From:

Heather Urner <heather.urner@yahoo.com>

Sent:

Tuesday, February 06, 2018 12:38 AM

To:

Sigaty, Mary Kay

Subject:

Words to Remember

Follow Up Flag:

Flag for follow up

Flag Status:

Flagged

"The spirit of resistance to government is so valuable on certain occasions, that I wish it to be always kept alive. It will often be exercised when wrong, but better so than not to be exercised at all. I like a little rebellion now and then." -- Thomas Jefferson - (1743-1826), US Founding Father, drafted the Declaration of Independence, 3rd US President Source: letter to Abigail Adams, February 22, 1787; reproduced in Thomas Jefferson, Writings (The Library of America, 1984), p. 889-890

The world we see that seems so insane is the result of a belief system that is not working. To perceive the world differently, we must be willing to change our belief system, let the past slip away, expand our sense of now, and dissolve the fear in our minds. William James

It is our attitude at the beginning of a difficult task which, more than anything else, will affect its successful outcome. William James

From: Sent: DOUGLAS Perkins <dmpx@comcast.net>

Tuesday, February 06, 2018 12:00 AM

To:

Sigaty, Mary Kay

Subject:

Subdividing infill lots and APFO restrictions

Ms. Sigaty,

Thank you very much for noting during the meeting tonight the issues that I, and others in my circumstances are encountering due to the APFO restrictions on development.

As it stands, the APFO policies are forcing me to start subdividing now so that I may be able to accomplish this sometime in the future. Furthermore, it may compel me to build directly after the end of my wait, even if that is before I would really want. I am not certain how this benefits either me or the county.

I have been told by the county government that as I would be sub dividing a parcel that had been subdivided once before, I am not eligible for that four house exemption. My subdivision is considered by the county as a major subdivision, to be subject to the same APFO holds as something such as Maple Lawn.

What would benefit people in such straits as mine would be an explicit exemption from these APFO holds for sub divisions that will result in the addition of one house and one family. There will be a family on my lot. The only question that remains is whether that will happen with me having an age in place home on the back half acre and the county collecting taxes from two homes or me being elsewhere and the county collecting from only one house.

If there is a willingness to develop such an amendment and if I can provide any assistance I would really appreciate it.

Again, thank you very much for your expressed concern for my circumstances.

Douglas Perkins

Sigaty, Mary Kay	
From: Sent: To: Cc: Subject:	Mark Dunham <mdunham@generationsofhope.org> Monday, February 05, 2018 6:45 PM Sigaty, Mary Kay Clay, Mary HCAS Requested Addition to Amendment 3</mdunham@generationsofhope.org>
Dear Councilmember Sig	aty:
On behalf of the Howard considered as a part of a	County Autism Society, thank you for your efforts to ensure that affordable housing needs are ny amendment of APFO.
With apologies for the laconsidered this evening.	te outreach, we would like to request the following change in amendment 3 that will be
Amendment 3 establisher to proceed. Housing cost disabled adults.	es the factors the County Exec and Council should consider when approving a PILOT or resolution ts and homelessness for families and school children are identified but there's no reference to
identified as one of the f supporters and funders r	nat "the housing challenges experienced by adults with disabilities" (or similar) be specifically factors. This would hopefully mitigate some of the concern potential project partners, might have regarding the viability of affordable housing projects serving disabled adults in light y and new approvals that would be required under a revised APFO.
As an example, I've inser	ted the relevant text below with the suggested insertion of additional text underlined in red.
BURDEN ON FAMILIES, T	FFORDABLE HOUSING IN THE COUNTY, INCLUDING FACTORS SUCH AS THE HOUSING COST THE HOUSING CHALLENGES EXPERIENCED BY ADULTS WITH DISABILITIES, AND THE EXTENT OF FAMILIES AND SCHOOL CHILDREN."
Many thanks for your co	nsideration.
Sincerely, Mark Dunham	
Mark Dunham Howard County Autism	Housing Initiative

From:

grace kubofcik < gracek8@verizon.net>

Sent:

Sunday, February 04, 2018 12:37 PM

To: Cc: Sigaty, Mary Kay james kubofcik

Subject:

CB1-2018 Amendment 3

Follow Up Flag:

Flag for follow up

Flag Status:

Flagged

Mary Kay: Wanted to say thank you for your proposed amendment. I hope you secure the necessary votes. We have such a death of affordable units and this amendment keeps the door open for State funding to help create some additional units for families, foster care kids aging out and others with special needs.

Grace K

Sigaty, Mary Kay	
From: Sent: To: Cc: Subject:	Kathleen Casey < caseyfam@comcast.net > Friday, February 02, 2018 6:31 PM Sigaty, Mary Kay Pat Sylvester Fwd: Re: Transit Hub
Dear Mary Kay,	
email today to let her k email to Jen. The photo	cent conversation, I wanted you to know that I did reach out to Jen Terrasa by now that I supported Amendment No. 3 to the APFO legislation. Below is my ne call mentioned at the beginning refers to the call we had about two weeks hal email sent after Pat and I testified.
I echo Pat's comment workable compromise	that you are indeed doing the "work of angels". Hopefully you have provided a which can gain the necessary votes.
Thanks so much for al	I your continuing efforts on behalf of affordable housing.
All the best,	
Paul	
Original M	lessage

From: Kathleen Casey <caseyfam@comcast.net> To: "Terrasa, Jen" < jterrasa@howardcountymd.gov>

Date: February 2, 2018 at 11:24 AM

Subject: Re: Transit Hub

Dear Jen,

I am glad that we had the opportunity to talk about the affordable housing issues as impacted by APFO. Thanks for taking the time to give me a call. There has never been any doubt that you understand very well the critical need for affordable housing in our County. You have shown time and again that you are supportive of legislation that enables the development of affordable housing—and, in particular, the development of affordable housing in Downtown Columbia. We may not have always agreed on the specific methods, but it was always clear that your commitment to addressing affordable housing needs was unwavering. I believe, like you, that Howard County can address the critical shortage of affordable housing while simultaneously ensuring quality education for our school children.

This morning I reviewed Amendment No. 3 to Council Bill 1-2018 offered by Mary Kay Sigaty, and I wanted to share with you that I believe it provides for an effective procedure for balancing the concerns about desirable limits on school utilization capacity and the critical need for affordable housing. It appears to establish a thoughtful, carefully considered review process that will allow the Council to ensure quality education for our school children and also to address the ongoing significant need for affordable housing. These issues will certainly continue to present themselves over the period that the revised APFO is in effect and this Amendment will allow the Council to consider and balance these issues when they arise—a decision that will be completely within the Council's control. I think that the wisdom of the Amendment is that it does not change the standards established by the APFO legislation—thus addressing the concern that there be no automatic exceptions to the APFO-- but rather establishes a process that allows for careful consideration and thoughtful decision by the Council. Although I might have preferred an APFO exception for Downtown Columbia, nonetheless, I wanted to share with you that I support this Amendment because I believe it provides a reasonable, workable ongoing approach to ensuring quality school education while addressing the shortage of affordable housing. I would encourage your support of the Amendment. As always, please do not hesitate to let me know if you would like to discuss this further. I know that you will give this matter your very thoughtful consideration. Thank you for your dedicate service to our County.

All the best,

Paul

On January 19, 2018 at 5:35 PM "Terrasa, Jen" < jterrasa@howardcountymd.gov> wrote:

Hello Paul,

I'd like to ask you a couple of questions for clarification on behalf of Jen Terrasa.

In your testimony at the public hearing on Tuesday, you mentioned that if the bill passed, the library and the transit hub wouldn't be able to be built. Can you tell me why it wouldn't just be delayed instead?

Also, is there anything else that you think Jen should know about before Monday's work session? Thanks!

Kindest regards,

Melissa

Melissa Affolter

Chief of Staff to Councilwoman Jen Terrasa

Howard County Council, District 3

3430 Court House Drive \parallel Ellicott City, MD 21043

Office: 410.313.3108 \parallel Fax: 410.313.3297

From:

Chris Malagari <cmalagari@bei-civilengineering.com>

Sent:

Friday, February 02, 2018 5:21 PM

To:

Weinstein, Jon; Ball, Calvin B; Terrasa, Jen; Sigaty, Mary Kay; Fox, Greg

Subject:

CB1-2018 (APFO)

2/2/18

Council members,

I have been personally working in this county for 30 years and my company is celebrating it's 20th year in business. I consider this CB1-2018 (APFO) devastating not only to the sustainability of the County's government and economy but also to the economic viability of mine and other small businesses. This Bill is fiscally irresponsible.

It is very clear that the BOE has failed to redistrict this county properly and is under utilizing the existing schools throughout this county. Passing CB1 would set this County back for decades. Placing this county into a moratorium will not fix the school issues that seems to be the communities concern. Redistricting, properly, can fix that. There will always be someone not happy about the school capacities but the reality of it is that know matter what is changed, there will always be a perceived problem.

I know that you will do what is right for the small civil engineering businesses, the landscapers, builders and all the small trades to keep their tax base in this county and be fiscally responsible in your decision. Amendment 2, 3, 5 and 6 of the CB1-2018 is an improvement and amendments 1, 4, 7 and 8 are just more road blocks and are not good for anything.

I hope that I and many other small businesses will be able to keep their businesses in Howard County and/or stay in business. CB1-2018 will be more devastating than you are aware of. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Christopher A. Malagari P.E., NSPE President/Principal Benchmark Engineering, Inc.

Celebrating our 20th year in business! Thank you to all our great clients!

8480 Baltimore National Pike
Suite 315
Ellicott City, MD. 21043
410-465-6105 (o)
410-465-6644 (fax)

Check us out at: www.bei-civilengineering.com

Since 1998...

Thank you for your business and confidence in our Engineering/Surveying services

We will continue to strive to be the **Benchmark of Excellence!**

From:

Vick <vickgi@comcast.net>

Sent:

Tuesday, February 06, 2018 3:14 PM

To:

CouncilMail; Weinstein, Jon; Weinstein, Jon; Terrasa, Jen;

KSigaty@HowardCountyMD.gov; Fox, Greg; Kittleman, Allan

Subject:

CB 1 Amendment 3 & High Density Housing

Hello Council Members and Count Executive,

Last night vote on CB 1 with the inclusion of amendment 3 is not in the best interested of Howard County or it's residents. Am disappointed as are most of your constituents.

Amendment 3 reads something to the effect of "housing affordable to those earning 60% of the median income in Howard County".

HoCo median income in 2018 is \$114,000 a year. 60% of that is \$68,400 per year (that's the requirement in amendment 3, housing affordable to 60% of the Howard county median income)

Someone earning \$68,400 per year qualifies to buy a home in the \$275,000 range.

Amendment 3 to CB 61 could be a inducement to build townhomes and apartments close to our already overcrowded schools.

About those \$275,000 townhomes (see Ducketts Lane & Rowanberry Drive for examples) Where will the .5 children from each one of those townhomes attend school?

That's before we get to high density apartments disguised as affordable housing.

Can we please stop using the misnomer "affordable housing" when it is in reality high density housing? Affordable Housing infers helping those less fortunate. Earning \$68,400 while not wealthy isn't exactly less fortunate.

Jon Weinstein, you were the swing vote on amendment 3, that will not be forgotten come election time. You have repeatedly failed to act in the best interest of your constituents. Just three months ago as chairperson of the Howard County Council you conveniently didn't know to count the days to approve CB 61 (but developers knew) in time. Your speech last night and then seeming pivot were not necessary, it's the Howard County Council, not community theater. You're entrusted with acting in the best interest of the public and you have are not.

Very interesting, the 480 high density houses proposed to be built across from Ducketts Lane would be in the area covered by amendment 3 if High School 13 is built at Troy Hill.

Sigaty, you introduced amendment 3. It is very developer friendly amendment. Am not fooled or emotionally engaged by the term "affordable housing". Call it what it is. <u>High Density Housing</u>, where building can be quickly approved close to our already overcrowded schools. Even though I am not one of your constituents I'd like know why you introduced amendment 3 to CB 1? What was your thought process? How did you think this was a good idea and worth of inclusion in CB 1? Why didn't you introduce it in CB 61 in 2017?

The rest of the Howard County Council walks away from the mess they've made. Jen you've done a good job. Calvin, we appreciate what you've done to support Elkridge (we don't always agree politically and that's fine, still appreciate what you've done as do many).

County Executive Kittleman you are included on this email as you must pass CB 1 expediently. In part so Howard County can move on raising fees to developers. We have budget shortfalls, a school system over budget, in need of new schools and renovations and facing other challenges. Obviously Howard County needs to raise revenue, however our homeowners already are carrying much of the burden. You have a very challenging task in front of you.

I believe a balance can be found to allow some development to keep funds flowing and increase our tax base while increasing fees to developers. Part of that will be in the redevelopment of Howard County. Not by opening the door to high density housing close to our already overcrowded schools.

Please, can we stop saying affordable housing! What you have done is opened up our county to development of high density housing without providing the necessary infrastructure, schools or funding.

Sincerely,
Vick G.
Rowanberry Drive
Elkrdige, Maryland
20175
District 1 Resident

From: Sent:

Karina Fisher <kf321jump@verizon.net> Tuesday, February 06, 2018 2:48 PM

To:

warren.miller@house.state.md.us; Trent.Kittleman@house.state.md.us; gail.bates@senate.state.md.us; Bob.Flanagan@house.state.md.us; Clarence.Lam@house.state.md.us; Terri.Hill@house.state.md.us;

Eric.Ebersole@house.state.md.us; edward.kasemeyer@senate.state.md.us; Vanessa.Atterbeary@house.state.md.us; frank.turner@house.state.md.us; shane.pendergrass@house.state.md.us; guy.guzzone@senate.state.md.us

Cc:

hoc1@mlis.state.md.us; CouncilMail; Kittleman, Allan; boe@hcpss.org;

superintendent@hcpss.org

Subject:

APFO Vote & HoCo 12 - 18

Good afternoon,

As you know, the final vote for APFO was reached last night. Now the children of Howard County need you.

Mobilize HOCO School leadership asked you the question of "if our County Council renders a final vote on February 5th, 2017 for CB1, will that provide enough time for you to reach a decision on HoCo Bill 12-18." The answer of ves was given during both discussions on November 19th, 2017 at the Howard County State Delegation Public Hearing and on the December 4th, 2017 PTACHC Meeting where the delegation were honored guests.

The community is asking for these specific items:

- 1 No buy-up provisions
- 2 Market rate school surcharge fees
- 3 Do not take the approach of inaction

A petition to protect tax payer dollars and a call for developers to may market based school surcharge fees was launched about about a week ago. To date this petition has been signed by approximately 850 residents of Howard County and continues to grow in volume every day. The glow of the cherished blue ribbon schools that Howard County government has come to rely on as their biggest marketing tool is tarnishing as parents continue to wake up to the fact that our children are not being advocated for but rather exploited for their success. Our children do the actual work to earn Howard County the ability to attract businesses and new residents who will support and contribute to our school system and our families have been carrying the majority of the financial burden in up keeping a struggling infrastructure. It is time for the developers to pay their fair share into the public facilities that are needed to support the additional residents their products bring to Howard County.

Protect Tax Payers Dollars - Charge Developers Market Based School Surcharge Fees

Thank you to Delegate Turner for bringing this fact to light during both visits here to Howard County and during public statements made last Wednesday.

Thank you to Delegate Atterbeary for proclaiming that 120% is too much for you....it is for us too!

Thank you to Senator Guy Guzzone, Delegate Pendergrass and Delegate Ebersole for advocating that the responsible thing to do with HoCo Bill 12-18 was to wait for the APFO vote to be cast and acknowledging that the language in the draft before you would more than likely not be the final outcome.

Thank you to Senator Gail Bates for clarifying that this bill is only about school surcharge fees. Transparency in process about which entity is tasked with or has the ability to alter fees has been a luxury that escapes us. We would appreciate hearing more clarification on what the county council and/or county council can or cannot do on their own.

Thank you to Delegate Warren Miller for asking for an exact apples to apples comparison of school surcharge fees. The community hopes that these figures were provided and if so, provided not by the same developer interest that offered them to the state delegation last week. The MBIA, VP of Government Affairs, has a vested interest in providing figures that serve the same entity who employs him.

Thank you to Delegate Terri Hill for the clarifying questions and bringing issues such as infill to the forefront. Yes, some are exempt from APFO but some are not. This shines light on how involved the community needs to be in the current zoning review process being conducted by Clarion.

