and am demanding lowering the school capacity test, adding a much needed high school capacity test (are you aware Howard high school is more than 500 students over capacity as of September 5, 2017 ?) and increasing school impact fees. Howard County's development fees are already among the lowest in the State of Maryland.

Please move forward with policy that results in a stronger APFO. Please vote to table and then amend Council Bill 61. Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County and your constituents.

Sincerely,

Lorraine Dunn
3602 Valley Rd
Ellicott City, MD 21042
ldunn917@verizon.net

Sayers, Margery

From: Ann Fulks <annfulks@northropteam.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 11:36 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Ann Fulks
9984 Guilford Rd Apt 104
Jessup, MD 20794
annfulks@northropteam.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Cindy DelZoppo <cindydelzoppo@northropteam.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 11:19 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Cindy DelZoppo
11710 Stonegate Ln
Columbia, MD 21044
cindydelzoppo@northropteam.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Vick Mark <vickgi12@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 10:30 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I do not support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am a resident of Howard county, one of your constituents. I write to oppose Council Bill 61 as drafted. Substantial amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance are required. This bill represents the interests of developers who for too long have not paid their fair share towards schools and other public facilities. The bill as presented is inequitable and irresponsible and does not provide adequate funding for our schools. CB 61 does not place the residents of Howard County first.

Specifically, I am strongly in favor and am demanding lowering the school capacity test, adding a much needed high school capacity test (are you aware Howard high school is more than 500 students over capacity as of September 5, 2017 ?) and increase school impact fees. Howard County's development fees are already among the lowest in the State of Maryland

Please move forward with policy that results in a stronger APFO. Please vote to table and then amend Council Bill 61. Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County and your constituents.

Sincerely,

Vick Marx
8360 Court Ave
Ellicott City, MD 21043
vickgi12@comcast.net

Sayers, Margery

From: Kelly Balchunas <kjbalchunas@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 10:08 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: whrn developers win, HoCo kids lose

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

The Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) represents over 1,000 business members. Mobilize HoCo Schools represents over 1,600 RESIDENTS OF HOWARD COUNTY WHO VOTE.

The MBIA is portraying Council Bill 61 as a "reasonable and responsible compromise." As a parent and taxpayer I am not willing to compromise and I expect my elected officials to support my interests.

I write in support of the following amendments to Council Bill 61:

1. School capacity limits -- INCLUDING high schools -- to be set at 100%. Schools are closed to new development at that level. The adjustment to the school capacity threshold must be unbundled from the financial mitigation piece and voted on as a stand-alone amendment to CB61. These two issues were artificially paired together as a "compromise" by the APFO committee. As parents we are not willing to compromise for our children. We want the school capacity to be set at 100% at the elementary, middle, AND high school levels NOW. There is no need to wait on lowering the school capacity threshold until fall because that piece does not require state legislature approval.
2. Mitigation (funding, additional time, or both) begins when a school reaches 95% capacity.
3. NO reductions to the current wait time for housing allocations or school tests.
4. APFO needs to be reviewed every 4 years.
5. Increase real estate transfer tax by 1.0%.
6. APFO needs to include measures for public safety, emergency services, recreation, and other community facilities.

Please move forward with these amendments that are supported by the Board of Education, the PTA Council, and Mobilize HoCo Schools.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County. #HoCoParentsVote

Sincerely,

Kelly Balchunas
10930 White Dahlia Dr
Woodstock, MD 21163
kjbalchunas@gmail.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Heather DeVito <hmd3010@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 9:56 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I oppose Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am writing as a very concerned Howard County resident and parent of hcps students, 2 in the insanely over capacity Manor Woods.

I write in opposition of Council Bill 61 as drafted, it needs amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance.

Specifically, I am requesting that you amend the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test and increase school impact fees. We were one of the best school systems in the country but we are slipping.

Our children need and deserve better

I'm sure none of your children had to deal with the stress of a school they barely fit in.

Is it fair to spend the day in a portable feeling like an outcast from the rest of the school?

The hospital emergency room is so bad my child was referred to Hopkins for a finger injury.

Please do what you know is right and help Howard County.

Sincerely,

Heather DeVito
3034 Mullineaux Ln
Ellicott City, MD 21042
hmd3010@gmail.com

Sayers, Margery

From: HoCo Parent <hocoparentsvote@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 9:54 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: When Developers Win HoCo Kids Lose

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

The Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) represents over 1,000 business members. Mobilize HoCo Schools represents over 1,600 RESIDENTS OF HOWARD COUNTY WHO VOTE.

The MBIA is portraying Council Bill 61 as a "reasonable and responsible compromise." As a parent and taxpayer I am not willing to compromise and I expect my elected officials to support my interests.

I write in support of the following amendments to Council Bill 61:

1. School capacity limits -- INCLUDING high schools -- to be set at 100%. Schools are closed to new development at that level. The adjustment to the school capacity threshold must be unbundled from the financial mitigation piece and voted on as a stand-alone amendment to CB61. These two issues were artificially paired together as a "compromise" by the APFO committee. As parents we are not willing to compromise for our children. We want the school capacity to be set at 100% at the elementary, middle, AND high school levels NOW. There is no need to wait on lowering the school capacity threshold until fall because that piece does not require state legislature approval.
2. Mitigation (funding, additional time, or both) begins when a school reaches 95% capacity.
3. NO reductions to the current wait time for housing allocations or school tests.
4. APFO needs to be reviewed every 4 years.
5. Increase real estate transfer tax by 1.0%.
6. APFO needs to include measures for public safety, emergency services, recreation, and other community facilities.

Please move forward with these amendments that are supported by the Board of Education, the PTA Council, and Mobilize HoCo Schools.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County. #HoCoParentsVote

Sincerely,

HoCo Parent
3430 Court House Dr
Ellicott City, MD 21043
hocoparentsvote@gmail.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Shannon Franks <shannonkayfranks@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 9:37 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I DO NOT support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am a Howard County parent who thinks the message below is outrageous. Developers donate money to the County Council and in return they've gotten their way for too long. Now we have massive issues with overdevelopment and school crowding. You must take a stand FOR the people who vote you in, because we also vote you out. It's time our kids come first.

Again, the message below is horrifyingly transparent. Build, build, build and leave us residents to deal with it by paying higher taxes, overcrowded roads (have YOU driven in Columbia lately?) and suffering education in schools that are overcrowded and cannot function properly.

High schools MUST be included in the schools test.
The threshold MUST be lowered to 100%.
Developers MUST pay their fair share of the costs.
Developers MUST NOT be able to build until there is adequate resources to do so.

We will not accept any less. It's time to do what is right for the children in this county, finally.

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Shannon Franks - Howard County Parent

7273 Calm Sunset

Columbia, MD 21046

shannonkayfranks@gmail.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Stacey Williams <Secwilliams@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 9:31 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I oppose Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard County Council,

I am one of your taxpaying constituents and I am appalled at the scare tactics and heavy handed lobbying that the MBIA is engaged in to win your votes. I DO NOT support Council Bill 61 as drafted. It needs substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of flawed work over the course of an entire year, with biased voting mechanisms caused by some of the APFO Task Force. The bill as presented is not reasonable or responsible!

Specifically, I am in support of amendments to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test AND increase school impact fees. Continued business as usual in Howard County will continue to decrease vital public safety through overcrowded roads, schools and an overburdened hospital. Your constituents are frustrated with traffic, over crowded schools and overdevelopment and people are watching. What is going to happen to our economic development when people no longer want our schools or want to deal with our traffic. We are now where Montgomery County was 10 years ago. We choose to live here. Passing this bill will help to turn us into the Montgonery County nobody here wanted to live in! Development does not equal progress or quality of life!

Sincerely,

Stacey Williams
2978 Brookwood Rd
Ellicott City, MD 21042
Secwilliams@gmail.com

Sayers, Margery

From: George Hamikton <user@votervoicenet>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 7:05 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

George Hamikton
5692 April Journey
Columbia, MD 21044
hamey4@yahoo.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Mike Mccann <mike.mres@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 6:42 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Mike Mccann
935 W Padonia Rd
Cockeysville, MD 21030
mike.mres@gmail.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Jeff Barba <jeff@emeraldproperties.net>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 6:44 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Jeff Barba
109 Carmichael Ct
Queenstown, MD 21658
jeff@emeraldproperties.net

Sayers, Margery

From: Herb Engler <hengler@sandyspringbank.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 6:25 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Herbert W. Engler
11804 Cool Garden Way
Clarksburg, MD 20871
hengler@sandyspringbank.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Steve Breeden <sbreeden@sdcgrou.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 5:23 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Steve Breeden
587 Gaither Rd
Sykesville, MD 21784
sbreeden@sdcgrou.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Ralph Mobley, Jr. <rmobley@mitchellbest.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 5:11 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Ralph Mobley Jr.
9103 Bowling Green Dr
Frederick, MD 21704
rmobley@mitchellbest.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Jeff Pearl <jep4383@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 4:51 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Jeff Pearl
1 Sonachan Ct
Towson, MD 21286
jep4383@hotmail.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Teresa Pearl <reaser617.com@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 4:53 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Teresa Pearl
1 Sonachan Ct
Towson, MD 21286
reaser617.com@gmail.com

Sayers, Margery

From: scott rouk <Lonestrdesign@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 4:45 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Scott D. Rouk
7810 Paragon Cir
Elkridge, MD 21075
Lonestrdesign@gmail.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Doug Eshelman <doug@burkardhomes.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 4:30 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Doug Eshelman
7013 Meandering Stream Way
Fulton, MD 20759
doug@burkardhomes.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Scott Taylor, PE <staylor@gtaeng.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 4:26 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

SJT
14280 Park Center Dr
Laurel, MD 20707
staylor@gtaeng.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Jon Mayers <jon@chesapeakerealtypartners.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 4:24 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Jon Mayers
10 Woodvalley Ct
Reisterstown, MD 21136
jon@chesapeakerealtypartners.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Brandon Rowe <browe@bohlereng.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 4:10 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Brandon Rowe
14034 Fox Hill Rd
Sparks Glencoe, MD 21152
browe@bohlereng.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Kate Szallo <user@votervoice.net>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 4:05 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Kate Szallo
5025 Montgomery Rd
Ellicott City, MD 21043
kati_szallo@yahoo.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Dustin Albers <dustin.albers@bloomfieldld.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 4:08 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Dustin Albers
1653 Bloom Rd
Westminster, MD 21157
dustin.albers@bloomfieldld.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Tom Iacoboni <tiacoboni@iacoboni.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 3:54 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Tom Iacoboni
15635 Yeoho Rd
Sparks Glencoe, MD 21152
tiacoboni@iacoboni.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Scot Foster <scotf@bctarchitects.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 3:52 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Scot Foster
120 Oak Dr
Catonsville, MD 21228
scotf@bctarchitects.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Mr. & Mrs. Christopher Keelty <ckeelty@hwklawgroup.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 3:52 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Christopher Keelty
707 Hawkshead Rd
Lutherville Timonium, MD 21093
ckeelty@hwklawgroup.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Martin Mitchell, Sr. <mmitchell@mitchellbest.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 3:48 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Martin J. Mitchell
405 Tschiffely Square Rd
Gaithersburg, MD 20878
mmitchell@mitchellbest.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Jennie Ricker <jenniericker@boblucidoteam.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 3:32 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Jennie Ricker
3721 Almar Ct
Hampstead, MD 21074
jenniericker@boblucidoteam.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Arthur Leonard <art@sillengineering.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 3:02 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Arthur Leonard
2110 Rosante Ct
Fallston, MD 21047
art@sillengineering.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Tim Hartman <twhartman@drhorton.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 2:55 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Tim Hartman
5403 Glen Falls Rd
Reisterstown, MD 21136
twhartman@drhorton.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Mike O'Brien, Jr. <mike@sillengineering.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 2:47 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed. Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted. Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Mike O'Brien Jr.
58 Liberty St
Westminster, MD 21157
mike@sillengineering.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Daniel Murtaugh <dmurtaugh@sandyspringbank.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 2:44 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Daniel T Murtaugh
1829 Landrake Rd
Towson, MD 21204
dmurtaugh@sandyspringbank.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Mr. & Mrs. Steve Smith <ssmith@gaylordbrooks.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 2:20 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Steve Smith
2703 Merrymans Mill Rd
Phoenix, MD 21131
ssmith@gaylordbrooks.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Eliot Powell <epowell@whitehalldev.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 2:20 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Eliot Powell
1844 Milvale Rd
Annapolis, MD 21409
epowell@whitehalldev.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Marina Morris <marinamorris@williamsburgllc.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 2:12 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Marina Morris
5485 Harpers Farm Rd
Columbia, MD 21044
marinamorris@williamsburgllc.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Kris Thompson <kthompson@craftsmendevlopers.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 2:18 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Kris Thompson
534 Anneslie Rd
Baltimore, MD 21212
kthompson@craftsmendevlopers.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Thomas White <tomwhite@williamsburgllc.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 2:13 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Thomas White
5485 Harpers Farm Rd
Columbia, MD 21044
tomwhite@williamsburgllc.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Tracy McLaughlin <tracymclaughlin@williamsburgllc.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 2:19 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Tracy McLaughlin
7040 Mink Hollow Rd
Highland, MD 20777
tracymclaughlin@williamsburgllc.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Bob Schultz <bschultz@crdland.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 2:12 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Bob Schultz
3324 Odonnell St
Baltimore, MD 21224
bschultz@crdland.com