Mr. Flanagan - I look forward to hearing more support from you personally as you are in 9B and doorknocking in my neighborhood. When you knock on my door, what will welcome you in or keep the door closed will be your decision on whether you choose to advocate for my child. He works hard to contribute to the continued prosperity in Howard County and I want you to work hard for him. If you are attending tonight's Candidate Forum hosted by the Ellicott City & Western Howard Democratic Club, I will see you there to ask. Many in 9B are wanting to know.

Respectfully, Karina Fisher Mobilize HOCO Schools

From: Sent: David < langlois.david@gmail.com > Sunday, February 04, 2018 10:09 PM

To:

CouncilMail

Cc:

Kittleman, Allan; boe@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.org

Subject:

CB1 & CB2 Testimony

Members of the Howard County Council, Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further. The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development. I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8. These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county. I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests. These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO. With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required. APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees. Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote! Sincerely, **David Langlois**

3784 Plum Spring Lane Ellicott City, MD 21042 (I am a District 1 resident)

From:

Angela Mason <angela.states@yahoo.com>

Sent:

Monday, February 05, 2018 8:07 PM

To:

CouncilMail

Cc:

Kittleman, Allan; boe@hcpss.org; supperintendent@hcpss.org

Subject:

CB1 & CB2 Testimony

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken the legislation. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Thank you for your time!

Sincerely, Angela Mason 5351 Briar Oak Court Ellicott City, MD 21043 District 1 Voter

From:

Keith Ohlinger < kohlinger 05@verizon.net>

Sent:

Monday, February 05, 2018 5:36 PM

To:

CouncilMail

Subject:

APFO

Dear County Council:

I am very sorry for sending this so late in the game. I only received the budget information that I was seeking recently and I was not able to focus on it with the death of my mother. However, it appears to me that the APFO changes as discussed in the HCEDA report would cause the Agricultural Land Preservation Fund to become insolvent at sometime during the period between 2022-2025. This would not only impact farmers who are currently receiving payments from the county on easements already purchased but would essentially end Ag Preservation in Howard County at a time when 3928 acres is still up for potential development. In addition, HSCD and HCEDA receive 80% and 100% of their budgets respectively from this fund which is the bulk of all programs in agriculture in Howard County.

I uncovered this in fighting against proposed delegation bill 15-18 submitted by Delegate Flanagan. I am not fluent in the Parkland Acquisition, Low Income Family Program's, or County Fire Fighting Budgets to discuss the potential impact there but it will destroy Ag Preservation in the County. I cannot imagine it would help those programs.

I beg of you to please explore these issues somehow and at the very least reach out to your contacts with the Delegation and ask them to oppose 15-18.

Very Truly Yours,

Keith Ohlinger Porch View Farm LLC Cell # 240-893-1718 Sent from my iPhone

From: Sent: Amy Grutzik <agrutzik@gmail.com> Monday, February 05, 2018 5:20 PM

To:

CouncilMail

Subject:

CB1 & CB2 Testimony

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely, Amy Grutzik 1990 Saint James Road Marriottsville, MD 21104

From:

Roy Appletree <roy.appletree@gmail.com>

Sent:

Monday, February 05, 2018 5:12 PM

To:

CouncilMail

Subject:

Amend CB 1-2018 Amendment 3 re Affordable Housing SUPPORT

I strongly support the proposed amendment regarding housing developments with at least 40% of units serving households earning 60% or les of SMSA.

The word - properly used - in the description is <u>balance</u> If you are at all serious about supporting affordable housing - and to be honest I have grave doubts - you must balance it against other needs. Today, affordable housing can only be done with a layering of subsidies. These subsidies include both direct dollars as well as zoning and building code tools. The decision making pattern - Downtown, Village Center Plans, Flier Building, Long Reach Renewal, etc - clearly demonstrated that you do not provide a priority for the workforce type housing specified in this amendment. One can only hope for a change.

Additionally, this appears to be a necessary carve out for the old Community Homes Projects. I started my housing career back in 1979 as CEO of Columbia Interfaith Housing. Back then the buildings were already in serious need of renovation. That was 39 years ago! Any real attempt to revitalize old neighborhoods is going to require tools such as offered in Amendment 3.

Please do the right thing for the community.

Roy Appletree 7230 Single Wheel Path Columbia, MD 21046

Roy Appletree 410-312-9044 H 410-707-2640 C

From: Laura Wisely <laura.wisely@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 05, 2018 5:08 PM

To: CouncilMail; Kittleman, Allan; boe@hcpss.org

Subject: APFO

Hello,

I am writing in hopes of letting my council members know that my family is in support of APFO bill that was passed in November. I understand that due to the technicality, the bill needed to be introduced. There were so many citizens that came in support of strengthened APFO laws to meetings and to testify this fall. This was new territory for so many people, especially from my community in Elkridge. Many families, while concerned, were very intimidated by what APFO was and did not fully understand the extent and impact that it really does have. It took many key leaders in our community to explain this to families so that they could feel empowered enough to speak up or write to their councilmember to share their thoughts. It is extremely intimidating for some of us to think about writing and giving testimony but many families did.

When the bill was reintroduced the Council stated it was just a formality and that the bill would be introduced in its entirety. Testimony was discouraged. It was disheartening to see developers stating what is best for our community. Here in Elkridge, we are not interested in more dense homes. We are interested in developers who can re-develop what we have or bring new businesses to our area.

The quality of our school system is what drives people to Howard County. Elkridge Elementary school continues to receive registration throughout the school year. I believe we are up to 938 students and we have 740 seats. None of the children at our school are due to be redistricted this upcoming school year. I know that we are destined for more portables. Our school has stopped providing Cultural Arts for our children. The school cannot fit multiple grades into a gathering space (due to fire codes) and coordinate the logistics. Please let our communities "catch up" from all the housing growth that has been allowed. I want to spend my money in Elkridge and take my family to shops and restaurants in Elkridge. I want to have trees and green space. Make APFO stronger. Follow the Board of Education's recommendations. It is a slap in the face to all those parents who came out dressed in yellow and learned about APFO, wrote testimony and became involved. Do not let them down. Do not sour their first opportunity at being involved in their community.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8. I oppose 2, 3, 6. I do not know whether Amendment 5 is to strengthen or weaken the roads test.

Thank you, Laura Wisely 5811 Main Street Elkridge District 1

From:

Melissa Metz < melissametz 725@gmail.com >

Sent:

Monday, February 05, 2018 4:53 PM

To:

CouncilMail

Cc:

Kittleman, Allan; boe@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.org

Subject:

CB1 & CB2 Testimony

Dear Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jon Weinstein, Jen Terrasa, and Dr. Calvin Ball for sponsoring CB-61 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB-1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB-61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. The bill as passed on November 6th was the culmination of a thoughtful process of engagement with the community and considering trade-offs in the policy-making process, as it should be. I oppose recent amendments that introduce exemptions into APFO that would create loopholes for development.

In addition to re-stating my support for approving CB-1 as proposed, exactly as CB-61 was approved, I would also like to add testimony on the recently-proposed amendments to CB-1.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8. These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests. These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

I would also like to mention the testimony that I submitted on January 21 via email, which highlighted numerous substantial weaknesses in the study "The Economic and Fiscal Impacts of the Proposed Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance on Howard County", commissioned by the Howard County Economic Development Authority. The study's main findings do not take into account the fixed costs of investing in infrastructure (schools, roads, etc.). The study includes a section on costs (pages 32-34), which is limited to the General

Fund. The findings of this section are not included in the main findings of the report. While this section does not examine capital expenditures, its findings are striking - it finds that passing CB-1 would be cost-benefit positive (bottom of page 32.). It finds in 2022, a net positive impact of \$2.1 million of passing CB-1; in 2023, a net positive impact of \$2.3 million of passing the bill; in 2024, a net positive impact of \$1.8 million. (Note that these refer to the bill as introduced and do not examine the more recent amendments.)

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote.

Sincerely,

Melissa Metz

3101 Chatham Rd.

Ellicott City, MD 21042

From:

Russell Snyder < RSnyder@voaches.org>

Sent:

Monday, February 05, 2018 4:48 PM

To:

CouncilMail

Subject:

Support of Amendment #3- CB1-2018

Good afternoon Council Members. On behalf of Volunteers of America Chesapeake, Inc, an affordable housing developer in Maryland, we would offer our strong support of Amendment #3 to CB1-2018. The County has made tremendous strides to provide affordable housing in the County in an effort to end homelessness. We were fortunate to be the developer of Leola Dorsey Community Resource Center, where 35 formerly chronically homeless Howard County citizens, are now living in their apartments and are no longer living in their cars, encampments or motels. This development of 35 apartments only scratches the surface of the estimated gap of over 6700 units needing affordability that remain unavailable.

Without the passage of Amendment #3, the current version of CB1-2018 would create an unintended moratorium on affordable housing development in Howard County in an effort to head off any overcrowding of our schools. This Amendment #3, as written allows affordable housing in the County with a balance that will help remedy the concerns of overcrowding of schools but not create a moratorium.

Please vote for Amendment #3 to CB1-2018 and allow all citizens and opportunity to live in affordable housing in our community. Thank you in advance.

Russell Snyder | President and CEO

Volunteers of America Chesapeake | rsnyder@voaches.org

7901 Annapolis Rd Lanham, MD 20706

T: 240-764-2631 | C: 301-395-8984 | F: 301-459-2627

Helping America's most vulnerable®

Visionary | One Body | Integrity | Compassion | Excellence | Faith

Follow us on Twitter | Join us on Facebook | Watch us on YouTube | Visit our Blog | Listen to our monthly podcast

This information and any attachments in this electronic message may contain CONFIDENTIAL and legally protected information under applicable law, and is intended only for the use of the individual or entity named above. If you are not the addressee and an intended recipient, please do not read, copy, use or disclose this communication to others; you are hereby notified that any dissemination, copy or disclosure of this communication is prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately purge it without making any copy or distribution. This footer also confirms that this e-mail message has been scanned for the presence of computer viruses. Thank You.

From: Sent:

Carol Evans <carwe301@verizon.net> Monday, February 05, 2018 4:04 PM

To:

CouncilMail

Subject:

Amend SB 1-2018

Please support Ammendment 1-2018 Quality Education and Affordable Housing. Further adults with disabilities need to be included in the population this bill covers. Thank you for your consideration

Carol Evans carwe301@verizon.net

From:

Leonardo McClarty < lmcclarty@howardchamber.com>

Sent:

Monday, February 05, 2018 3:53 PM

To:

CouncilMail

Cc: Subject: Sylvie Porter APFO Legislation and Related Amendments

Attachments:

CB1 Letter_2.05.18.pdf

Howard County Council Members:

Please find attached the Chamber's position related to CB1.

Thanks

Leonardo McClarty, CCE / President & CEO Imcclarty@howardchamber.com



Howard County Chamber 410-730-4111 x107 6240 Old Dobbin Lane, Suite 110 Columbia, MD 21045 www.howardchamber.com









The Mission of the Howard County Chamber is to provide advocacy, connections, and access to timely information to advance the growth and success of the business community.







6240 Old Dobbin Lane Suite 110 Columbia, MD 21045

February 5, 2018

The Honorable Mary Kay Sigaty Howard County Council Chair George Howard Building 3430 Court House Drive Ellicott City, MD 21043

RE: CB1-2018

Dear Council Chair Sigaty:

This letter comes in response to the recent APFO legislation posted this past Friday and up for consideration by the Council later this evening.

Upon review, the latest legislation begins to address some of the concerns raised by the Chamber, particularly in the area of affordable housing (Amendment 3). We are also pleased to see modifications being made to the roads test (Amendment 5), however, we believe more can still be done. While we see positive movement in the areas referenced above, we remain concerned with the capacity thresholds under consideration (Amendment 2). As such, we would specifically like to see Amendment 2 modified so as not to halt future development in the County. It is our opinion that the Howard County Board of Education (BOE) should adjust its boundaries to better utilize school capacity. We are particularly concerned with adding a high school test (Amendment 6), in light of the pending 13th high school slated to be completed over the next five years.

Of greatest concern to us are Amendments 4, 7, and 8. To date, the school system and administration have had approximately six years when one includes the three year delay in closed school districts and three years it takes to navigate the development process. Amendment 4 essentially stifles any new development. Amendment 7 does not adequately solve the overcrowding problem, it simply stops development. Lastly, Amendment 8 further complicates an already highly complex issue. The Chamber has always advocated for a development process that is clear and consistent. This amendment does not do that.

The decision before you and the Council is one that will dictate the direction of this County for years to come. While many will argue that APFO should be more stringent, the ordinance only works if the Howard County Board of Education routinely rebalances school population. APFO should be used as a tool for planning, and not as a replacement for redistricting. It is important that APFO address growth concerns without inhibiting economic development.

The Chamber thanks you in advance for your consideration of our position and recommendations. For questions and comments, I can be reached directly at <u>443-878-1234</u>.

Respectfully,

Leonardo McClarty, CCE

President, Howard County Chamber

Terrado McClut

CC:

Howard County Council

The Honorable Allan Kittleman, Howard County Executive

Howard County Chamber Board of Directors

From:

jewasol < jewasol@gmail.com>

Sent:

Monday, February 05, 2018 3:44 PM

To:

CouncilMail; Ball, Calvin B; Weinstein, Jon; Terrasa, Jen; Sigaty, Mary Kay

Subject:

CB 61 & CB 62 as written and intended to pass in November 2017

Dear Howard County Council Members:

Please vote in favor of CB 61 and CB 62.

Be fair to children being educated in the Howard County Public School System.

They deserve adequate facilities in which to learn.

They do not deserve portables lacking security, lacking proper HVAC.

They do not deserve tiny tracts of land for recess space. How much space did you have for recess when you were growing up? They do not deserve to be in closets converted to classrooms without windows, without adequate space to move freely. Have you seen the 'magic' carpets during reading time with the teacher? It used to be enjoyable to listen to a story the teacher read aloud. Now it is torture as 30 kids sit on a rectangle criss-cross trying to keep elbows and knees from touching another student's while the teacher reads or admonishes kids for any movement. Have you given any thought to the spread of flu and other viruses when there isn't enough room in the buildings for adequate air flow? When was the last time you visited a school during a transition period? How much time do you get for lunch? My kids get 30 minutes total which includes standing in line waiting for the last class to leave, standing in long lines to buy lunch, leaving little time to actually consume the meal let alone digest it before going back to instruction. Noise is less tolerated, while they are not louder than previous generations of kids, it's louder because there are more of them. Crowded schools means less quality teacher engagment time. They're treated not as individuals but as tiny soldiers.

They do not deserve long bus rides out of walkable school zones. How would adding buses to the already moving parking lot situations in sections of Howard County affect quality of life? It's already difficult to hire qualified bus drivers for the routes we currently have.

Be fair to the bus drivers who are already stretched thin between high school, middle school and elementary school runs.

Be fair to parents who pay high property taxes for one of the best public education systems in our county. How do your children or grandchildren get to their after school activities? How much time do you allot for these commutes of 3-7 miles? How much does that extra exhaust from vehicles contribute to air quality? With wider roads, this problem is mitigated.

Parents make a huge commitment when they move to Howard County whether they buy or rent their home.

Be fair to HoCo Hospital, Police, Fire and Ambulance professionals. They cannot provide adequate services when the roads are jammed. Have you or one of your family member needed emergency transportation to the hospital? One of mine has and it was during rush traffic time.

Be fair to builders. Make them pay their fair share of costs!

Howard County cannot keep adding houses, apartments, townhomes and businesses without proper planning for schools and other infrastructure.

Without passing CB 61 and CB 62, you'll be paving the way to create a new Arlington/Northern Virginia where traffic gridlock is part of life. I moved away from there to enjoy an active yet quiet suburban lifestyle. I did enjoy it for a short time until I had children who eventually went to school and had recreational actitities outside of school. Now I cringe at the traffic every time I have to leave my neighborhood during the hours of 4:00-6:30.

Do the right thing for your constituents. Be fair. Vote yes to CB 61 and CB 62.

Thank you.

Jennifer Soler Howard County resident in district 2 since September 2003 Mother of 2

From:

Lisa May savm78@vt.edu>

Sent:

Monday, February 05, 2018 3:42 PM

To:

CouncilMail

Cc:

Peter Morgan; Smith, Gary; Pruim, Kimberly; Affolter, Melissa; Clay, Mary; Knight, Karen

Subject:

CB-1 Amendment Comments from Howard County Realtors(R)

Attachments:

HCAR Comments on CB1 Amendments.pdf

Chairwoman Sigaty and Members of the Council,

Please find attached comments from the Howard County Association of Realtors® regarding the proposed amendments to CB-1, which you will consider at this evening's hearing. If you have any questions or need additional information, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Thank you in advance for the time and attention you have paid to CB-1 and the APFO process.