Sayers, Margery

From: John Startt <user@votervoice.net>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 2:05 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

John Startt
11018 Gaither Farm Rd
Ellicott City, MD 21042
jsstartt@verizon.net

Sayers, Margery

From: Katherine Dixon <kathy.dixon@Inf.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 2:03 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the thousands of private citizens who own land with valuable development rights in Howard County and I'm writing to protect my rights and the substantial investments I have made based upon those rights. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Kathy Dixon
12170 Lime Kiln Rd
Fulton, MD 20759
kathy.dixon@Inf.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Michael Brewer, CPA <mbrewer@rsandf.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 1:54 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Michael Brewer
8335 Montgomery Run Rd
Ellicott City, MD 21043
mbrewer@rsandf.com

Sayers, Margery

From: tim morris <timmorris@williamsburgllc.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 1:58 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Tim Morris
11623 Federal St
Fulton, MD 20759
timmorris@williamsburgllc.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Kevin Setzer <kevin.setzer@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 1:54 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed. Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

-Kevin Setzer
2955 Winters Chase Way
Annapolis, MD 21401
kevin.setzer@gmail.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Ben Shreve <ben.shreve@calatl.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 1:47 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Ben Shreve
6701 Whitegate Rd
Clarksville, MD 21029
ben.shreve@calatl.com

Sayers, Margery

From: DIANE BUTLER <politicodiane@msn.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 1:42 PM
To: CouncilMail; Kittleman, Allan; cindy vaillancourt; Christina Delmont-Small
Subject: Additional notes to my testimony CB61 and 62

To the Council,

Now that I have more than three minutes, I would like to quantify my remarks from last night.

After the County Executive was elected, he did his preliminary taskforces to gauge the interest of Howard County residents in different areas. The APFO was one of the areas with a lot of interest and there were many suggestions from the citizenry about what we would like our APFO to look like. The task force was set up with this in mind. There were many different areas of the Howard County community invited to participate in order to be as inclusive as possible. Due to this fact, the task force was much larger than the past APFO groups, as we were looking at the APFO in a different light than the two original APFO groups that were literally writing new legislation (for the original APFO and then for the Columbia component). According to my understanding, we were looking at what was working, what was not working, and what new public facilities the citizenry thought ought to be included in the APFO. This required more members, and a large educational component. The executive's office did a very good job getting all of the county staff to our meetings to get everyone up to speed on so many different county entities; everything from storm water management, infill, roads, schools, police, fire, hospital, bike paths, etc. This was very time consuming, yet extremely informative. Unfortunately, this pushed our meetings way past the original time period scheduled, yet most of the members of the task force agreed to continue as we felt that the work was important. Please, also, be mindful of the fact that the development community had a much broader knowledge of the current APFO policies (as well as its loopholes) and, in my opinion they used this to their advantage.

I think the biggest problem that we had, with this committee, was the voting standard for recommendations to the executive. Joe Rutter, from the past committees, and our past head of DPZ, as well as a developer, came to the original meetings(s) and discussed how the committees were set up in the past. This was reflected in the original "rules" for this committee, even though we really had a different objective than the original APFO legislative committee. The thresholds we set too high, and set from the original number of committee members, not the number present at each meeting. The group of "developers and friends" took advantage of these thresholds and APFO loopholes, in my opinion, to stymie the committee at almost every turn. We also had two committee members who were not going to compromise on anything, period, and this further caused delays and downright frustration. One was a developer and one was a school advocate. Next, we had a few members who had other issues that precluded their attendance at all of the meetings, and this further exacerbated the voting thresholds. This did not become apparent until we were well into the process (IE at least 6 months) as we did all of the educational components, and idea gathering, up front. We then did the voting processes at the end of the committee time period.

As we worked, we had many ideas that are not currently in the APFO, and not even staff was sure of their proper place in legislation. Should it be in APFO? Should it be elsewhere in legislation? Should it be in APFO, yet we have no place for it yet in the current APFO set up? Where should it be? How can it be implemented? We are finding this out now as some of the legislation has to be presented at the state level, not just countywide, which is also confounding the executive office's progress. But, most of the committee members felt that these items were important enough to be included in the executive's report (even though many of these were summarily dismissed by the development group). Due to the timing of the committee and its overrun, and then the Ellicott City flooding (where the executive's, and Jon's time was so sorely needed), a long time passed before the executive was even able to get to looking at the APFO legislation, and suggestions. As with anything, the longer you wait, it is sometimes harder to remember everything that has transpired. However, I believe, that our "parking lot" list was one of the most important aspects of the summation of the committee.

The roads portion of our discussions was given short shrift, as in an effort to make up time, the rules for the committee were changed the day that we started on the discussions of the different roads items that we had added to our list of 80 something discussion items. If I am not mistaken, the weather was bad and some of the committee were a few minutes late. The vote was done right at the beginning of the meeting to "take a vote" about even having the discussion of the action item, and this passed as, as usual, all of the development gang was already in the room. The entire roads section was voted on to not even be discussed. I was really upset, as were some of the other committee members. We spoke with Carl after the meeting, and the old rules were restored, but the damage was done. The entire roads section was totally ignored, and we had some very important changes that needed to be on the recommendations for the executive. At the very end of the session we were able to go back and address the timing of certain road remediation projects, and this has been included as part of the changes in Council Bill 61.

It is really too bad that the storm water management section was done before the Ellicott City flood, as, if it had come after the flood, the suggestions would have been much more stringent. As it was, this section again was not given its due diligence.

As we ran out of time, way too many items were pushed under the rug without the proper discussion and recommendations, and certain parties were only interested in their one subject. The representative from the Board of Education showed up for all of the school discussions, but did not show up for example, when we were discussing sidewalks and bike trails. It severely limited our ability to get items passed for consideration. At the very end of the process, the developers only wanted the items in the report that had passed with the high threshold of votes, and not the items that had a majority of votes for them. We insisted, and these were added to the report, but there are also some very good suggestions in the other items that were not able to get a majority that really should be looked at, as the work was done.

Frankly, this was not the executive's fault. It is the fault of every one of you on the council, the Board of Education, the state Smart Growth policies, and the administration before yours. There are many, many items that the citizens of Howard County are unhappy about, currently in the county, and no one seemed to be listening to them. So, when the executive listened, people wanted to be heard, and you all should be listening, also. The executive's only mistake was not having a longer time line for the committee.

I refuse to play party politics with the important items that were derived from this committee. I spent nearly a year on this committee as a citizen advocate, and that is exactly what I will continue to do. Advocate for the citizens of Howard County, and what they believe this county should look, and what adequate public facilities they believe are important. As Calvin said a few weeks ago, at a neighborhood meeting, "he has a little bit of developer stink on him", as do you all. Every one of you. But this county belongs to the citizens, not the developers. When I was in the parking lot the other night after the meeting, Cole came running up to me waving his voting numbers in my face, and saying that I was just upset because I had not "won". I had to carefully remind him that I was representing the citizens of Howard County, not myself at these meetings, and that every single idea that was brought up during the committee meetings was something that some group, or other, in the county felt was important and wanted to have discussed or implemented. There is no winning or losing, only whether you will all work together for the citizens that put you in office. Take the time, listen to the citizens, get this right, and keep working at it until you do. Quit pitting party against party, we are better than that, and start working for the people of this county.

Other notes:

The APFO, and the allocations should be enforced for every single unit built in this county. No matter what type of unit it is. This is simple statistics. When you "exclude" some pots of buildings, IE senior housing, or moderate-income housing, you destroy the outcome of the overall plan. When you build more senior homes, you encourage seniors to sell their homes (that no longer have school age children) and move to senior developments. This in turn opens up the older home to a new family with younger children and the need for more school seats. Thus, the turnover rate that the developers are so fond of spouting that they have no responsibility for. Yes, they do. They built the senior projects. If every one of these senior, and moderate-income units was left in the calculations, the allocations, and the APFO, our overcrowding would not be so high. If we charged our developer's what other "full" counties are charging their developers, we would have a lot of money to make up, but we would be on the road to doing so. We are woefully undercharging the development community. This was evidenced when they all jumped at the chance to pay a much higher fee to build in areas that are between 110 to 115% and 115 to 120% of school capacity. What does this tell you about how little we are charging them, and how little they care about our children? Mary Kay was adamant the other night about people paying more to live in Howard County because of our schools. Then let the developers pay much higher fees. If the cost of new housing goes up, this will allow the existing homes to be more competitive in the market, and increase in value (which has been stagnant due to too much growth, and too little infrastructure). The MIHU units must also be used in every calculation, and not be given special "pots" of allocations, for the very same reasons. It is simple math. Moderate income families do not have any less children than do other homeowners. Why do we exempt so many things from our calculations, only to wonder why we are so behind the eight ball? The developers very craftily try and switch these building pots around to keep right on building, even when our schools have reached saturation in some areas. But you do not get to bus children all over the county to cover up the mistakes of the Smart Growth policies that led the past administration to abandon our careful planning and move the development away from where we had planned (and built the schools), from the west to the east. You are going to have to be way more creative than that. Our children should not be paying for the mistakes of the adult's lack of foresight.

I am very proud of the committee, and the committee worked very hard at compromise. We listened to the development community and what they thought that they needed, and during the discussion phases we

thought that they were also listening to us, but when it came to actually voting on anything it was a different story. The development group did not reciprocate.

And, as for the grand bargain, we sat there in the snow until 1am, to try and placate the developers, to get to the 110% number, that the developers fought every way possible, when this number should be 100%. If other counties, much less affluent than ours, are able to reach these numbers, than why can't we?

My hope is that you all care about the citizens of Howard County. The citizens, who are tired of all of the traffic, tired of all of the continued development without adding the proper infrastructure, tired of the increased crime, tired of paying increased taxes to cover the lack of planning in the past, tired of paying a tax to sell our own homes, tired of their kids going to overcrowded schools, tired of redistricting, tired of their kids being shipped off to other cities to go to school after carefully choosing where they wanted to live in the county, tired of Columbia making all of the decisions for the entire county, tired of builders putting homes in our backyards and then flooding us out, tired of sitting in hearings while the developers use every loop hole to double the density of their projects using lawyers that used to work for the county and know how to exploit the system to do so, tired of developers paying a fee in lieu of doing what is right, tired of development on steep slopes where it does not belong and in our watersheds, and really tired of party politics hindering the work that needs to be done in this county. We should really be concentrating on building businesses in this county, instead of relying on home construction taxes. Every one of these thoughts were brought up on this committee, but the development community was adamant about not voting for anything that might cost them another dollar.