Sincerely,

Lisa V. May HCAR Government Affairs Director



February 5, 2018

Main 410-715-1437 Fax 410-715-1489 Web www.hcar.org

The Honorable Mary Kay Sigaty, Chairwoman Howard County Council George Howard Building, 1st Floor 3430 Courthouse Drive Ellicott City, MD 21043

Re: Amendments to CB 1-2018, Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance (APFO)

Dear Chairwoman Sigaty and members of the Council,

On behalf of the Howard County Association of REALTORS® (HCAR), an organization representing over 1,700 real estate professionals who live and work in the County, we offer the following comments on the amendments to CB-1 filed last week.

HCAR remains concerned about the impacts CB-1 will have on the County if it is approved as written. This includes the loss of revenue from new construction and related activities, increased pressure on residential property taxes to make up for that lost revenue, and impacts to housing availability and affordability. For that reason, we sincerely ask the Council to give thoughtful and careful consideration to amending to CB-1.

Taken together, amendments to allow development in school attendance areas where surrounding school regions have additional capacity (Fox); to provide mechanisms for affordable housing developments to proceed (Sigaty); and to delay implementation of the high schools tests until the completion of High School #13 (Sigaty) may help to alleviate the worst impacts on residential development while still granting additional flexibility to the school system beyond what is currently provided. Without approval of these or similar amendments, HCAR must oppose CB-1 as having a detrimental effect on the County, its homeowners and its business environment.

We all care greatly about the quality of Howard County schools and the future success of each of our students. However, we also must care about the success of Howard County itself under these proposed APFO tests. Any version of CB-1 must balance the needs of all our County residents and our local economy, both now and in the years to come.

Sincerely,

JóAnn Alexander

President

Howard County Association of REALTORS®

un alexanden

From:

Shaun Eddy <Shaun@oxfordplanning.com>

Sent:

Monday, February 05, 2018 3:09 PM

To:

CouncilMail

Subject:

Support Affordable Housing and Quality Education

Good morning Chair Sigaty and Council Members:

As a Howard County resident and supporter of affordable housing and education in Howard County I strongly encourages you to approve amendments 2, 3, 5, and 6.

The need for affordable housing for our most vulnerable populations is at risk without these amendments.

The numbers speak for themselves - 500 plus homeless children already in our schools, a shortfall already of over 6,000 rental units for those earning \$50,000 or less.

What affordable housing stock we do have is aging and could not be properly preserved without these amendments.

We ask that you please approve these amendments and allow progress to be made on these and other critical affordable housing challenges facing our community.

Best Regards,

Shaun Eddy, CFP®, MSFA, AIF®

Owner and CEO

OXFORD PLANNING GROUP, LLC

Want more Financial Planning and Investment News?

http://oxfordplanning.com/newsletter-sign-up

www.oxfordplanning.com

(O) 410-995-8711 x 102

(F) 410-995-8716

(M) 410-206-7969

10713 B Birmingham Way | Woodstock, MD 21163

Oxford Planning Group, LLC does not accept buy, sell or cancel orders by email or voicemail or any instructions by email that would require your signature.

WARNING: All emails sent to this address will be received by Oxford Planning Group, LLC corporate email system and are subject to archival and review

by someone other than the recipient.

The information contained in this email message is intended only for the personal and confidential use of the recipient(s) named above. If the reader of this message

is not the intended recipient or an agent responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, please notify us by email and delete the original message without any

review/dissemination thereof.

review/dissemination thereof.

Please remember to contact Oxford Planning Group, LLC, in writing, if there are any changes in your personal/financial situation or investment objectives for the purpose of reviewing/evaluating/revising our previous recommendations and/or services, or if you want to impose, add to, or modify any reasonable restrictions to our investment advisory services, or if you wish to direct that Oxford Planning Group, LLC effect any specific transactions in your account. Please be advised that there can be no assurance that any email request will be reviewed and/or acted upon on the day it is received - please be guided accordingly. A copy of our current written disclosure statement discussing our advisory services and fees continues to remain available for your review upon request.

From:

Stephanie Trout < gwtw18@gmail.com>

Sent:

Monday, February 05, 2018 2:54 PM

To:

CouncilMail

Cc:

kittleman@howardcountymd.gov; boe@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.org

Subject:

Testimony for CB1 and CB2

Attachments:

CB1 & CB2 Testimony.pdf

Good Afternoon,

I respectfully submit testimony as it pertains to CB1 and CB 2. Please see attached.

Thank you,

Howard County District 1 Resident

TO: councilmail@howardcountymd.gov

CC: akittleman@howardcountymd.gov, boe@hcpss.org, superintendent@hcpss.org

RE: CB1 & CB2 Testimony

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely,

Stephanie Trout

Stephania Trout

5906 Margery Lane, Elkridge MD 21075

District 1

From: Karina Fisher <kf321jump@verizon.net>
Sent: Monday, February 05, 2018 2:43 PM

To: CouncilMail; Weinstein, Jon

Cc: Kittleman, Allan

Subject: Testimony on CB1 & CB2 - District One Voter

Afternoon.

I want to be very simple in my testimony so that there is no chance of misinterpretation. I oppose amendments 2, 3 and 6.

Amendment 2 - It is a shame that this is even submitted. Jon Weinstein, you are my District Representative and my expectation is that you uphold not only your vote as cast on November 6th, 2017, but that you do your part to restore the community's faith in the legislative process that was under your care as chairperson. I will remind you that the amendment that was "voted" in, was yours. I believe in your competence in vetting the amendments that you yourself would put forth and therefore would not expect you to exploit what was called an administrative error as others have chosen to do.

Amendment 3 - This amendment has clear intentions to weaken APFO for the favor of developers. Nothing more. It is disgraceful that affordable housing would be used as a wedge issue with the community. The ironic part is that the idea of discrimination was discussed if exemptions for affordable housing was not included when the actual discrimination is purposed within this amendment. The idea that anyone would purpose to knowingly place affordable housing in areas without adequate infrastructure is in fact discriminatory! Do you not think that children and families who reside in affordable housing deserve the same education, roads and safety protections? And coming from a mortgage lending background (7 years of contract underwriting), the idea that APFO would be used as a scapegoat for concerns with Fair Housing violations is guite frankly a joke and completely transparent.

And let's face it, it the council was at all serious about affordable housing, more would be done about the fee-in-lieu options that developers take advantage of. This issue has been going on for years as evidenced in the annual report published in March of 2014. The Columbia Downtown Housing Corporation said that it is facing "major structural impediments to achieving its affordable housing goal". The report goes on to discuss how the developers have no legal or financial incentive to participate in helping to achieve this goal but now they want to come and sit in "support" of real people who have real concerns with affordable housing? No, it is simply a way for them to support weakening APFO. And let's talk about the issue with basic math equations ---- you cannot solve for x if all factors are accounted for! Exemptions have no place in APFO!

Amendment 6 - The High School students need to be counted. This is yet again, just an attempt to allow development in areas that cannot handle it! I will remind you that the voted capacity was 115%!!!!!! NOT 100%!!!!! I agree with Mr. Fox that portables are a complete waste of taxpayer dollars. We cannot take another 5 years of just throwing these dollars out the window.

Amendment 5 - I am so thankful to have experts of every kind in our community so that we do not have to rely on information being given to us. After review, its seems that this latest amendment serves to weaken the traffic study process voted in as it lowers the number of intersections studied from 2 to 1. If that is the case, I oppose it as well.

Karina Fisher 4053 High Point Road Ellicott City, MD 21042

From:

Brandon Thomson brandon.thomson@gmail.com

Sent:

Monday, February 05, 2018 1:41 PM

To:

CouncilMail

Subject:

CB 1 & CB2

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely,

Brandon Thomson 3033 Brookwood Road Ellicott City, MD 21042

From:

DIANE BUTLER <politicodiane@msn.com>

Sent:

Monday, February 05, 2018 1:15 PM

To:

CouncilMail; Kittleman, Allan

Subject:

APFO

To all of the council,

I find it shocking and disturbing that you are even trying to change the bill that was originally passed after so much community input, due to your own error. Now, after having all of these new meetings, during holiday and mid winter time periods, you are trying to weaken the bill. Shame on you. I think it is time to call a lawyer and think about sueing the county.

Jon, you are not seriously trying to weaken the only roads test that was allowed to even be discussed by the developers when we had the task force. I wrote to you in detail how that whole section was inadvertently tossed to the side by a "one meeting change in the rules". Shame on you. What a joke that we have so called remediation THAT NEVER HAPPENS when state roads are involved. You cannot grow without roads, and that seems to be all that you care about is growth.

Mary Kay, All MIHU's need to be included in every calculation for adequate public facilities. Interesting that you are headed to General Growth Properties after your stint as a council person. Who are you representing now? The citizens, as you were elected to, or them. I am not being mean, the perception is out there.

And who is it that is trying to delay the High Schools test when that has been the biggest problem that we have right now with schools. Shame on all of you, once again. You were elected to represent us, and you are not doing so.

Unbelievably disappointed in the current council. Thank goodness you are on the way out. Shame on you.

Diane Butler

From:

lada2@verizon.net

Sent:

Monday, February 05, 2018 1:01 PM

To: Subject: CouncilMail APFO vote

Members of the Howard County Council: I urge you to pass CB1 as drafted when you vote tonight.

If you accept any amendments, please choose only those that strengthen the infrastructure of our county, namely amendments 1, 4, 7, and 8.

I urge you NOT to accept amendments which would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, or create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO, namely amendments 2, 3, and 6.

Please listen to your constituents. We are tired of overcrowding in our schools, roads, and hospital, and we are tired of developers' interests being placed ahead of the well-being of our county's citizens.

Lada Onyshkevych 6200 Bright Plume Columbia MD 21044

From: Joshua Greenfeld <jgreenfeld@marylandbuilders.org>

Sent: Monday, February 05, 2018 12:13 PM

To: Feldmark, Jessica; Ball, Calvin B; Smith, Gary; Weinstein, Jon; Terrasa, Jen; Sigaty, Mary

Kay; Fox, Greg; Knight, Karen; Pruim, Kimberly; Clay, Mary; CouncilMail

Cc: Kittleman, Allan; Wilson, B Diane; Lazdins, Valdis; Lori Graf

Subject: MBIA Testimony on CB1 Amendments - Please Support Amendments 2, 3, 5 and 6

Attachments: BUILDING INDUSTRY CB1 TESTIMONY WITH AMENDMENTS.pdf

Dear Chairwoman Sigaty and Members of the Howard Council,

The Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA), representing over 1,000 business members and 100,000 employees in Howard County and across the State, writes in the strongest possible opposition to Council Bill 1 as drafted, but in <u>support of Amendments 2, 3, 5 and 6 and in further oppositions to Amendments 1, 4, 7 and 8.</u>

Please find attached testimony regarding proposed amendments to CB1.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County. If you have questions about the MBIA's positions, please contact Josh Greenfeld at jgreenfeld@marylandbuilders.org or 443.515.0025.

Best regards,

Josh Greenfeld, Esq.

jgreenfeld@marylandbuilders.org Vice President of Government Affairs Maryland Building Industry Association 11825 W. Market Place Fulton, MD 20759

Ph: 443-515-0025





Wine & Chocolate Tasting with PWB Council - Feb. 7 Join us at Kelsey's Kloset in Fulton. Register here.

Future Industry Leaders (FIL) Breakfast Series - Feb. 8 Guest Speaker, Jeff Caruso. Register here.

Successful NEW Home Selling Seminar - Feb. 20-22 Earn NAHB's Certified Sales Professional designation. Register here.

Check out NAHB's Member Advantage Program at www.nahb.org/ma



February 5, 2018

Re: BUILDING INDUSTRY CB1 TESTIMONY WITH AMENDMENTS

Dear Chairwoman Sigaty and Members of the Howard Council,

The Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA), representing over 1,000 business members and 100,000 employees in Howard County and across the State, writes in the strongest possible opposition to Council Bill 1 as drafted, but in support of Amendments 2, 3, 5 and 6 and in further oppositions to Amendments 1, 4, 7 and 8. The MBIA remains supportive of the compromise recommendations of the 23 member APFO task force who represented a broad cross-section of Howard County and conducted one year of study on this extremely complicated issue. Despite claims to the contrary, this legislation in no way represents a compromise.

The MBIA's position that this legislation will not relieve crowding in schools, will create significant budget shortfalls, will result in cuts to county jobs and services and will create further housing unaffordability is well documented and remains consistent. This letter serves as a response to Amendments 1through 8 proposed by Councilmembers.

The MBIA SUPPORTS Amendments 2, 3, 5 and 6

The Council should vote in support of Amendments 2, 3, 5 and 6 which collectively serve to balance multiple competing interests in the County including retaining excellent school achievement, promoting housing affordability, creating sufficient capacity on the County's road network and promoting responsible and smart economic growth and development. Specifically, Amendment 2, which removes the outdated and logically unsupportable elementary regions tests, and Amendment 6, which implements the new high school test when High School #13 is built create the appropriate balance between smartgrowth and maintenance of the County's stellar schools reputation. Amendment 3, which promotes housing affordability, particularly mixed income housing, honors the County's values of inclusion and support for those less fortunate and will encourage full spectrum housing affordability. Finally, Amendment 5 strengthens the County's roads test significantly while keeping it in line with other stringent counties such as Montgomery and Anne Arundel.

The MBIA OPPOSES Amendments 1, 4, 7 and 8

The Council should oppose Amendments 1, 4, 7 and 8, which propose to lower school capacities further, create a flagrant and unconstitutional property "taking," and create new adequacy tests for non-public facilities such as "health" and agencies such as "police" and "fire," which have not asked for adequacy tests and have not defined what "adequacy" would mean.

In conclusion, closing more schools will not solve challenges related to school crowding, only rebalancing of school seats and continued investment in new school construction will do that. However, a development moratorium will cripple the economy of Howard County, make financing school construction more challenging, open the County to costly lawsuits, result in cuts to County staff and services and likely result in future tax increases to the detriment of every County resident.

For these reasons, the MBIA remains opposed to CB 1, but asks the Council to support Amendments 2, 3, 5 and 6.

Thank you for consideration of this important bill and for your service to the County. If you have questions about the MBIA's positions, please contact Josh Greenfeld at <u>jgreenfeld@marylandbuilders.org</u> or <u>443.515.0025</u>.

Best regards,

Josh Greenfeld, Vice President of Government Affairs

From:

Vick <vickgi@comcast.net>

Sent:

Monday, February 05, 2018 12:13 PM

To:

CouncilMail; Kittleman, Allan; boe@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.org

Subject:

CB1 & CB2 Testimony

Members of the Howard County Council,

I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted!

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

<u>I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.</u>

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely, V. Rowanberry Drive Elkridge, MD 21075

From: Athena Fischer <fischer.athena@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, February 05, 2018 12:07 PM

To: CouncilMail

Cc: Ball, Calvin B; Kittleman, Allan

Subject: CB1 & CB2 Testimony

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017 (about which I wrote you in the fall). I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely, Athena Fischer 6264 Light Point Place, 21045 District Two

From:

Denise Gmail <denisegiuliano5@gmail.com>

Sent:

Monday, February 05, 2018 12:03 PM

To:

CouncilMail

Subject:

Tonight's vote

Dear Council Members,

Please support Jen Terrasa's amendments— #s 1,4, 7 and 8. Please ONLY vote "yes" on final passage if her amendments are approved.

The over-development in Howard is a big concern for us so we will be watching your votes carefully.

Thank you,
Denise and Paul Giuliano
Kathleen Court
Columbia

Sent from my iPhone

From: Cynthia Williams <cawilliams66@hotmail.com>

Sent: Monday, February 05, 2018 11:45 AM

To: CouncilMail; Kittleman, Allan; boe@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.org

Subject: APFO - CB1 & CB2 Testimony

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting

the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely, Cynthia Williams 15754 Union Chapel Rd. Woodbine

Sent from Outlook

From: Greg Keenan < gregory.keenan@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, February 05, 2018 11:40 AM

To: CouncilMail

Cc: Kittleman, Allan; boe@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.org

Subject: CB1 & CB2 Testimony

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken the legislation. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Sincerely, Greg Keenan 5463 Autumn Field Court Ellicott City, MD 21043 District 1 Voter

From:

Jorge Gonzalez < jgonzalez@mdvamilk.com>

Sent:

Monday, February 05, 2018 11:30 AM

To: Cc: CouncilMail Jay Bryant

Subject:

Please support amendments 2, 3, 5 and 6 to CB1-2018 (APFO) and please reject

amendments 1, 4, 7 and 8

Councilmembers,

As CFO and speaking also for our CEO, Jay Bryant, of the Maryland & Virginia Milk Producers Cooperative Association which was founded in 1920 and is comprised of 1,500 farmers, I write that you please support amendments 2, 3, 5 and 6 to CB1-2018 (APFO), and please reject amendments 1, 4, 7 and 8. Our association owns approximately 220 acres in Howard County where we actively process milk and farm our land - just like our member farmers, we rely heavily on the value of our property to help finance our operations. This proposed bill would severely impact our finances, our property's future value, and possibly our ability to operate in Howard County. Planned growth is essential to the continued sustainability of Howard County's government and economy and in a time when our county is already facing a budget shortfall, this bill would exacerbate the situation. For properties in designated growth areas, a moratorium for development is not the right course of action and would only make things worse by not provide any remedy for the schools which face overcrowding, but effectively cut off a large source of school construction funding with the loss of school impact fees.