If you want to test the waters of the county, drive around and look at all of the yard signs, and go back and look at all of the notes from the APFO committee. Please look at the APFO legislation, listen to the citizens and the Board of Education, and make proper decisions for the citizens of Howard County.

Thank you,
Diane Butler

Sayers, Margery

From: Will Pippen <wpippen@sdcgroupp.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 1:33 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Will Pippen
5206 Eliots Oak Rd
Columbia, MD 21044
wpippen@sdcgroupp.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Hillary Colt <user@votervoice.net>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 1:20 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance.

This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Hillary Colt
1216 Ridervale Rd
Towson, MD 21204
hillarycolt@aol.com

Sayers, Margery

From: David Ager <dager@townscapedesign.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 12:32 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. My office and my residence are located in Howard County. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance.

This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed. Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

David Ager
5044 Jericho Rd
Columbia, MD 21044
dager@townscapedesign.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Shana Witman <shanawitman@calatl.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 12:20 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Shana Witman
3700 Toone St
Baltimore, MD 21224
shanawitman@calatl.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Rob Dorsey, Jr <robdorseyjr@dorseyfamilyhomes.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 11:54 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Rob Dorsey Jr
10407 Wetherburn Rd
Woodstock, MD 21163
robdorseyjr@dorseyfamilyhomes.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Mark Levendusky <mark.levendusky@calatl.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 11:55 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Mark LEVENDUSKY
9710 Patuxent Woods Dr
Columbia, MD 21046
mark.levendusky@calatl.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Mark Roebber <user@votervoice.net>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 11:55 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Mark roebber
6249 Old Dobbin Ln
Columbia, MD 21045
mroebberfishhard@aol.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Paul Sill, PE <paul@sillengineering.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 11:44 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

Below is a letter drafted by my organization, which I wholeheartedly agree with. I wanted to add that I own a small engineering firm in Howard County, and do most of my work in Howard County. If the effects of the amendments before you on this bill come to fruition, it would most certainly put me, and many others in this industry, out of business. The bill as drafted is a huge accomplishment between all stakeholders in this. Please do not amend this bill.

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed. Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Paul Sill PE
6691 Macbeth Way
Sykesville, MD 21784
paul@sillengineering.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Michael Adcock <mike@saaland.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 11:48 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Michael Adcock
7611 Woodbine Rd
Woodbine, MD 21797
mike@saaland.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Bill Sowers <billsowers@BobLucidoTeam.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 11:37 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Bill Sowers
10609 Steamboat Lndg
Columbia, MD 21044
billsowers@BobLucidoTeam.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Jennifer Van Kirk <user@votervoice.net>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 11:32 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Van Kirk
5693 Trotter Rd
Clarksville, MD 21029
jreck11@yahoo.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Christopher Malagari <cmalagari@bei-civilengineering.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 11:23 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Christopher Malagari
8597 Mansfield Ct
Middletown, MD 21769
cmalagari@bei-civilengineering.com

Sayers, Margery

From: John Bowers, Jr. <jnbdevelopment@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 11:15 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

John N. Bowers, Jr.
803 Ryder Ct
Westminster, MD 21158
jnbdevelopment@comcast.net

Sayers, Margery

From: Jason Van Kirk <jvankirk@elmstreetdev.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 11:17 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Jason Van Kirk
5693 Trotter Rd
Clarksville, MD 21029
jvankirk@elmstreetdev.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Earl Armiger <earl@orcharddevelopment.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 11:02 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Earl Armiger
11130 Homewood Rd
Ellicott City, MD 21042
earl@orcharddevelopment.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Hank Kodan <hkodan@carusohomes.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 10:50 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Hank Kodan
2120 Baldwin Ave
Crofton, MD 21114
hkodan@carusohomes.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Mitchell Kemp <mitchkemp7@msn.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 10:56 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Mitchell Kemp
824 Hoods Mill Rd
Cooksville, MD 21723
mitchkemp7@msn.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Leslie Rosenthal <leslie@boblucidoteam.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 10:52 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Leslie Rosenthal
3119 Nestling Pine Ct
Ellicott City, MD 21042
leslie@boblucidoteam.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Robert Weickgenannt <bob@starcomdesignbuild.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 10:35 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Robert Weickgenannt
2625 Thompson Dr
Marriottsville, MD 21104
bob@starcomdesignbuild.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Adam Cornelius, Esq. <adam.cornelius@calatl.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 10:39 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Adam Cornelius Esq.
9710 Patuxent Woods Dr
Columbia, MD 21046
adam.cornelius@calatl.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Beverley Little <user@votervoice.net>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 10:31 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Beverley J Little
11063 Hunters View Rd
Ellicott City, MD 21042
jbkmlittle4@verizon.net

Sayers, Margery

From: James Fraser, PE <jamie@i-s-land.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 10:24 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

James Fraser PE
2605 Brown Alder Ct
Odenton, MD 21113
jamie@i-s-land.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Harris Woodward <harris@finishwerks.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 10:19 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

William "Harris" Woodward
9375 Breamore Ct
Laurel, MD 20723
harris@finishwerks.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Jonathan Kipnis <jkipnis@kipnislaw.net>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 9:59 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Jonathan I. Kipnis
6938 Tolling Bells Ct
Columbia, MD 21044
jkipnis@kipnislaw.net

Sayers, Margery

From: Justin Boy <justin@cornerstone-homes.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 9:54 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Justin Boy
9693 Gerwig Ln
Columbia, MD 21046
justin@cornerstone-homes.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Patrick Bollinger <PBollinger@bbandt.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 9:43 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Patrick Bollinger
7108 Oxford Rd
Baltimore, MD 21212
PBollinger@bbandt.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Tim Burkard <tim@burkardhomes.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 9:33 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Tim Burkard
8415 Horseshoe Rd
Ellicott City, MD 21043
tim@burkardhomes.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Scott Armiger <scott@orcharddevelopment.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 9:33 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