Thank you for your consideration of these amendments and your service to our County."

Jorge Gonzalez Chief Financial Officer Maryland & Virginia Milk Producers Reston, VA 20190 Work phone (703) 742-7421

From:

Maureen Belgen <mtmckenna24@gmail.com>

Sent:

Monday, February 05, 2018 11:24 AM

To:

CouncilMail

Cc:

Kittleman, Allan; boe@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.org

Subject:

CB1 & CB2 Testimony

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake.

However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding.

These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017.

As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely,

Maureen T. Belgen 6468 Skipton Dr Hanover, MD. 21076 District 1 Resident

From: Douglas Bice <douglasbice01@gmail.com> Monday, February 05, 2018 11:02 AM Sent:

To: CouncilMail

Cc: Kittleman, Allan; boe@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.org

Subject: CB1 & CB2 Testimony

Members of the Howard County Council, Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further. The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development. I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8. These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county. I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests. These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO. With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required. APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees. Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote! Sincerely, Douglas Bice, MD 3820 Plum Spring LN Ellicott City, MD 21042

District 1

From:

Mark Levy <amnimal@aol.com>

Sent:

Monday, February 05, 2018 10:59 AM

То:

CouncilMail

Subject:

CB-1-2018

Dear Council Members.

Please focus on and consider your actions and votes this evening. Your decisions could lead to negative financial impacts for Howard County in the coming years. We know that is certainly not your intent.

Please put "politics" aside, and do what is best for Howard County.

Support amendments 2,3,5 and 6.

Reject amendments 1,4,7, and 8.

Do not let the public, and your conscious down.

We are all watching......

Best always,

Mark L. Levy

President H & H Rock Companies 6800 Deerpath Road #100 Elkridge,Maryland 21075 410-579-2442 x2000 Direct Line 410-567-1045

From: Star and Todd <STARNTODD@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 05, 2018 10:44 AM

To: CouncilMail

Cc: Kittleman, Allan; boe@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.org

Subject: CB1 & CB2 Testimony

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely,

Starlite Dolbier

9119 Northfield Rd

Ellicott City, MD 21042

District 1

From:

Michael Young <michaelyoung16@hotmail.com>

Sent:

Monday, February 05, 2018 10:28 AM

To:

CouncilMail; Kittleman, Allan; boe@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.org

Subject:

Fw: CB1 and CB2

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

I have been following this issue for quite a while. The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, it is NOT an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. My children had to take classes in trailers which exist to this day, 10+ years later! These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely,

Michael Young

3861 Woodville Lane, Ellicott City MD 21042 (DISTRICT ONE)

From:

Mj Monck <mjmonck@gmail.com>

Sent:

Monday, February 05, 2018 10:13 AM

To:

CouncilMail

Cc:

Kittleman, Allan; boe@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.org

Subject:

CB1 and CB2 Testimony

Members of the Howard County Council,

I have seen firsthand what overcrowding in an elementary school looks like and I am dismayed and disappointed that Howard County has allowed this to go on at such rampant rates without a look to the future and what that means for our county. It is so very easy to say "Çhildren are our future" without actually addressing what that actually represents. They deserve the best instruction in the best facilities with the best resources if we want them to grow up to manage an even more complex and demanding world.

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely, Marijane Monck 11064 Berrypick Lane Columbia, MD 21044

From:

Mj Monck <mjmonck@gmail.com> Monday, February 05, 2018 10:13 AM

Sent: To:

CouncilMail

Cc:

Kittleman, Allan; boe@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.org

Subject:

CB1 and CB2 Testimony

Members of the Howard County Council,

I have seen firsthand what overcrowding in an elementary school looks like and I am dismayed and disappointed that Howard County has allowed this to go on at such rampant rates without a look to the future and what that means for our county. It is so very easy to say "Çhildren are our future" without actually addressing what that actually represents. They deserve the best instruction in the best facilities with the best resources if we want them to grow up to manage an even more complex and demanding world.

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely, Marijane Monck 11064 Berrypick Lane Columbia, MD 21044

From:

Feldmark, Jessica

Sent:

Monday, February 05, 2018 10:11 AM

To:

Sayers, Margery

Subject:

FW: ACS supports Amendments 2,3,5,6 to CB1

Jessica Feldmark
Administrator
Howard County Council
410-313-3111
jfeldmark@howardcountymd.gov

From: Joan Driessen [mailto:joan.driessen@acshoco.org]

Sent: Monday, February 05, 2018 10:10 AM

To: Sigaty, Mary Kay <mksigaty@howardcountymd.gov>; Ball, Calvin B <cbball@howardcountymd.gov>; Fox, Greg

<gfox@howardcountymd.gov>; Terrasa, Jen <jterrasa@howardcountymd.gov>; Weinstein, Jon

<jweinstein@howardcountymd.gov>

Cc: Feldmark, Jessica < jfeldmark@howardcountymd.gov>

Subject: ACS supports Amendments 2,3,5,6 to CB1

Dear Council Chairperson Sigaty and members Ball, Fox, Terrasa and Weinstein,

On behalf of the American Association of Community Services I write to express support for CB 1 amendments 2, 3, 5 and 6. We feel inclusion of these amendments in CB1 will offer our community opportunity to consider development of at least some affordable housing. These amendments offer a reasonable balance of the need to manage school capacities as well as to provide safe and quality housing for low and moderate-income households and persons with disabilities. We are especially appreciative of Amendment 3's attention to "factors such as housing cost burden on families and the extent of homelessness among families and school children." We do wish to forward the thought that inclusion of the disabled in that sentence would recognize a community need as well as increase the potential to attract state financing.

We look forward to an affirmative Council vote for these amendments and final inclusion in CB1.

Respectfully,

Joan Driessen

Joan

Joan Driessen
Executive Director
Association of Community Services of Howard County
9770 Patuxent Woods Drive, Suite 301
Columbia, MD 21046
410-715-9545
Direct: 443-518-7701
www.acshoco.org



From:

Sent:

Monday, February 05, 2018 9:45 AM

To:

CouncilMail; Kittleman, Allan; boe@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.org

Subject:

Howard County Development and School planning

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county.

I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. Busing students to schools outside their neighborhoods is not planning and is detrimental to the students and to the quality of the HC school system.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

Pam Foster

Ellicott City, Maryland

From:

Amanda Sparrow <almsparrow@yahoo.com>

Sent:

Monday, February 05, 2018 9:36 AM

To:

CouncilMail; Kittleman, Allan; boe@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.org

Subject:

February 5, 2018 vote

RE: CB1 & CB2 Testimony

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

Right now in Howard, traffic is terrible, school crowding is out of hand, and unfavorable comparisons to neighboring congested areas ("I may as well move to Montgomery County") are not uncommon to hear. Adding new growth when the current status is so fraught is not the right way to go.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely, Amanda Sparrow 9617 Stirling Bridge Drive Columbia, MD 21046

From:

Grace Morris <gmorris@hhpcorp.org>

Sent:

Monday, February 05, 2018 9:37 AM

To:

CouncilMail

Subject:

CB 1

Good morning Chair Sigaty and Council Members:

As a provider of affordable housing in Howard County for more than 50 years, Heritage Housing Partners Corporation strongly encourages you to approve the following amendments to CB 1: 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6.

The need for affordable housing for our most vulnerable populations is at risk without these amendments.

The numbers speak for themselves - 500 plus homeless children already in our schools, a shortfall already of over 6,000 rental units for those earning \$50,000 or less.

What affordable housing stock we do have is aging and could not be properly preserved without these amendments.

We ask you to please approve these amendments and allow progress to be made on these and other critical housing issues in our community.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Grace A. Morris
Executive Director
Heritage Housing Partners Corp.
9770 Patuxent Woods Dr
Mail stop 305
Columbia, MD 21046
443-518-7687 (direct)

From:

Nancy Wisner < nancywisner16@gmail.com>

Sent:

Monday, February 05, 2018 9:36 AM

To:

CouncilMail

Subject:

APFO

I urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments that strengthen the infrastructure of our county, namely amendments 1, 4, 7, and 8.

I also urge defeat of amendments which would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO, namely amendments 2, 3, and 6. (If # 5 actually weakens the roads test, reject it as well.)

We need to STOP the growth in Howard County and focus on the overcrowded schools and quality of life. I've lived in the county 40 years and what was the perfect place to live has become an overwhelming number of buildings, stores, houses, townhouses and condos lining all our roads and open spaces. Columbia Mall area is so overdeveloped that I refuse to shop there.

You can put an end to this and LISTEN to the residents!

Nancy Wisner President, North Laurel Senior Council 10575 Graeloch Rd. Laurel, MD 20723

From:

Tejas Doshi <tkdoshi@hotmail.com>

Sent:

Monday, February 05, 2018 9:00 AM

To:

CouncilMail

Cc:

Kittleman, Allan; boe@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.org

Subject:

CB1 & CB2 Testimony

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely, Tejas Doshi 12718 Milo Ct, Sykesville, MD 21784

From: Sent: Anita Davis <grandmaita@gmail.com> Monday, February 05, 2018 7:52 AM

To:

CouncilMail; Kittleman, Allan; boe@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.org

Subject:

CB1 & CB2 Testimony

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017! I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, **we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation** that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I do support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county (amendments 1, 4, 7, 8), and I strongly feel that the council votes on CB 1 and 2 should remain identical to those made in November To do otherwise would suggest that the invalidation of the original votes was simply a ploy to attempt to change votes to benefit developers.

I strongly oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose *any* exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely,

Anita Davis

3805 Macalpine Rd

Ellilcott City, MD 21042

District 1

From:

Cathy Nagle <cathy.nagle1@gmail.com>

Sent:

Monday, February 05, 2018 7:49 AM

To:

CouncilMail; Kittleman, Allan

Cc:

boe@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.org; Smith, Gary; Keller, Jessie; Weinstein, Jon

Subject:

Re: TESTIMONY FOR CB1

Mr. Weinstein and Mr. Kittleman,

As a follow up to my last email in support of passing APFO Bill, CB-1 as it was already voted on November 6, 2017, I am now writing in strong opposition of Amendments 2, and especially 3 and 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests, and any delay in implementation of the APFO high school test. APFO is meant to ensure the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. APFO should not contain loopholes for development. The strengthening of Howard County's APFO is long overdue. I expect CB-1, which was merely invalidated by a technical issue with timing, to be passed as voted on November 6, 2017.

Sincerely,
Catherine Nagle
9872 Fox Hill Court
Ellicott City, MD 21042
DISTRICT 1

On Mon, Jan 22, 2018 at 7:46 AM, Cathy Nagle < cathy.nagle1@gmail.com wrote: Mr. Weinstein and Mr. Kittleman,

As a voter in District 1 in Howard County, I urge you to pass APFO bill, CB-1, as it was already voted on November 6, 2017, before a timing technicality later invalidated the vote. I expect you to honor your vote of school thresholds at 115% for High Schools, 110% for Middle Schools, and 105% for Elementary Schools as they were previously voted on.

I have read testimony from last week's meeting regarding the purported affect these changes may have on affordable housing. Although I recognize the need for affordable housing, those looking to increase the supply of affordable housing should look to regulations that will directly affect this need, and that will provide more specific and on-going need fulfillment. APFO is meant to balance infrastructure and to prevent overcrowding for all. There should be no further changes or exceptions made to what should already have been passed.

Since the original vote was invalidated through the irresponsibility of this council, it is my belief that this reintroduction is simply supposed to correct the unbelievable timing technicality. Some have suggested that allowing the technicality was purposeful. I choose to believe that is not the case. However, maintaining the vote, as it was passed on November 6, will certainly restore my faith in this council.

Sincerely,

Catherine Nagle 9872 Fox Hill Court Ellicott City, MD 21042

From:

Crissy Baran < crissybaran@gmail.com> Monday, February 05, 2018 7:23 AM

Sent: To:

CouncilMail

Cc:

Kittleman, Allan; boe@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.org

Subject:

EMAIL TITLE: CB1 & CB2 Testimony

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken the legislation. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Thank you for your time!

Sincerely, Christine Baran 5300 Tangle Wood Court Ellicott City, MD 21043 District 1 Voter

From:

Christopher Gross <cogross@gmail.com>

Sent: To:

Monday, February 05, 2018 7:07 AM

10, C.J.: -4. CouncilMail; Kittleman, Allan

Subject:

CB1 & CB2 Testimony

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely,

Christopher Gross 3058 Terra Maria Way

From:

John Taylor <jetaylor91@comcast.net>

Sent:

Monday, February 05, 2018 12:44 AM

To:

CouncilMail

Subject:

APFO vote on Feb 5.

I urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments that strengthen the infrastructure of our county, namely amendments 1, 4, 7, and 8.

I urge defeat of amendments which would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO, namely amendments 2, 3, and 6.

John Taylor Elkridge

Sent from my Verizon 4G LTE smartphone

From:

Carolan Stansky <cbstansky@comcast.net>

Sent:

Monday, February 05, 2018 12:17 AM

To:

CouncilMail: Kittleman, Allan

Cc:

hoc1@mlis.state.md.us; boe@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.org; Smith, Gary

Subject:

CB1 & CB2; State bills 12-18 and 15-18

Attachments:

CB1 amendments.docx; APFO 20030127.pdf

Dear County Council, County Executive, State Delegation, Board of Education and Superintendent,

Needs or wants? Stewards or exploiters?

I believe "we" (myself and other taxpayers, and you elected decision makers) NEED to ensure adequate public facilities (and programs) for those who already call Howard County home. I understand that others WANT to move here (and builders want to make that happen) BUT without adequate revenue streams to support ALL aspects of growth, any decisions that cost more than "we" can now afford serve only to exploit existing residents and public and private institutions, thus degrading our quality of life. I believe Howard County is at an important inflection point! I am counting on your responsible stewardship on behalf of all Howard County voters—and their children.

Please vote for CB1 and CB2 on 2/5/18 as passed on 11/6/17. I am strongly opposed to ALL amendments to CB1 that change the thresholds and measures "adopted" in the ill-timed vote. I, and many other members of the St. John's Community Assocation (representing Dunloggin) advocated for 110% school thresholds and a stronger road test in APFO over 15 years ago! (See attached handout from 2003.) My specific comments regarding the "new" amendments to CB1 are attached (in case I am being long-winded and my reader being short on time). I also wrote to the Council on 1/20/18, after the CB1 & CB2 worksession.

Re State Bill 12-18 (companion to CB2), I have written and asked the Delegation to NOT approved the bill in its current form. Simply put, our current fees are too low, thus 2 or 3 times a low fee STILL doesn't produce sufficient revenue to ensure adequate schools and roads in a timely manner. My specific arguments re bills 12-18 and 15-18 are in my email to the Delegation dated 1/31/18 and copied to the Council.

To me, information put forth during two public meetings this week further proves that Howard is clearly at an inflection point: the 13th HS has now "slipped" to 2023 as a 60-month build time is required (so 5 years, not the 3 provided in APFO waits), Hammond HS's renovation is already 10 years delayed, but may be now be "fast-tracked" (read:still 5 years out) by adding 200 seats, the BOE is <u>not</u> actively thinking about HS14 (even though we have a min. 5 year build window?), and the "standard" high school plan (that was promised "way back when" to save HoCo lots of money) needs to be updated for LEED certification and other code changes (why wasn't this being done independent of a site?), and the teachers' healthcare funding has been raided to pay for other "needs", including negotiated salary increases. I have also looked at 1/31/18 enrollment stats which show a gain of 356 students overall since 9/30/17, which is 1684 students above the number projected for 17-18 in the last Feasibility Study. I feel like the "Ghost of Christmas Past": HC annual revenues are still not sufficient to meet needs, "building new" takes precedence over capital repairs (eg. Northfield's renovation was delayed from when my daughter began 1st grade in 1999 to the year she graduated HS in 2011--yet the school opened in 1968 and was built with "open classrooms"), and the stories of neglected capital needs in Baltimore City Schools should

be our "Ghost of Christmas Present." What will the "Ghost of the Future" see in Howard County? I believe we MUST change our approach, or like Montgomery County (where I grew up), Howard will be forced to eventually implement "market rate fees" -- but only when it is too late and the county is mired in gridlock. Please do it now!

I thank you all for your public service and respect that you have many constituents to listen to. However, it is clear we have a STRUCTURAL BUDGET ISSUE and unless the <u>Marginal Cost is less than the Marginal Revenue</u>, new development only makes the budget hole <u>deeper</u>. Please look at fully-loaded costs as well as revenues. Beware of "growth" as a "pyramid scheme." That we are in the situation we find ourselves now simply proves the prior APFO growth controls were NOT sufficient. You must strengthen them <u>and</u> raise revenue--<u>now!</u>

Carolan Stansky

3826 Plum Meadow Dr.

Ellicott City, MD 21042

CB1-2018 Amendments for vote 2/5/18

As stated in emails of 1/20/18 and 2/4/18, I believe it best to pass this legislation in the same form as voted on 11/6/17.

Since amendments will be discussed, here are my observations. I am a "veteran" of the 2003 APFO revisions and advocating for Marriotts Ridge HS and Veterans ES "way back when" (but when some folks thought HC would never need those seats!), former PTA President at Northfield ES 2001-2003, and 28-year member (and past officer) of the St. John's Community Association, representing Dunloggin. (I am now the BWI Next-Gen Noise chair for SJCA.)

#1-OK; makes clarifications

#2-Oppose: Current HCPSS "regions" are problematic and should be revised. Creating a new definition of "region" is confusing and likewise problematic. "Nearest" is not defined. (Is it Front door of school 1 to front door of other schools? Midpoint of polygon where building is proposed to each school door or to school property line?) Elongated current school boundaries make "nearest" quite subjective! (Eg. Veterans ES, Worthington ES, Thunder Hill ES, and Northfield ES are likely "nearest" to Wheatfield neighborhood, but those kids attend Waterloo ES. So would this mean nearest to the property or nearest to the currently-districted school?) While I appreciate the desire to find a way to "open" a school area to new building IF seats are available "nearby", it strikes me that the PRACTICAL solution is to allow a project to proceed ONLY IF the developer will sign an agreement and pay for busing to the open school(s) and will "advertise" this to all potential residents that this will be the designated school until capacity becomes available. (This would "protect" current residents but would likely hurt developer sales/prices—yet wouldn't that be the "free market" at work?) I would rather this idea be discussed further as a potential revision to APFO in 3-5 years.

#3-Oppose: Philosophically, I support the mission to provide more moderate and low income housing in Howard County. However, as I have stated: we currently have a STRUCTURAL BUDGET DEFICIT. Unless these are senior housing or other "adult only properties", by definition, they will cost the county more in education and other services (school seat construction and annual operating costs) than tax revenues from these specific units will provide (as is true for almost all market-rate housing, as well!) Howard County has an overall poverty rate of 5%, yet over 20% of current students now receive FARM so poverty is more acute in our schools (by definition, the same salary for a single adult v. an adult with two children changes where the family is on the poverty income-limit scale). However, as I believe both of these numbers have increased over the past 15 years (i.e. Howard now has higheroverall poverty rates) we must not add to the revenue stream shortfall in the near term. Until and unless we raise developer fees to market rates (perhaps with some discount for moderate income properties), or find another "new" revenue stream, Howard should not make this exception to APFO. Again, I would rather this idea be discussed further as a potential revision to APFO in 3-5 years.

#4-OK: This makes changes to strengthen the law and applies only IF the County has not yet provided adequate seats. I trust that 6-7 years meets the Constitutional tests for "taking," beyond the current 3-4 years in existing APFO.

#5-Oppose: The road test was insufficient 15 years ago! It MUST be strengthened now! (i.e. Long Gate Shopping Center and other properties on that stretch of Rt. 103 only had to "test" the light at the fire station and the light at the Y; the "cooperating" lights at 29S and near UNO could be ignored but those DO contribute to much gridlock and backing both ways on Rt. 103 and congestion on Rt. 100.) I do not support "easing" from the November bill with number of trips: as amended 50-98 trips at a "peak hour" would be deemed "no impact!" WRONG! The community agreed with the proposed methodology in November; please keep the original trip measures. The clarification of "major collector" from "signalized intersection" (page 20, line 5) seems OK, contingent on the DPZ/DPW review provisions that follow, BUT they should apply to ALL projects—not just 100+ trips (so oppose page 20, lines 15-20 as amended). It is not fair to existing residents where roads are not already sufficient say; this amendment basically says 30-99 trips/hour is "meaningless." I strongly disagree.

#6-Oppose: APFO must be changed NOW because the 2003 version has not worked as intended!

#7-OK: Personally, I favor stricter limits (surrounding counties have APFO at 100 and 105%) but respect that this should remain where it was voted 11/6/17.

#8-OK; makes clarifications for police, fire, and health services which are covered in nearby counties' APFO regulations and are important county services that must be funded to parallel the impact of any approved unit growth in Howard County. Again, if Marginal Revenue is less than Marginal Cost, new housing units will not bring excess "tax dollars." Thus, since both Howard County and BOE operating and capital budgets are now dramatically constrained, development should not proceed without new fees to let growth pay for growth!

APFO

Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance

Original
120% of capacity
ES test only

Current
115% of capacity
ES & MS test

Open/Closed Chart (On/Off switch for development)

- o No recognition of how close to target
- NES at 114.6%=OPEN (though only 1.7 students from CLOSED)
- Kids from just one house should likely effectively close it, yet any number (even 100+ houses) could still be built!
- o Building is still allowed (APFO one lot exemption)
- Chart adopted only once-a-year based on 3-year-out projections made each spring
- o Focus on projections, not current situation

Extra 15% is not easily accommodated at most schools

- o Class size is "protected" by formula: (K/22), $(1^{st}+2^{nd}/19)$, $(3^{rd}+4^{th}+5^{th}/25)$
- o Extra 0.5 by Sept. 30 is supposed to get school a new teacher & class at that level
- o Percentage means problem gets worse as school size gets larger
- Older schools are more stressed by overcrowding
- o Portables: Adequate? Unattractive! Not the solution!

Rated Capacity	110%	115%	120%	125%
300	330 (+30)	345 (+45)	360 (+60)	375 (+75)
500	550 (+50)	575 (+75)	600 (+100)	625 (+125)
700	770 (+70)	805 (+105)	840 (+140)	875 (+175)

Marginal Cost > Marginal Revenue = Budgetary Woes

- o 4BR houses attract families with children
- o Good schools attract families with children
- o Developers advertise to families with children

• Recommendations

- o Change open/closed to 105%; review between 105-115%
- o Add a provision to allow tentative allocation
- O Consider school size and thus number of children, not just a percentage
- o Close loopholes that still allow building in closed school districts
- o Drastically lower new housing units for 2-3 years to allow catch-up
- o Acquire land NOW for all future school needs
- o Address inadequate APFO Roads test

From: Sent: Robert Miller <robmilfam@gmail.com> Sunday, February 04, 2018 11:32 PM

To:

CouncilMail

Subject:

CB1

Dear Councilmembers,

I am writing to add my voice to those advocating passage of CB1, preferably with Amendments 1,4,7, and 8. Briefly, the overcrowding at three of our high schools and the difficulty of finding school sites in the northeast portion of the county due to the amount of development provide current illustrations of why this legislation is needed. Then, going forward, better plans for development that will provide for a range of housing throughout the county and will account for service and infrastructure needs, with more subsidizing from developers, hopefully can occur. Keeping Howard County a very desirable place to live would be beneficial to our students, other citizens, and I believe even the developers. Things appear to have gotten out of balance, and this bill appears to be a significant step in the right direction. Though I am not an expert in zoning, the consequences of problems with the old APFO seem quite apparent. Thank you very much for your efforts and consideration as you attempt to draft legislation that will affect the lives of many, hopefully positively, directly and indirectly, over many years.

Sincerely,

Robert W. Miller 10372 Painted Cup Columbia, MD 21044 Phone: 410-227-8445 robmilfam@gmail.com

From: Sent: Michele Aylaian <msaylaian@aol.com> Sunday, February 04, 2018 10:14 PM

To:

CouncilMail

Cc:

Kittleman, Allan; boe@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.org

Subject:

CB1 and CB2 Testimony

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely,

Michele Aylaian 9963 Timberknoll Lane Ellicott City 21042 District 1

From: Sent:

Laurie <thehealinghands@comcast.net> Sunday, February 04, 2018 10:07 PM

To:

CouncilMail

Cc:

Kittleman, Allan; boe@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.org

Subject:

CB1 & CB2 Testimony

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken the legislation. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Thank you for your time!

Sincerely, Laurie Alcock 5305 Sweet Birch Ct Ellicott City, MD 21043 District 1 Voter

From:

Susan Garber < buzysusan23@yahoo.com>

Sent:

Sunday, February 04, 2018 9:34 PM

To: Subject: CouncilMail CB-1 and 2

Dear Council Members,

I am writing to urge you to pass CB1 as introduced, or with the addition of amendments that **strengthen** the infrastructure of our county, namely amendments 1, 4, 7, and 8. I urge you to reject amendments which would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO, namely amendments 2, 3, and 6. (If # 5 actually weakens the roads test, I would want to see it rejected as well.) We simply cannot continue to kick the can down the road, causing the deterioration of our communities.

Re:CB-2 While I am pleased that CB-2 eliminated the uncertainty of units being exchanged between categories, I feel the definite exchange of 200 units out of Growth & Revitalization and into Established Neighborhoods will further destroy those neighborhoods with infill that disrupts everything from storm water management to neighborhood character. I also think it may be short sighted to make this change at a time when very large new developments such as Erickson, the Laurel Park Station, and Downtown are planned.

Please value existing residents as much as new ones!

Thank you for your consideration,

Susan Garber

From:

secwilliams . <secwilliams@gmail.com>

Sent:

Sunday, February 04, 2018 9:29 PM

To:

CouncilMail

Subject:

APFO

Howard County Council Members,

I am in favor of the passing of CB1 as drafted and approved in November. I urge you to work on behalf of the existing citizens of Howard County to defeat any amendments which would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the purpose and function of APFO, namely amendments 2, 3, 6 and 5 (if it weakens the already subpar roads test.)

Stacey Williams 2978 Brookwood Road Ellicott City, MD 21042

secwilliams@gmail.com

From:

E Kato <euk369@gmail.com>

Sent:

Sunday, February 04, 2018 8:25 PM

To:

CouncilMail

Cc:

Kittleman, Allan; boe@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.org; Michele Shrum

Subject:

RE: CB1 & CB2 Testimony

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I **support amendments** 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I **oppose amendments 2, 3, 6**. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting

the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely, Liz Kato 7335 Carved Stone

Columbia 21045

From: Sent: Beth Magen

Sunday, February 04, 2018 7:55 PM

To:

CouncilMail

Cc:

Kittleman, Allan; boe@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.org

Subject:

CB1 & CB2 Testimony

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely, Beth Magen 7127 Rivers Edge Rd, Columbia, MD 21044 District 4

Sent from my iPad

From:

Garvin and Ruth <gcrkc1@verizon.net>

Sent:

Sunday, February 04, 2018 7:08 PM

To:

CouncilMail

Cc:

Kittleman, Allan; boe@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.org

Subject:

CB1 and CB2 Testimony

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely,

Garvin Cung 5003 Cobble Stone Ct, Ellicott City, MD 21043 District 1

From:

Garvin and Ruth <gcrkc1@verizon.net>

Sent:

Sunday, February 04, 2018 7:06 PM

To:

CouncilMail

Cc:

Kittleman, Allan; boe@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.org

Subject:

CB1 & CB2 Testimony

Hello,

Thank you for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. Please continue to push for CB61 as drafted or with amendments that only strengthen in further.

As I've written in the past, we settled down in Howard County largely for its education system. The AFPO plan that was submitted back in November addressed many of our concerns. Please continue to push to not continually re-districting, prevent overcrowding at schools, and make sure developers pay sustainable/practical fees towards developing schools as they develop more here. Howard County is built up fairly well now, and we need sustainable laws/rules/guidelines. Neighboring counties have much higher fees (probably for good reason), and so should we. We need more balance in Howard County, and believe AFPO can still do this with CB61 as discussed in 2017.

Thank you.

Garvin Cung 5003 Cobble Stone Ct. Ellicott City, MD 21043 District 1

From: Sent:

Rachael Gross <rkbrick@gmail.com> Sunday, February 04, 2018 6:51 PM

To:

CouncilMail

Cc:

Kittleman, Allan

Subject:

CB1 & CB2 Testimony

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely, Rachael Gross 3058 Terra Maria Way

From:

DEBORAH FICHTER < fichters4@comcast.net>

Sent:

Sunday, February 04, 2018 6:14 PM

To:

CouncilMail

Cc:

Kittleman, Allan; boe@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.org

Subject:

RE: CB1 & CB2 Testimony

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely, Bryan and Deborah Fichter 4520 Chews Vineyard

Ellicott City, MD 21043

District 1 Residents

From:

Locke Joanne <joannelocke@gmail.com>

Sent:

Sunday, February 04, 2018 6:14 PM

To:

CouncilMail

Cc:

Kittleman, Allan; boe@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.org

Subject:

CB1 & CB2 Testimony

Dear Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote. I'm counting on you.

Sincerely, Joanne Locke 8575 Autumn Harvest Ellicott City, MD 21043

From:

Paul Ward Iii <paulward3@verizon.net>

Sent:

Sunday, February 04, 2018 6:05 PM

To:

CouncilMail

Kittleman, Allan

Cc: Subject:

CB1 & CB2 Testimony

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the <u>November 6th</u> vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for <u>February 5th, 2018</u> is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely,

Paul Ward 2902 Evergreen Way Ellicott City, MD 21042

Sent from AOL Mobile Mail
Get the new AOL app: mail.mobile.aol.com

From:

Paul Ward Iii <paulward3@verizon.net>

Sent:

Sunday, February 04, 2018 5:56 PM

To:

CouncilMail

Cc:

kittleman@howardcountymd.gov

Subject:

CB1 & CB2 Testimony

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely, Paul Ward 2902 Evergreen Way Ellicott City, MD 21042

From:

Elizabeth G <edgarstecki@gmail.com>

Sent:

Sunday, February 04, 2018 5:43 PM

To:

CouncilMail

Subject:

Fwd: CB1 & CB2 Testimony

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Elizabeth G < edgarstecki@gmail.com Date: February 4, 2018 at 5:35:39 PM EST To: councilma@howardcountymd.gov

Cc: akittleman@howardcountymd.gov, boe@hcpss.org, superintendent@hcpss.org

Subject: CB1 & CB2 Testimony

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely, Elizabeth D Garstecki 3024 Carlee Run Ct Ellicott City, MD 21042

From: Lisa Balighian < lstick21702@hotmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, February 04, 2018 5:27 PM

To: CouncilMail
Cc: Kittleman, Allan
Subject: CB1 & CB2 Testimony

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely,

Lisa Balighian

3112 SAint Charles Place, Ellicott City Md 21042

From: Phyllis Greenbaum <phyllisgreenbaum@icloud.com>

Sent: Sunday, February 04, 2018 5:04 PM

To: CouncilMail

Cc: Kittleman, Allan; boe@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.org

Subject: CB1 & CB2 Testimony

RE: CB1 & CB2 Testimony

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely, Phyllis Greenbaum 6407 Sunset Light

Columbia, MD 21045

Frances O'Connor <chettyoak@yahoo.com>

Sent: Sunday, February 04, 2018 4:02 PM

To: CouncilMail; Kittleman, Allan

Cc: Kittleman, Allan; boe@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.org

Subject: CB1 & CB2 Testimony

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken the legislation. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Sincerely, Frances Keenan 5463 Autumn Field Court Ellicott City, MD 21043 District 1 Voter

From:

Greg Fitchitt <Greg.Fitchitt@howardhughes.com>

Sent:

Sunday, February 04, 2018 3:40 PM

To:

CouncilMail Kittleman, Allan

Cc: Subject:

HHC letter regarding CB-1 and proposed amendments

Attachments:

HRD APFO amendments letter 2-4-18.pdf

Councilmembers,

Attached please find testimony on CB-1 and the proposed amendments.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely, Greg Fitchitt

Greg Fitchitt | Senior Vice President, Development | The Howard Hughes Corporation Columbia Regional Office | 10480 Little Patuxent Parkway, Suite 400 | Columbia, MD 21044 410.964.5445 phone | 310.892.9718 cell | 410.964.5409 fax

Experience the new Downtown Columbia https://www.facebook.com/#!/ColumbiaMD www.downtowncolumbia.com

The information contained in this communication and any attachments is intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed and others authorized to receive it. It may contain confidential or legally privileged information. If so, inadvertent disclosure to third parties is not intended to waive such confidentiality or privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, disclosure, copying, distribution or taking any action in reliance on the contents of the information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by responding to this email and then delete it from your system. Neither The Howard Hughes Corporation, nor any of its affiliates is liable for the proper and complete transmission of the information contained in this communication nor for any delay in its receipt. For more information contact us at 214-741-7744 or visit us at www.howardhughes.com. The Howard Hughes Corporation trades on the New York Stock Exchange under the symbol HHC.