L. Scott Armiger
5032 Dorsey Hall Dr
Ellicott City, MD 21042
scott@orcharddevelopment.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Amy DiPietro, PE <adipietro@mragta.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 9:28 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Amy G. DiPietro, P.E., LEED AP
3445 Box Hill Corporate Center Dr
Abingdon, MD 21009
adipietro@mragta.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Eric Bers <pacesetterhomes@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 9:12 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Eric Bers
6470 Anderson Ave
Hanover, MD 21076
pacesetterhomes@comcast.net

Sayers, Margery

From: russ dickens <rdickens@elmstreetdev.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 9:08 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

russ dickens
5191 Britten Ln
Ellicott City, MD 21043
rdickens@elmstreetdev.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Kevin Scott <kscott@nvrinc.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 8:58 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Kevin Scott
9720 Patuxent Woods Dr
Columbia, MD 21046
kscott@nvrinc.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Jeremy Rutter <jeremy@rutterpm.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 8:42 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Jeremy Rutter
1720 Saint Michaels Rd
Woodbine, MD 21797
jeremy@rutterpm.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Steve Lavin <Steve.Lavin@susquehanna.net>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 8:38 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Steve Lavin
3661 Fallston Rd
Jarrettsville, MD 21084
Steve.Lavin@susquehanna.net

Sayers, Margery

From: Bethany Hooper <bhooper@hrehllc.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 8:26 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Bethany Hooper, Humphrey Management
4862 Green Bridge Rd
Dayton, MD 21036
bhooper@hrehllc.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Scott Nicholson <user@votervoice.net>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 8:01 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Scott Nicholson
6333 Frostwork Row
Columbia, MD 21044
snichlsl@aol.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Frederick Kohler <fkohler.hdlc@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 8:04 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Tyler kohler
3200 E Lombard St
Baltimore, MD 21224
fkohler.hdlc@gmail.com

Sayers, Margery

From: duane zentgraf <n777dz@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 8:03 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

duane zentgraf
10176 Baltimore National Pike
Ellicott City, MD 21042
n777dz@comcast.net

Sayers, Margery

From: Jeffrey Minich, A <jeff.minich@lennar.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 7:14 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey Minich A
1013 Howard Grove Ct
Davidsonville, MD 21035
jeff.minich@lennar.com

Sayers, Margery

From: bob lucido <bob@boblucidoteam.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 6:55 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

bob lucido
1884 Woodstock Rd
Woodstock, MD 21163
bob@boblucidoteam.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Kristin Hogle <khogle@marylandbuilders.org>
Sent: Thursday, September 14, 2017 4:09 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: I support Council Bill 61 as Drafted

Dear Howard County Council,

Dear Chairman Weinstein and Members of the Howard Council,

I am one of the over 100,000 employee members of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) representing over 1,000 business members. I write in support of Council Bill 61 as drafted and without ANY substantive amendments related to the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. This bill represents hundreds of hours of work over the course of an entire year by the APF Task Force including 23 county residents from a broad cross section of stakeholders. The bill as presented is a reasonable and responsible compromise that effectively protects the County's valuable public resources while respecting the rights of private property owners and implementing the County's growth goals in PlanHoward 2030.

Specifically, I am opposed to any potential amendment to lower the school capacity test, add a high school capacity test or increase school impact fees. Howard County's total development fees are already among the highest in the State when taken together with the MIHU fee and the building excise tax which are generally not present in other counties. Any of these potential amendments which have been introduced during recent testimony will drastically limit the County's ability to meet its Plan Howard 2030 residential and commercial development goals as well as its goals related to job growth and economic development. Failing to meet these goals may have devastating impacts on the County's budget through loss of permit fees, impact fees, MIHU fees, property tax revenue and income tax revenue causing significant budget shortfalls, decreases in vital public safety and health services and layoffs to Howard County staff, teachers, and first responders. They would also undermine the substantial efforts of the APFO Task Force and all of the County's resources that were devoted to establishing a fair and reasonable compromise between the goals and interests of all stakeholder groups. If any of these amendments are introduced, they must not be acted upon until a full fiscal analysis of the negative impacts to the County budget and economy is completed.

Please do not move forward with any policy that results in job loss, cuts to vital County services or limited growth in the County. Please vote for Council Bill 61 as drafted.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County.

Sincerely,

Kristin Hogle
4640 Tall Maple Ct
Ellicott City, MD 21043
khogle@marylandbuilders.org

Sayers, Margery

From: Laina McGinnis <lainamcginnis@verizon.net>
Sent: Thursday, September 14, 2017 8:43 AM
To: CouncilMail; Kittleman, Allan
Subject: WRITTEN TESTIMONY FOR COUNCIL BILL 61

Dear Mr. Kittleman and County Council members,

I have lived in Howard County for almost 30 years. My husband and I have had two sons graduate from different Howard County high schools (*due to redistricting, not because we moved*) and have a daughter who is currently a freshman at Mt. Hebron High School. We are concerned that she may graduate from a completely different high school than her brothers if we are redistricted in 2018. How can this happen within a span of 12 years? Howard County needs to do a better job of strengthening our school communities and that begins with making a commitment to our families that they, the citizens, who make this county great, will be our priority and not the developers who continually create growth without any further commitment to our county. I'm worried that if the county doesn't do a better job controlling and planning for development the schools will be forced to redistrict again in 2-3 years. Please stop the madness now and don't kick the can further down the road.

I am requesting that Council Bill 61 is amended with the following provisions to more fairly and equitably balance well-planned growth and effective mitigation for our public infrastructure.

- School capacity limits -- INCLUDING high schools -- to be set at 100%. Schools are closed to new development at that level.
- Mitigation (funding, additional time, or both) begins when a school reaches 95% capacity.
- NO reductions to the current wait time for housing allocations or school tests.
- APFO needs to be reviewed every 4 years.
- Increase real estate transfer tax by 1.0%.
- APFO needs to include measures for public safety, emergency services, recreation, and other community facilities.

All of you made a commitment to the Howard County citizens that you would represent our best interest when you were elected. Please honor your commitments. I thank Mr. Kittleman for his recent promise to help to fund HS #13 so it may open by 2022. Please also ensure that funding for that high school does not come directly from the taxpayers' wallets. It needs to be subsidized by the developers who created the problem in the first place. You also need to address the above items, especially school capacity limits, which must be closed to new development when they reach 100% capacity.