The Howard Research And Development Corporation 10480 Little Patuxent Parkway, Suite 400 Columbia, MD 21044 **Greg Fitchitt** T 410.964.5445 Greg.Fitchitt@HowardHughes.com

February 4, 2018

Honorable Mary Kay Sigaty Councilmember, District #4 Chair, Howard County Council George Howard Building 3430 Court House Drive Ellicott City, MD 21043

Re: CB-1 Legislation and Proposed Amendments

Dear Council Chair Sigaty and Councilmembers:

I am writing on behalf of HRD and The Howard Hughes Corporation to urge your careful consideration of the CB-1 (APFO) legislation and the 8 proposed amendments made public on Friday.

Generally, we believe the CB-1 legislation has mistakenly become an attempt to solve a problem properly addressed by HCPSS and the Board of Education, not the County Council. The existing APFO legislation provides ample time for planning to address capacity issues through new schools, expansions and renovations of existing schools, and redistricting to better utilize the existing school capacity, for which Howard County taxpayers have already paid hundreds of millions of dollars. But recognizing that CB-1 is likely to pass in some form, we hope that you will amend it in such a way as to minimize damage to the County, minimize unintended consequences, and support wise use of scarce County resources.

Specifically:

Amendment #1: Please oppose. This amendment is an attempt to solve a problem which does not exist. CEPPA alternative compliance was built into the Downtown Columbia Plan out of a recognition that it would be impossible to predict every circumstance in Downtown as the plan develops over 30 years. It has been approved by the Planning Board in eminently justifiable circumstances, such as:

- the alternative compliance which enabled the early transfer of Merriweather Post Pavilion to DCACC, and
- the alternative compliance to phase the environmental restoration work in the Crescent to occur concurrent with development, so as not to damage restoration work prematurely required out of sequence.

The Howard Research And Development Corporation 10480 Little Patuxent Parkway, Suite 400 Columbia, MD 21044

Greg Fitchitt T 410.964.5445 Greg.Fitchitt@HowardHughes.com

Passage of this amendment could have the consequence, intended or unintended, of hindering many Downtown Columbia projects, including the new Central Library and other residential projects which would include affordable housing.

Amendment #2: Please support with modification. If the Board of Education fails to adequately plan for new capacity or redistrict and utilize available school capacity, this should not result in an effective building moratorium. This amendment as drafted is a step in the right direction, but it should go further.

Modification to this amendment could address the all-too-common circumstance where one school is at 110% of capacity or more, while an adjacent school sits at only 90% or less. For example, under the current Open/Closed chart adopted by Council on July 3, 2017, projected capacities in the 2020/2021 year at immediately adjacent schools include:

- Bryant Woods ES @ 114.1%; Longfellow ES @ 82.6%
- Veterans ES @ 114.1%; Worthington ES @ 74.4%
- St. Johns Lane ES @ 117.8%; Waverly ES @ 86.3%
- Forest Ridge ES @ 127.5%; Laurel Woods ES @ 83.1%
- Pointers Run ES @ 111.2%; Clarksville ES @ 59.5%

In such circumstances, rather than halt new residential construction, the Board of Education should adjust boundaries to better utilize the school capacity that Howard County taxpayers have already paid for. Adjusting the threshold on line 11 of the amendment from 110% to 115% would at least permit projects to move forward in 3 of the 5 circumstances above, supporting better utilization of the investments Howard County has already made in our schools.

Amendment #3: Please support. While this amendment and the added hoops it creates for affordable housing projects to jump through should not be needed at all, the effective moratorium imposed by the current draft of CB-1 makes it necessary, if the County believes in its stated goals of providing affordable housing opportunities for its residents.

Amendment #4: Please oppose. HCPSS and the Board of Education already effectively have 6 years of lead time to plan for and address projected overcrowding under current law - the 3 year delay on development in closed school districts, plus the 3+ years it takes to zone, permit, build and sell new housing. Six years is more than ample time. This amendment is simply an attempt to deny property rights and halt any new development.

Amendment #5: Please support with modification. This is a rational modification to the expanded road test provisions, although the proposed thresholds remain very low. For the proposed scoping meeting, we believe that this goal could be achieved through electronic submissions and/or a phone call, which would work reasonably within business constraints and should work for the County staff as well. No one wants to add unnecessary meetings.

Greg Fitchitt T 410.964.5445 Greg.Fitchitt@HowardHughes.com

The Howard Research And Development Corporation 10480 Little Patuxent Parkway, Suite 400 Columbia, MD 21044

Amendment #6: Please support. A high school test should not be necessary. Everyone knows that elementary schoolers become middle schoolers, and middle schoolers become high schoolers. So there is already 9 years of lead time built into the system to plan. But if a high school test is to be introduced, at least deferring it until 2023 should allow the Board of Education to select one of the proposed sites for HS-13 and build the new high school.

Amendment #7: Please oppose. For the same reasons noted above in support of Amendment #2, this amendment would further exacerbate the waste of taxpayer resources resulting from the failure to utilize the past investments in school capacity made by Howard County. Further, it would choke off any state funding for new school construction, which is already in jeopardy with CB-1 as currently drafted. If we ever hope to rationally address school overcrowding, please reject this amendment.

Amendment #8: Please oppose. Creating undefined and arbitrary new APFO tests without careful study is poor public policymaking. As we can see with the extensive debate and discussion over the schools test during the past 3 years, there is plenty of challenge understanding and interpreting the APFO standards already in place. The current planning processes for public services should be the vehicle for addressing future needs, rather than adding more duplicative and complicating layers of bureaucracy and regulation to the mix.

Thank you for your consideration. If you elect to pass CB-1, we hope that you will choose to amend it in a thoughtful and productive manner, so as to keep our excellent quality of life in Howard County strong and moving in a positive direction.

Sincerely,

Greg Fitchitt Senior Vice President of Development

The Howard Hughes Corporation

Cc: Jon Weinstein, Councilmember, District #1
Dr. Calvin Ball, Councilmember, District #2
Jen Terrasa, Councilmember, District #3
Greg Fox, Councilmember, District #5
Allan Kittleman, Howard County Executive

From:

Yunshan Ye <yunshanye@gmail.com>

Sent:

Friday, February 02, 2018 8:18 PM

To:

CouncilMail

Cc:

Kittleman, Allan; BOE@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.org

Subject:

CB1 & CB2 Testimony

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely, Yunshan Ye, Resident at 4527 Rolling Meadows Ellicott City MD 21043

From:

DOUGLAS Perkins <dmpx@comcast.net>

Sent:

Sunday, February 04, 2018 3:16 PM

To:

CouncilMail

Subject:

CB1

There seems to be some confusion or lack of clarity in the public as to what is being proposed concerning the Adequate Public Facilities legislation.

I moved into Howard County shortly after graduating from college and have been paying taxes here for 42 years. All but twelve of those years I had no children in the HO CO schools and had no objection to paying to support schools for other peoples children. My children graduated in 2008 and I am once again supporting a school system in which I have no children. I have no objection to that. I ardently support the county schools as important part of our society.

What does concern me is an attitude that was expressed by many at a recent hearing who want to slam the door on anyone moving into the county and also impose draconian financial burdens upon those buying new houses.

What also concerns me was an outpouring of support on the part of many that I would term relative newcomers to arbitrarily restrict all development and thereby take value from existing property owners. This is a point where such proposals may directly affect me and cause me great concern.

I own a one acre parcel that is zoned R-20 and is eligible for subdividing to two half acre lots. I purchased this property nearly four decades ago with that directly in mind as a way to afford my retirement in my dotage. Such infilling has been taking place in my neighborhood and the half acres have been selling for more than \$250,000. As I age, I have anticipated taking the same action that many of my neighbors have already done. Proposals have been made to 1) place an increased development surcharge of as much as \$40,000 per house and 2) place as much as a seven year hold on ones right to act. If either of these have been incorporated into the proposals, they would have a devastating effect upon my property value. The first would be a direct attack on my value and the second could disallow my subdividing in my lifetime.

I would appreciate a response directly addressing my personal concerns about these proposed attacks on my financial well being and whether they were or are incorporated into the APFO.

I reside at 10613 Vista Road, Columbia 21044

I can be contacted either at this email or by voice or text at 410-440-3523

I look forward to a response that will set my mind at ease. I would hate to be rushed into initiating subdividing years before I would really wish.

Thanks,

Douglas Perkins

From:

rdeutschmann2@gmail.com

Sent:

Sunday, February 04, 2018 2:46 PM

To:

CouncilMail

Cc:

superintendent@hcpss.org; Kittleman, Allan; boe@hcpss.org

Subject:

CB1 & CB2 Testimony

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely,

Richard & Vanessa Deutschmann 9485 Hickory Limb Columbia, MD 21045

From: Angela Katenkamp <akatenkamp@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, February 04, 2018 2:25 PM

To: CouncilMail

Cc: Kittleman, Allan; boe@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.org

Subject: CB1 & 2 Testimony

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely,

Angela Katenkamp Shiplet

6250 Summer Home Terrace

Elkridge MD 21075

District 1 Resident

From: Christine Lemyze <clemyze@hotmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, February 04, 2018 2:18 PM

To: CouncilMail

Cc: Kittleman, Allan; boe@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.org

Subject: CB1 and CB2

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

I have been following this issue for quite a while. The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, it is NOT an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. My children had to take classes in trailers which exist to this day, 10+ years later! These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely,

Christine Lemyze

3861 Woodville Lane, Ellicott City MD 21042 (DISTRICT ONE)

From:

Jeannie McCaffrey <jvmccaffrey@yahoo.com>

Sent:

Sunday, February 04, 2018 1:45 PM

To:

CouncilMail

Cc:

Kittleman, Allan; boe@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.org

Subject:

CB1 & CB2 Testimony

Members of the Howard County Council.

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Jean McCaffrey 2824 Thornbrook Rd Ellicott City, MD 21042

From: Tim Burkard <tim@burkardhomes.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 04, 2018 1:00 PM

To: CouncilMail

Subject: Please SUPPORT Amendments 2,3,5, and 6 tp CB!-2018 (APFO)

Dear Howard County Council Members:

I am writing to you today in strong opposition to council Bill 1 (CB1-2018) as it is extremely shortsighted and not in the best interest of Howard County. I am also writing in strong support of Amendments 2,3,5,and 6 and strong opposition to Amendments 1,4,7, and 8 of this bill. I reside at 8415 Horseshoe Road, Ellicott City, MD 21043 and am the owner of Burkard Homes, LLC, a homebuilding company with offices at 5850 Waterloo Drive, Columbia MD 21045. Simply put, the bill does not address the problem of school overcrowding – the students are already there – only redistricting will solve that problem.

The bill, as proposed, effectively creates a building moratorium for much of the county for years to come. This will have devastating and far-reaching effects on our county. I ask you to re-consider the already presented facts:

- The Economic and Fiscal Impact of the Proposed APFO on Howard County prepared by Mr. Clinch and Mr. Steere. As evidenced in the public hearing presentation, the legislation would have damaging affects our economy it would exacerbate the upcoming budget deficit, increase taxes, reduce government services, and make it more difficult to build more schools.
- Many of the programs targeting low-income residents would not be able to continue. as was evidenced in one of the hearings. The MIHU program would be devastated as there would be no lots to build affordable homes upon.
- Testimony that explained that it is the Board of Educations' mismanagement of resources that have lead to the imbalance within county districts. It is not a result of growth policies. The decrease in new houses built has only incremental impact on the overcrowded schools today. This bill does very little to fix the problem that was created due to a lack of will to redistrict in the past. The residents and students are already here.
- I believe you have also received a letter from respected Maryland Economist, Dr. Anirban Basu, who outlined what happens to municipalities that adopt moratoriums as regular part of their land use planning. Over time, populations go elsewhere, school close, businesses move, and budget deficits balloon.
- Moratoriums should only be used in extremely circumstances for limited periods of time much like the County implemented in the wake of the horrible Ellicott City flood.

As a childhood resident of Bowie, MD, I have experienced the consequences first hand of mismanagement by County officials. Dr. Basu's warning can save Howard County from this long road of hardship. I urge all of you to re-read his letter as Dr. Basu is an expert in the study of economics and real estate in the State of Maryland.

Howard County is known for being one of the best places to live in the United States stemming from years of responsible governing. Please do not taint the "Columbia" philosophy. Cutting low-income programs of our residents is not "Howard County customary" nor would the population accept it. This is not Jim Rouse's dream: especially not the rising housing costs that will quickly follow. The split between the halves and halves not would continue to increase as housing prices would escalate due to the lack of supply.

Having lived happily in Howard County for over twenty years, I have enjoyed the amenities and perks of being a resident. The County Council and the Education Board have made positive impacts:

- The school system is at 98% overall capacity, which is a testament to the County's allocation system as well as the APFO tests.
- My home is in one of the currently closed to development school districts. I have a 12 year old at Ellicott Mills Middle and have a 22 year old who recently attended Howard High School. In both cases, the overcrowding situation has not negatively affected their education experience.
- The acknowledged necessity of building additional units of incremental housing per year (many of which are multifamily units). As demonstrated in the hearings, reducing this will not affect the student populations. Only a thoughtful redistricting approach will affect that.

As a homebuilder who focuses on affordable side of market rate housing, the moratorium would be devastating to the affordable housing industry. Expert testimony at the latest hearing demonstrated that our business tax dollars (and collaboration with the county every step of the way) are allocated to support necessary programs. A moratorium would drive builders out of business in Howard County. Within a few years our business and personal tax dollars would relocate to other counties or leave Maryland entirely. Leaving behind a financial vacuum and the subsequent pointing fingers in Howard County.

In summary, the County Council has been given an opportunity to re-think the bill that has largely been driven by a short-term political quick fix that doesn't solve the problem. Please don't repeat the mistake of rushing through legislation that will have severe negative affects for our community for years, perhaps decades to come.

Please vote no of Council Bill (CB1-2018) and in the absence of that, please vote YES on Amendments, 2,3,5,and 6, and NO on Amendments on 1,4,7 and 8.

Thank you for taking the time to read this and re-evaluate the information that has already been presented to you.

Sincerely,

Tim Burkard

Tim Burkard Burkard Homes, LLC 5850 Waterloo Road, Suite 140 Columbia, MD 21045

www.burkardhomes.com

Mobile: (240) 375-1052 Sales Office: (410) 992-2221

From:

Caroline Bodziak <cbodziak@aol.com>

Sent:

Sunday, February 04, 2018 12:33 PM

To:

CouncilMail

Cc:

Kittleman, Allan; boe@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.org

Subject:

CB1 & CB2 Testimony

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely,

Caroline Bodziak 3133 Hearthstone Rd. Ellicott City, MD 21042 District 5 resident

From: Michele Shrum <micheleshrum@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, February 04, 2018 12:20 PM

To: CouncilMail
Cc: Kittleman, Allan

Subject: CB 1

Dear Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

I understand that the vote scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct the mistake made on November 6th. Please do not use this as an opportunity to weaken this legislation that is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their neighborhood schools. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6 and any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

APFO is meant to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please think about what is best for HCPSS students as you deliberate on this matter.

Sincerely, Michele Shrum

11342 Market Street, Fulton, MD 20759

From:

Melissa Helicke <mhelicke@yahoo.com>

Sent: To:

Sunday, February 04, 2018 11:57 AM CouncilMail

Cc:

Kittleman, Allan; boe@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.org

Subject:

CB1 & CB2 Testimony

Dear Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely, Melissa Helicke 4610 Smokey Wreath Way Ellicott City, MD 21042 District 1 resident

From: Debra

Debra Radcliffe-Borsch <debra4@earthlink.net>

Sent: Sunday, February 04, 2018 11:35 AM

To: CouncilMail

Cc: Kittleman, Allan; boe@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.org

Subject: CB1 & CB2 Testimony

Members of the Howard County Council,

I support the Greater Elkridge Community's views on CB 1 and CB2.