Thank you for your time regarding this important issue.

Regards,

Laina McGinnis
4829 Ellicott Woods Ln

Ellicott City, MD 21043

#HOCOPARENTSVOTE
#StrongerAPFO

Worthington Community

Sayers, Margery

From: H Kan <hongjuncan@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 13, 2017 10:53 AM
To: Kittleman, Allan; CouncilMail
Subject: Fwd: Suggestions for delaying HS redistricting

FYI.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **H Kan** <hongjuncan@gmail.com>
Date: Wed, Sep 13, 2017 at 10:45 AM
Subject: Suggestions for delaying HS redistricting
To: superintendent@hcpss.org
Cc: schoolplanning@hcpss.org, mavis_ellis@hcpss.org

Dear Dr. Martirano,

I would like to express my support for delaying high school redistricting for 5 years until High School #13 opens in 2022 as being proposed. Delaying an immediate massive redistricting makes the most sense to our students and communities:

- The sheer size of the proposed redistricting can inflict serious pain and damage to so many communities and their students and families. Our kids are not polygons to be freely moved around without real emotional and physical cost. It is simply too painful for too many families to swallow and the potential negative impact could last for years to come.
- The process has proven not controversy-free. For example, the final AAC proposal has potential serious flaws including data inaccuracy.
- The root cause of redistricting appears to be poor planning over the past years. Redistricting without fixing APFO and improved long-term planning can hardly solve the issue. While APFO is being revised, expediting the building of a new HS is a great solution to overcapacity in the meantime and to avoid massive immediate and future redistricting.

I really appreciate the fact that you have been thinking and working very hard with communities, BOE, and County Council to consider creative solutions like this. Over the past several months, many communities have come to realize that we as a whole simply cannot afford the extreme disruption of communities and schools by such a broad-scale boundary line adjustment. Therefore, we strongly support any feasible proposal that suspends and delays high school redistricting including expediting High School #13.

To ease overcapacity in the meantime, I urge you and Office of School Planning to seriously consider creative solutions including open enrollment, and redistributing programs such as JROTC in overcapacity schools (eg, Howard HS) to other high schools. These more voluntary-based solutions may not only immediately alleviate overcapacity without as much community disruption but also may reduce future redistricting needs when HS #13 opens.

Many thanks for your understanding and listening to our parents and communities.

Sincerely,
Hongjun Kan
11722 Trotter Point Ct, Clarksville

Sayers, Margery

From: Katherine Burkitt <katiepb@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, September 13, 2017 10:03 AM
To: CouncilMail; Weinstein, Jon
Cc: Kittleman, Allan
Subject: WRITTEN TESTIMONY FOR COUNCIL BILL 61

I've lived in Howard county for 18 years, I have 2 children that attend Mt Hebron High School. I'm worried that if the county doesn't do a better job controlling and planning for development the schools will be forced to redistrict again in 2-3 years.

While my children will be done with school in 2 years, I think its very disruptive to children to move them from their "home" school. As teenagers, they were very concerned that with the initial proposed redistricting, that they'd need to start an all important junior year at a new school. Children grow up watching their neighbors go to school and aspire to join them when they are old enough, redistricting frequently disjoins the communities.

I am requesting that Council Bill 61 is amended with the following provisions to more fairly and equitably balance well-planned growth and effective mitigation for our public infrastructure.

1. Reduce the school capacity limits—INCLUDING high schools—to be set at 100%. I do understand we should not want to stop development altogether, but developers must be required to pay substantially increased surcharges after the initial cap is reached.
2. Establish mitigation funding, additional time, or both, when a school reaches 95% capacity. Otherwise, we are too late to make the capital improvements vital for our children's learning and safety.
3. Increase real estate transfer tax by 50 basis points (from 1.5% to 2.0%) to account for the growth that does come from resales.
4. Include a provision that ensures that additional excise taxes SUPPLEMENT rather than SUPPLANT existing county-provided funds. These additional fees and taxes are needed IN ADDITION TO the funding already allocated.
5. There should be NO REDUCTIONS to the current wait time for housing allocations or school tests.
6. APFO needs to be reviewed every 4 years. Waiting 10 years to review does not allow for necessary fine-tuning and the changing needs of a growing county.
7. Include measures for public safety, emergency services, recreation, and other community facilities.

If we want to continue to keep Howard County a desirable place to live and work, we need an updated, county-wide comprehensive plan for responsible growth paired with adequate funding from developers for infrastructure support, development, and maintenance.

Without stronger APFO, Howard County will cease to thrive, and our schools will quickly deteriorate. The very assets that draw and keep developers, businesses, and our residents will no longer be assets.

Sincerely,
Katherine Burkitt

4745 Gawain Drive, Ellicott City, MD 21043
District 1 Resident

Sayers, Margery

From: Melissa Saddoughi <melissa.saddoughi@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 13, 2017 10:01 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: Fwd: Updated proposed plan/Polygon #164

Please see recommendation below. These changes were initially proposed in the first staff meeting; however were changed back in the AAC meeting. Please revisit this and make this sensible change originally proposed by Staff members.

Thanks so much for the consideration.

Concerned Parent,
Melissa Saddoughi

Begin forwarded message:

From: Melissa Saddoughi <melissa.saddoughi@gmail.com>
Date: September 11, 2017 at 11:42:25 AM EDT
To: SchoolPlanning@hcpss.org
Cc: Reza Saddoughi <seyed.saddoughi@gmail.com>
Subject: Updated proposed plan/Polygon #164

To whom it may concern:

I am parent of a current first grader at Manor Woods and have another younger child that will be entering the school system in a couple years. I have been keeping up with these changes/recommendations as our area is in a unique pocket that we feel was in line with needed changes, for a few reasons: 1) location (proximity to Waverly), 2) opportunity to relieve overcrowding issue at Manor Woods, and 3) move to Mt View MS for a cleaner direct feed to Marriotts Ridge/relieves Burleigh Manor as well.