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely, Debra Radcliffe-Borsch 2510 Pfefferkorn Road West Friendship, MD 21794 District 4-2

From:

Melinda Roch < melinda.roch@gmail.com>

Sent:

Sunday, February 04, 2018 11:05 AM

To:

CouncilMail

Cc:

Kittleman, Allan; boe@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.org

Subject:

CB1 & CB2 Testimony

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely,

Melinda Roch

3414 Pierce Drive

Ellicott City, MD 21042

District 1

From: Hughes, Matthew:(Constellation) < Matthew.Hughes@constellation.com>

Sent: Sunday, February 04, 2018 10:00 AM

To: CouncilMail

Cc: Kittleman, Allan; boe@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.org

Subject: CB1 & CB2 Testimony

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely,
Matthew Hughes
3606 Underoak Drive Ellicott City, MD 21042
FOR DISTRICT ONE RESIDENT

This Email message and any attachment may contain information that is proprietary, legally privileged, confidential and/or subject to copyright belonging to Exelon Corporation or its affiliates ("Exelon"). This Email is intended solely for the use of the person(s) to which it is addressed. If you are not an intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivery of this Email to the intended recipient(s), you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this Email is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please immediately notify the sender and permanently delete this Email and any copies. Exelon policies expressly prohibit employees from making defamatory or offensive statements and infringing any copyright or any other legal right by Email communication. Exelon will not accept any liability in respect of such communications. -EXCIP

From:

Lisa Harbaugh < lharbaugh 2@gmail.com>

Sent:

Sunday, February 04, 2018 9:42 AM

To:

CouncilMail

Cc:

Kittleman, Allan; boe@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.org

Subject:

CB1 & CB2 Testimony

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely, Lisa Harbaugh 2901 Evergreen Way Ellicott City, MD 21042

From: Sheryl Goering <srgoering@verizon.net>
Sent: Sunday, February 04, 2018 8:16 AM

To: CouncilMail

Cc: Kittleman, Allan; boe@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.org

Subject: CB1 & CB2 Testimony

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely, Sheryl Goering 11405 Butterfruit Way Ellicott City MD 21042 (District 1)

Sent from my iPhone

From:

Courtney Skinner < courtneyskinner35@gmail.com>

Sent:

Saturday, February 03, 2018 10:52 PM

To:

CouncilMail; Kittleman, Allan; boe@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.org

Subject:

CB1 & CB2 Testimony

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely,

Courtney Skinner

3020 Grotto Walk

Ellicott City, MD 21042

From:

Teri Holbrook <tjholbrook@gmail.com>

Sent:

Saturday, February 03, 2018 10:39 PM

To:

CouncilMail

Cc:

Kittleman, Allan; boe@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.org

Subject:

CB1 and CB2 testimony

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely, Teri Holbrook 3013 Evergreen Way Ellicott City, MD 21042

From:

Buffy Illum <buffy.illum@gmail.com> Saturday, February 03, 2018 9:55 PM

Sent: To:

CouncilMail

Cc:

Kittleman, Allan; boe@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.org; Smith, Gary; Keller, Jessie

Subject:

CB1 & CB2 Testimony from District 1 resident

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Thank you for your time and attention,

Buffy Illum

4606 Smokey Wreath Way

Ellicott City, MD 21042

District 1

From:

Niki McGuigan <mcniki1@gmail.com>

Sent: To: Saturday, February 03, 2018 9:20 PM

Subject:

CouncilMail; Kittleman, Allan Testimony for CB! and CB2

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely,

Niki McGuigan 6209 Patuxent Quarter Rd. Hanover DISTRICT ONE

From: H.Wolfgang Hohenner <wolfgang@hohenner.com>

Sent: Saturday, February 03, 2018 8:59 PM

To: CouncilMail

Cc: akittleman@howardcontymd.gov; boe@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.org

Subject: CB1 and CB2 Testimony

A thank you is due to Jen Terrasa, to Dr. Calvin Ball and to Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6, 2017. I am writing to urge the Council to pass CB1 as drafted, or only with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publically stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this error. However. we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should certainly *NOT* contain any exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendments that strengthen the infrastructure of our County. Thus, I support Amendments 1,4,7, and 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well-planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick-and-mortar neighborhoods, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments also help ensure that our County's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by additional new residents to the County.

And I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our County, such as Amendments 2, 3, and 6.

I also oppose any exemptions from school test. These school tests would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5, it appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is a purely technical correction, I feel further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the County's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so that they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provision and increasing the school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely, H. Wolfgang Hohenner 4053 Saint Johns Lane Ellicott City, Maryland 21042-5338

I am a District 1 resident

From: Deborah <deborah.rush2@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, February 03, 2018 8:44 PM

To: CouncilMail

Cc: Kittleman, Allan; boe@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.org

Subject: CB1 & CB2 Testimony

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely,
Deborah Rush
3734 Chateau Ridge Dr.
Ellicott City, MD 21042
DISTRICT ONE

From:

Karen Herren <karenherren@yahoo.com>

Sent:

Saturday, February 03, 2018 2:00 PM

To:

CouncilMail

Cc:

Smith, Gary; Keller, Jessie; Weinstein, Jon; Kittleman, Allan; BOE@hcpss.org;

superintendent@hcpss.org

Subject:

CB1 & CB2

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

I agree with Jen Terassa's assessment of how we should be addressing affordable housing. "We should invest directly in affordable housing through our budget, incentivize the building of affordable housing in areas where we have the school capacity to accommodate additional students, and not continue to overcrowd schools in neighborhoods with higher concentrations of poverty or economic challenges. We should also require affordable housing in all parts of the County, not just some, and stop letting developers out of these requirements by agreeing to build their affordable housing for them or allowing them to pay a minimal fee-in-lieu instead of building actual units." It simply does not make logical sense to make an exception for affordable housing in areas where the schools are already overcrowded. We should make diversity in housing types a priority all over the county with respects to all development. Amendment 3 is the wrong way to address this.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely,

Karen Herren

3721 Spring Meadow Dr.

Ellicott City, MD 21042 District 1

From:

Ronald Mutchnik <rjm262@gmail.com>

Sent:

Saturday, February 03, 2018 1:18 PM

To:

CouncilMail

Cc:

Kittleman, Allan; boe@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.org

Subject: CB1 & CB2 Testimony

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely,
Ronald Mutchnik
4222 Club Court, Ellicott City
District 1

From:

Buffy Illum <buffy.illum@gmail.com>

Sent:

Saturday, February 03, 2018 1:11 PM

To:

CouncilMail; Weinstein, Jon

Subject:

Affordable housing and education go to together

Dear Jon Weinstein,

I am writing from District 1 to share that I hope that you maintain your vote from November re.: APFO. I really like seeing leaders with ambitious and smart goals like having affordable housing and properly financed education go together. I am confident you know that social cohesion is not just a moral issue but also a smart investment because it cuts down on a lot of expensive drains to the county budget like crime. And after the floods on Main St I know you understand more than most that it pays more to do infrastructure in a way that respects the environment instead of needing to use large sums of tax money to cleanup and rebuild from catastrophes stemming from poor planning. Howard County, as you know, is a nature tourism destination in the region. So for lots of reasons, APFO matters for our county's economic health.

I hope to see fruitful and maybe even inspiring leadership from the council and hope for you all that you don't give into false choices and limited, habitual thinking. I came back to Howard County because I wanted to be a part of a community that uses its wealth to not only provide comfort and convenience (which I am a unashamed huge fan of) but also foster equity and opportunity. Let's not just go the easy route with wealth and use it to be self-satisfied and seek a false sense of safety in exclusivity. That's really a poverty mindset if you ask me. It would be a shame to continue to under nurture one of the few public school systems in the country that is integrated and performing at an exceptional level. It'd also be a shame to continue to neglect our green spaces. Let's invest now to keep this great county going! We are an inspiration.

All best, Buffy Illum Ellicott City, MD 21042

From:

Diana Berry < dianaberry@verizon.net> Saturday, February 03, 2018 12:20 PM

Sent: To:

CouncilMail

Subject:

APFO Amendments D1

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the <u>November 6th</u> vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for <u>February 5th, 2018</u> is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely,

Diana Berry 6456 Julie Ann Drive District-1

Sent from my iPhone

Diana Berry

Sent from my iPhone

From: Leslie Segev <lesliesegev@yahoo.com>

Sent: Saturday, February 03, 2018 12:17 PM

To: CouncilMail

Cc: Kittleman, Allan; boe@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.org

Subject: CB1 & CB2 Testimony

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely, [Leslie and Amir Segev [3773 Plum Hill Court Ellicott City, MD 21042 District 1 resident Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone

From:

T Makaravage <t.makaravage@gmail.com>

Sent:

Saturday, February 03, 2018 11:45 AM

To: Subject:

CouncilMail; boe@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.org; Kittleman, Allan

CB1 & CB2 Testimony

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, with amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county namely amendments 1, 4, 7, and 8.

I have specific concerns with the amendment that ties affordable housing to APFO. Affordable housing is necessary and so is adequate public facilities. The two are not, and should not, be pitted against one another. If the county allows for affordable housing projects to proceed without the required and adequate public facilities, we are doing an injustice to those that will be living in those homes and to the existing residents in those communities. Adding these exemptions is not in the best interest of those who need affordable housing, but rather in the best interest of developers to overbuild our county without regard to the quality of life.

My other concern is that redistricting was added to an amendment as an option to make an area open. We saw plainly last summer that the existing schools in this county, specifically in Elkridge, are not located where the development has gone on. Redistricting the current population of high school students to fill all the county high schools moved everyone west, often sending kids that were walking distance to their school to one much further west. It increased transportation costs, tore many communities apart, and just didn't make sense. Unlike the leadership of the past, I believe we have a Superintendent and Board of Education in place that have an eye to the future. I have a huge concern with legislation that allows development to mandate redistricting. Please be careful with that.

The County Council has publicly stated that the <u>November 6th</u> vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for <u>February 5th, 2018</u> is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

Amendments 1, 4, 7, and 8 would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely,

Tracy Makaravage
6233 Latchlift Ct., Elkridge, MD
District 1

From: Sent: Forrest Family <forrest_121@verizon.net>

To:

Saturday, February 03, 2018 11:36 AM

Cc:

CouncilMail Kittleman, Allan

Subject:

CB-1, CB-2

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely, Laura Forrest 10305 Greenbriar Ct Ellicott City MD 21042

From:

Geoff Pickett < geoffpickett@hotmail.com>

Sent:

Saturday, February 03, 2018 11:19 AM

To:

CouncilMail

Cc: Subject: Kittleman, Allan; superintendent@hcpss.org

CB1 & CB2 Testimony

Members of the Howard County Council,

I am writing to the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests. These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

Development in this great County of ours has largely gone unmanaged for yeas. So we need a stronger APFO to prevent further over-crowding of our schools and continued insufficient resources put towards proper infrastructure.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Regards, Geoff Pickett 6480 Abel Street Elkridge MD 21075 District 1

From:

Jennifer Shea <jkshea2@gmail.com>

Sent:

Saturday, February 03, 2018 11:17 AM

To:

CouncilMail

Cc:

Kittleman, Allan; boe@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.org

Subject:

CB1 & CB2 Testimony

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely, Jennifer M. Shea 3124 Bunker Drive Ellicott City MD 21042 FOR DISTRICT ONE

From:

Brian Esker <bl_esker@yahoo.com>

Sent:

Saturday, February 03, 2018 11:14 AM

To:

CouncilMail; Kittleman, Allan; boe@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.org

Subject:

CB1 & CB2 Testimony

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, with amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county namely amendments 1, 4, 7, and 8.

I have specific concerns with the amendment that ties affordable housing to APFO. Affordable housing is necessary and so is adequate public facilities. The two are not, and should not, be pitted against one another. If the county allows for affordable housing projects to proceed without the required and adequate public facilities, we are doing an injustice to those that will be living in those homes and to the existing residents in those communities. Adding these exemptions is not in the best interest of those who need affordable housing, but rather in the best interest of developers to overbuild our county without regard to the quality of life.

My other concern is that redistricting was added to an amendment as an option to make an area open. We saw plainly last summer that the existing schools in this county, specifically in Elkridge, are not located where the development has gone on. Redistricting the current population of high school students to fill all the county high schools moved everyone west, often sending kids that were walking distance to their school to one much further west. It increased transportation costs, tore many communities apart, and just didn't make sense. Unlike the leadership of the past, I believe we have a Superintendent and Board of Education in place that have an eye to the future. I have a huge concern with legislation that allows development to mandate redistricting. Please be careful with that.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

Amendments 1, 4, 7, and 8 would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are

aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely,

Liz Esker 6021 Hosta Ct., Elkridge, MD District 1

From:

Ken Schaffer <kschaffer24@gmail.com>

Sent:

Saturday, February 03, 2018 11:07 AM

To:

CouncilMail

Subject:

CB1 & CB2 Testimony

Dear Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely,

Ken Schaffer 3109 Nestling Pine Ct Ellicott City MD 2142

From:

Angie Boyter <angie.boyter@gmail.com>

Sent:

Saturday, February 03, 2018 10:47 AM

To:

CouncilMail

Subject:

CB 1

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Angie & David Boyter

From:

Amy Kilrane <akilrane@gmail.com>

Sent:

Saturday, February 03, 2018 10:25 AM

To:

CouncilMail

Cc:

Kittleman, Allan; boe@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.org

Subject:

CB1 & CB2 Testimony

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely, Amy Kilrane 3606 Underoak Drive Ellicott City, MD 21042 FOR DISTRICT ONE RESIDENT

From:

Angie Boyce <aboyce@jhu.edu>

Sent:

Saturday, February 03, 2018 9:51 AM

To:

CouncilMail

Cc:

Kittleman, Allan; boe@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.org

Subject:

CB1 & CB2 Testimony

Dear Members of the Howard County Council,

Thanks to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests. These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

To preserve administrative legitimacy and credibility, CB1 should be passed as it was originally drafted to correct the technical timing error.

Sincerely,

Dr. Angie Boyce 6260 Audubon Dr, Columbia MD

From:

Kirsten Noble Zwarick <kirstennoble@hotmail.com>

Sent:

Saturday, February 03, 2018 9:39 AM

To:

CouncilMail

Cc:

Kittleman, Allan; boe@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.org

Subject:

CB1 & CB2 Testimony

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely,

Kirsten Zwarick 4046 Crescent Road Ellicott City, MD 21042 District 1

From:

Jennifer Meckes < Jennifer. Meckes@LongandFoster.com >

Sent:

Saturday, February 03, 2018 9:21 AM

To:

CouncilMail

Subject:

APFO Vote Testimony

Subject: APFO Vote

Dear County Council members,

I'll keep this brief. I'm not anti-development, housing growth is my very livelihood. That said, our schools and infrastructure deeply need a pause button in this county. I request that you keep your promises and uphold the votes you cast in December. That decision was right for the citizens then, it is the right decision now and it is the right decision for the future of Howard County.

Best regards,

Jennifer Meckes, Realtor Long & Foster - The Legal Team 10805 Hickory Ridge Road Columbia, MD 21044 Office: (410) 715-2748

Cell: (937) 829-8418 www.LegalHomes.com

"The Legal Team - #1 Real Estate Team for over 10 Years in the #1 Long & Foster Office in the Region"

From:

Nick Nichols <bertrekker@hotmail.com> Saturday, February 03, 2018 9:20 AM

Sent: To:

Kittleman, Allan; CouncilMail

Cc:

boe@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.gov

Subject:

Apfo! Testimony

CB1 & CB2 Testimony

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and vote!!

William Nichols 10387 Cavey In. Woodstock

From: Gina Desiderio Edmison <desiderio@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, February 03, 2018 8:47 AM

To: Weinstein, Jon; CouncilMail

Cc: BOE@hcpss.org; Kittleman, Allan; superintendent@hcpss.org

Subject: CB1 & CB2 Testimony

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely, Gina Desiderio Edmison District 1 Resident 4713 Roundhill Road Ellicott City, MD 21043

From:

no-reply@howardcountymd.gov

Sent:

Saturday, February 03, 2018 8:41 AM

To:

Joni.nuetzel@gmail.com

Subject:

CB1 & CB2

First Name:

Joni

Last Name:

Nuetzel

Email:

Joni.nuetzel@gmail.com

Street

3505 Font Hill Drive

Address:

Subject:

City:

Ellicott City CB1 & CB2

Members of the Howard County Council, Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further. The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development. I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8. These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management

Message:

functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county. I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests. These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO. With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required. APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees. Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote! Sincerely, Joni Nuetzel 3505 Font Hill Drive Ellicott City, MD 21042 District 1 - AND I VOTE!!!