Honestly, the moving of the Middle School from Burleigh Manor to Mt View made the most sense and was the most important. It puts the kids in a more favorable position as they are building strong relationships and needing to essentially start over at Burleigh (since we are amongst the minority feed which barely meets policy threshold) then, as if that wasn't bad enough, being separated again after three years for high school. The easiest solution would be to change Area #164 middle school polygon to Mount View MS.

Additionally, due to the significant overcrowding issue that Manor Woods is currently dealing which will only multiply as the years go by, it only makes sense to move Area 164 to Waverly ES. This actually pains me to make this recommendation, since we love Manor Woods, but it absolutely makes the most sense given the situation there and our location to Waverly.

It was not to our surprise that both of these changes were made in the first proposed changes recommended by the Staff Committee. It was brought to my attention the AAC basically changed these back to where we are now. This absolutely is senseless. I was curious to see why this was reverted back to the existing plan. At this point I can only strongly suggest that these changes be revisited and recommend Area 164 to be changed from Burleigh Manor MS to Mount View MS. Further, if needed, implementing the ES change as well from Manor Woods to Waverly.

If there is anyone else I should speak to regarding this recommendation, or contact, please let me know. Please do not hesitate to reach back to me if needed as well (cell 518-522-8660).

I trust the board to make the right, best decision for our children of this area and the county.

Sincerely,
Melissa Saddoughi
(Parent of children residing on Fox Den Road)
Melissa.saddoughi@gmail.com

Sayers, Margery

From: Bruce Harvey <BruceHarvey@williamsburgllc.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 12, 2017 4:53 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: Testimony 9/11/17

As a follow up to my public testimony on 9/11/17, I am submitting the following written testimony.

My name is Bruce Harvey and I reside at 7792 Elmwood Road, Fulton, MD 20759. I have been a Howard County resident since 1978 and have 6 children who have gone to Howard County Public Schools. I was a member of the APFO task force that met from June 2015 through March 2016. Our report was issued on April 1, 2016. I am testifying in favor of passage of CB61 which adopts the majority of recommendations from the task force. While the task force was contentious with many different opinions expressed, the end product represented a super majority (2/3) consensus of the group. I believe the APFO has been very effective in compromising the need for housing growth in the County with the cost of building and providing infrastructure for the new residents that come to the County. One of the most significant components of Howard County's APFO law is the use of Housing Allocations. No other County has such a mechanism. This is an excellent planning tool because the County has linked this to its General Plan. So growth by definition is limited to the total housing allocations. I strongly support the use of this allocation chart because it provides predictability, it provides a more even flow of land for development, and it allows the County to plan its infrastructure needs in an even and rational manner.

The APFO test for Open and Closed schools is a very important part of this legislation. There was much discussion in the task force about the appropriate level for defining adequate school capacity. The current limit for school capacity is set at 115% of the County rated capacity. I am in favor of keeping the Open/Closed limit at 115% of capacity because of the method used by the County to calculate capacity. The current calculation is as follows:

Capacity utilization is the comparison of a facility's program capacity and its enrollment. If the enrollment equals the capacity, then the capacity utilization is 100%. The Howard County Public School System calculates program capacity differently for elementary, middle, and high schools. Methodologies by school type are as follows:

- **Elementary School: 22 students for each Kindergarten classroom; 19 students for each classroom in Grades 1 and 2; and, 25 students for each classroom in Grades 3–5;**
- **Middle School: 95 percent of the total number of teaching stations multiplied by 20.5 students, exclusive of special education classrooms;**
- **High School: either 80 or 85 percent of the total number of teaching stations multiplied by 25 students, exclusive of special education and special use classrooms.**

The above limits represent meaningful targets for each of the different schools, but economic reality will not allow every school to achieve this. So to allow an Elementary school to be closed until class sizes reach 25 for Kindergarten, 22 for grades 1 and 2 and 28 for Grades 3-5 is tight but reasonable. For middle school, this goes to approximately 24 before the school would be closed; again tight but reasonable.

I stated in my public testimony that the State rated capacity is calculated on a different basis than the Howard County calculation. I also stated that the State rated capacity calculation allows for higher capacities for each school. I was asked by the Council to provide some details on this. My research indicates the following about State rated capacity:

For Elementary Schools:

Pre-Kindergarten classrooms	20	Not in Howard County yet
Kindergarten	22	Same as Howard County

Grades 1-2	23	Howard is 19
Grades 3-5	23	Howard is 25
Special Education (self contained)	10	Not stated for Howard County
Alternative Education (self contained)	15	Not stated for Howard County

For Elementary schools, the true calculation would need to know the number of students in grades 1-2 versus grades 3-5 since the County uses different variables for these grade while the State uses a consistent standard of 23 students. However, assuming that the number of students in these grades are the same, the Howard County calculation would yield a capacity about 2% lower than the State rated capacity.

For Middle Schools and High Schools - 85% of the product of the number of teaching stations and 25. Dedicated Special Education and Alternative Education classrooms are counted the same as for Elementary schools.

As stated above, for middle schools Howard is 95% of the product of teaching stations multiplied by 20.5, so a higher % of the teaching stations but a lower standard. Based upon simple math ($95\% \times 20.5$ versus $85\% \times 25$), the Howard County calculation would yield a capacity about 9% lower than the State rated capacity.

The Board of Education should be consulted and provide this actual detailed information to the County Council.

I again recommend that the Howard County School Board continue to calculate capacity based upon the local model and that the State model not be adopted like some of our surrounding Counties. The local model allows us to target capacity as our local leaders wish to define it which should supersede the state rated capacity calculation. I also recommend that the Closed calculation continue to be at 115% as stated above. However, I do support the task force recommendation #7 which would lower the threshold for capacity to 110%, but allow projects to receive school allocations up to 120% of capacity if they agree to pay a higher school excise tax at time of building permit. This is a rational approach that allows for additional funds to be collected toward school capital budgets to be used in constrained areas.

Thank you for hearing my testimony.

Bruce A. Harvey
 President
 Williamsburg Homes
 5485 Harpers Farm Road
 Columbia, MD 21044
 Office: 410-997-8800 ext 23
 Cell: 443-398-4358