From:

Tim & Deb Lattimer < lattimertp@gmail.com>

Sent:

Saturday, February 03, 2018 8:39 AM

To:

CouncilMail

Subject:

Oppose Amendment #3

Please be aware that we agree with Council member Jen Terrasa in OPPOSING AMENDMENT #3 to CB1. Instead, we agree that we should invest directly in affordable housing through our budget, incentivize the building of affordable housing in areas where we have the school capacity to accommodate additional students, and not continue to overcrowd schools in neighborhoods with higher concentrations of poverty or economic challenges.

We should also require affordable housing in all parts of the County, not just some, and stop letting developers out of these requirements by agreeing to build their affordable housing for them or allowing them to pay a minimal fee-in-lieu instead of building actual units.

This is common sense. Stop pitting affordable housing against adequate public facilities! Stop listening to developers instead of families in our community!

Thank you, Tim & Deb Lattimer 8452 Each Leaf Ct. Columbia, MD. 21045 443/546-0125

From:

Jessamine Duvall <jessamined@gmail.com>

Sent:

Saturday, February 03, 2018 8:23 AM

To:

CouncilMail

Cc:

Kittleman, Allan

Subject:

Testimony - CB1 and CB2

Dear Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely, Jessamine Duvall 6660 Dovecote Drive Columbia, MD 21044

Sent from my iPhone

From:

Lindsey Hendren <lsmeltz@gmail.com>

Sent:

Friday, February 02, 2018 9:45 PM

To:

CouncilMail

Cc:

Kittleman, Allan; boe@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.org

Subject:

CB1 & CB2 Testimony

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely, Lindsey Hendren Deborah Jean Dr Elkridge, MD District 1

From:

Jenn S <jennja4623@gmail.com>

Sent:

Friday, February 02, 2018 8:41 PM

To:

CouncilMail

Cc:

Kittleman, Allan; boe@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.org

Subject:

CB1 & CB2 Testimony

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely, Jennifer and Eric Sarlin 3016 Katherine Place Ellicott City, Md

From:

Melissa Kistler < melissa.kistler@me.com>

Sent:

Friday, February 02, 2018 8:25 PM

To:

CouncilMail

Cc:

Kittleman, Allan; boe@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.org

Subject:

CB1 and CB2 testimony

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely, Melissa Kistler

9417 Aston Villa Ellicott City, MD District 1 resident

From: Yunshan Ye <yunshanye@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, February 02, 2018 8:18 PM

To: CouncilMail

Cc: Kittleman, Allan; BOE@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.org

Subject: CB1 & CB2 Testimony

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely, Yunshan Ye, Resident at 4527 Rolling Meadows Ellicott City MD 21043

From: Michele Cavey <michelecavey@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, February 02, 2018 8:08 PM

To: CouncilMail

Cc: Kittleman, Allan; boe@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.org

Subject: CB1 & CB2 Testimony

Members of the Howard County Council, Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further. The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development. I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8. These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county. I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests. These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO. With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required. APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees. Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote! Sincerely, Michele Cavey 9038 Overhill Drive

Ellicott City, MD 21042 District 1 Resident

From:

Rachel Thomson < rachel.e.thomson@gmail.com>

Sent:

Friday, February 02, 2018 8:02 PM

To:

CouncilMail

Cc:

Kittleman, Allan; boe@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.org

Subject:

CB1 & CB2 Testimony

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely, Rachel Thomson 3033 Brookwood Road Ellicott City, MD 21042

From:

Wendy Williams-Abrams <wmrlz@hotmail.com>

Sent: Friday, February 02, 2018 7:48 PM

To: Kittleman, Allan; CouncilMail; boe@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.org

Subject: CB1 & CB62 Testimony

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely,
Wendy Williams-Abrams
3144 Saint Charles Place
Ellicott City, MD 21042
DISTRICT 1 RESIDENT AND VOTER!

Sent: Friday, February 02, 2018 7:04 PM

To: CouncilMail

Cc: Kittleman, Allan; boe@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.org

Subject: APFO CB1 & CB2

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely,
Brian Vivrette
Hunt Club Estates
FOR DISTRICT ONE

From: Jessica Hicks < jessica.hicks1@verizon.net>

Sent: Friday, February 02, 2018 7:00 PM

To: CouncilMail

Cc: Kittleman, Allan; boe@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.org

Subject: CB1 & CB2 Testimony

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was

promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely,

Jessica Hicks 7568 Merrymaker Way Elkridge MD 21075

From:

Scott Nuetzel <snuetzel1@gmail.com>

Sent:

Friday, February 02, 2018 6:52 PM

To:

CouncilMail

Cc:

Kittleman, Allan; boe@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.org

Subject:

CB1 & CB2

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely,

Scott Nuetzel 3505 Font Hill Drive Elliott City, MD 21042

DISTRICT 1~ AND I VOTE!

From: Joni Nuetzel <joni.nuetzel@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, February 02, 2018 6:38 PM

To: CouncilMail

Cc: Kittleman, Allan; boe@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.org

Subject: CB1 & CB2 Testimony

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely, Joni Nuetzel 3505 Font Hill Drive Ellicott City, MD 21042

District 1 - AND I VOTE!!!

From:

Joy Marsh < jnjmarsh@hotmail.com>

Sent:

Friday, February 02, 2018 6:25 PM

To:

councilmail@howardcountymd.gov

Cc:

Kittleman, Allan; boe@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.org

Subject:

CB1 & CB2 Testimony

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely, Joy Marsh 3129 Seneca Chief Trail Ellicott City MD 21042 Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

From: S. Fergie <ec21042@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 02, 2018 6:17 PM

To: CouncilMail

Cc: boe@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.org; Kittleman, Allan

Subject: CB1 & CB2 Testimony

Members of the Howard County Council, Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further. The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development. I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8. These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county. I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests. These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO. With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required. APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees. Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote! Sincerely, Sharon Ferguson 3922 Chatham Road, Ellicott City MD 21042 District 1 resident

From:

Patricia Williams <pwilliamsmd@verizon.net>

Sent:

Friday, February 02, 2018 6:16 PM

To:

CouncilMail

Cc:

Kittleman, Allan; boe@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.org

Subject:

APFO final vote

TO: councilmail@howardcountymd.gov

CC: akittleman@howardcountymd.gov, boe@hcpss.org, superintendent@hcpss.org

EMAIL TITLE: CB1 & CB2 Testimony

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely,

Patricia L. Williams 9834 Longview Drive Ellicott City, Md. 21042

From:

Dietrich Family < dietrich21@verizon.net>

Sent:

Friday, February 02, 2018 6:04 PM

To:

CouncilMail

Cc:

Kittleman, Allan; boe@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.org

Subject:

CB1 & CB2 Testimony

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely, Kurt Dietrich 3805 Paul Mill Rd., Ellicott City Council District 1

From:

Aurora Schmidt <auroraschmidt@gmail.com>

Sent:

Friday, February 02, 2018 5:39 PM

To:

CouncilMail

Cc:

Kittleman, Allan; boe@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.org

Subject:

CB1 & CB2 Testimony

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely, Aurora Schmidt Fulton, MD

From:

jyoutzgrams@gmail.com on behalf of Jennifer Y. Grams <jygrams@gmail.com>

Sent:

Friday, February 02, 2018 5:36 PM

To: Cc: CouncilMail Kittleman, Allan

Subject:

CB1 & CB2 Testimony

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

• I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3,
 I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely, Jennifer Youtz Grams 3050 Terra Maria Way, Ellicott City MD 21042 District 1

From:

Shari Orszula <shariorszula@comcast.net>

Sent:

Friday, February 02, 2018 5:23 PM

To:

CouncilMail

Cc:

Kittleman, Allan; boe@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.org

Subject:

CB1 & CB2 Testimony

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely, Shari Orszula 4033 Chatham Rd. Ellicott City, MD 21042 District 1 Resident

From: JENNIFER SPIEGEL < jenallenspiegel@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, February 02, 2018 4:54 PM

To: CouncilMail

Cc: Kittleman, Allan; boe@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.org

Subject: CB1 & CB2 Testimony

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely,

Jen Spiegel (12475 Triadelphia Road, Ellicott City, MD, 21042)

From:

Shannon Franks <shannonkayfranks@gmail.com>

Sent:

Friday, February 02, 2018 4:35 PM

To:

CouncilMail

Cc:

Kittleman, Allan; boe@hcpss.org; superintendent@hcpss.org

Subject:

CB1 & CB2 Testimony

Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you to Jen Terrasa, Dr. Calvin Ball, and Jon Weinstein for sponsoring CB1 as it was passed on November 6th, 2017. I am writing the council to urge the passing of CB1 as drafted, or with the addition of amendments to strengthen it further.

The County Council has publicly stated that the November 6th vote taken on CB61 was invalidated due to a technical issue with timing. The community understands that the voting process scheduled for February 5th, 2018 is a necessary step to correct this mistake. However, we do not see this as an opportunity to weaken a piece of legislation that, by design, is intended to provide equal standards of adequate public facilities to all current and future residents. APFO should not contain exemptions that would create loopholes for development.

I support any amendment that strengthens the infrastructure of our county. I support amendments 1, 4, 7, 8.

These amendments would require new residential development to be done in a thoughtful and well planned manner. We must continue the work for all students to have a seat inside their brick and mortar neighborhood schools, that we, as taxpayers, are funding. These amendments would also help ensure that our county's emergency management functions are able to meet the increased demand generated by new residents to the county.

I oppose any amendment or language that weakens the infrastructure of our county. I oppose amendments 2, 3, 6. I oppose any exemptions from the school tests.

These amendments would increase school capacity, delay implementation of the APFO high school test, and create exemptions that defeat the basic purpose of APFO.

With regard to Amendment 5: It appears to weaken the roads test, as amended in the original CB61. If that is the intention, then I do not support it. If this is purely a technical correction, further explanation is required.

APFO is the safety valve to ensure that the county's infrastructure is adequate to support growth. Citizens are expecting the passage of this bill as the technical correction that was promised by the Council in November 2017. As you are aware, our Howard County State Delegation is also awaiting the passage of CB1 so they can move forward on the companion legislation to address removing the buy-up provisions and increasing school surcharge fees.

Please do not lose sight of that as you deliberate and ultimately vote!

Sincerely,

Shannon Franks

7273 Calm Sunsest

From: Sent: John Startt <jstartt@jstbuilders.com> Friday, February 02, 2018 3:40 PM

To:

CouncilMail

Subject:

APFO Legislation

Councilmembers

As a resident ,taxpayer and voter in Howard County I am asking you to support Amendments 2,3,5 and 6 to CB1-2018 (APFO) and please decline your support and in fact vigorously reject Amendment1,4,7 and 8. I will be closely watching the proceeding on Monday evening and my support with my vote and my efforts will be for elected officials who take a reasoned positions and lead not those who respond to the loudest voices in the crowd whether they be inform and rational voices or just loud voices.

The current APFO has largely worked but it may need some minor tweaks and The Board of Education should be more responsible in managing the student populations. There are loud voices that are calling for the building of more and more school however 2/3 of the residents in Howard County no longer have children attending school. If we continue to build schools even when we have adequate seats in our schools it will surely have a very detrimental effect on our taxes in the future. This bill as is will set the County back rather than move it forward.

Sincerely
John S. Startt
11018 Gaither Farm Rd
Ellicott, MD 21042

From:

Paul Sill <paul@sillengineering.com>

Sent:

Friday, February 02, 2018 3:32 PM

To:

CouncilMail

Subject:

CB1-2018 (APFO)

Good Afternoon Council members,

I am a civil engineer and own and operate a small business in Howard County preparing development plans for my clients. I employ 7 people and have been in business for over 10 years. Most of my work is in Howard County. I was also born and raised in this County and have never lived further than a half hour from my childhood home on Triadelphia Road. I feel this bill could have a severe impact on my business, and on the livelihoods of my employees.

After reviewing the bill and the amendments, I strongly urge you to SUPPORT Amendments 2, 3, 5, and 6, and I strongly urge you to OPPOSE Amendments 1, 4, 7, and 8.

This issue is a huge one for the County, and if this bill is passed without amendment it will hurt not only myself and my employees (and others in my industry), but the County itself by removing future tax income, which in turn could hurt the very schools it is trying to help by limiting future funding for new schools.

Again, please SUPPORT Amendments 2, 3, 5, and 6, and OPPOSE Amendments 1, 4, 7, and 8. Thank you,

Paul M. Sill, PE, LEED AP Sill Engineering Group, LLC 11130 Dovedale Court, Suite 200 Marriottsville, MD 21104 Office: 443-325-5076 ext. 102

Fax: 410-696-2022 Cell: 443-878-4314

Website: www.sillengineering.com

A Please consider the environment before printing this email.

From:

sbreeden <sbreeden@sdcgroup.com>

Sent:

Friday, February 02, 2018 3:29 PM

To:

CouncilMail

Subject:

Cb1

All,

As you probably know, I oppose CB1. I think this is putting politics ahead of what is good for the county. I would prefer that you vote no on the bill.

I believe that the VAST majority of the voters in the county don't want a moratorium, which will raise their assessments and taxes. Furthermore this bill does nothing to fix the problem. What do you think will happen in 6 years when the projects start to get out of jail and still won't have any capacity? We will have an even worse problem than we have now..

As long as it is easier for the school board to ask for millions of dollars for new schools, rather than do its job to redistrict, they will keep asking. How can you let that continue?

As you all know, I have and will be here for the county for the long run. Unfortunately what I am afraid you are going to do will have negative effects.for a long time..Howard County is becoming Montgomery County, and that is not a complement..

I do appreciate the attempts at amendments 2 3 5 and 6 which help a bit.

Please do the right thing and don't be swayed by a few people who don't understand this issue nor how to really fix the problem..

If you got this far, thanks for reading this..

I honestly wants what's best for most people in the county, and don't believe this is.. Once we get a bad reputation this will cause, it will be difficult to get our good reputation back again. Apfo worked for 15 years, and would still be working if the school board does its job.

Steve Breeden

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

From:

Daniel Murtaugh < DMurtaugh@SandySpringBank.com>

Sent:

Friday, February 02, 2018 2:26 PM

To:

CouncilMail

Subject:

Please support amendments 2, 3, 5 and 6 to CB1-2018 (APFO), and please reject

amendments 1, 4, 7 and 8.

Councilmembers,

I live in Ellicott City. I am a registered voter and I consider this issue to be the most important issue currently facing the County. I will be watching the proceedings on Monday night, and my votes in June and November will support the elected officials who take reasoned positions and lead, not those who respond to the loudest voices in the crowd. We cannot afford to have an effective moratorium imposed on Howard County. Planned growth is essential to the continued sustainability of Howard County's government and economy.

Sincerely, Dan Murtaugh



CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail transmission may contain confidential or legally privileged information that is intended for the individual or entity named in the e-mail address. Use of such information by any intended recipient shall be limited to the purpose for which such information was sent. Unauthorized use, disclosure or copying is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you received this e-mail transmission in error, please reply to the sender and delete the message. Thank you.

This message was secured by **ZixCorp**(R).

From:

Stephanie Tuite <Stephanie@fcc-eng.com>

Sent:

Friday, February 02, 2018 11:21 AM

To: Subject: CouncilMail CB1 - APFO

Dear Council,

I have appeared at previous hearings and offered my suggestions and experiences related to APFO and the school system capacities. I strongly encourage, as I have in the past, the bill should be more in line with the suggestions reached by the APFO task force so I ask that you consider passing Amendments 2, 3, 5, and 6, which provide flexibility in regions where some schools might be higher in capacity and others are well under capacity. The reduced percentages for school capacity to the levels in the initial bill will result in shutting down most of the county for development, which will in turn reduce a lot of anticipated income from taxes and permit impact fees that will go toward the allocation to the Public Schools. I feel this is an undesirable consequence as should you. I have no feelings for or against amendment 1. Based on my above support of the mentioned amendments, I am not in support of Amendments 4, 7, and 8.

I appreciate your further thought into this matter and again I encourage the passing of Amendments 2, 3, 5, and 6.

Stephanie Tuite

From:

Sent:

Wednesday, January 31, 2018 10:32 AM

To:

frank.turner@house.state.md.us; shane.pendergrass@house.state.md.us; warren.miller@house.state.md.us; clarence.lam@house.state.md.us; Trent.Kittleman@house.state.md.us; terri.hill@house.state.md.us;

Bob.Flanagan@house.state.md.us; Vanessa.Atterbeary@house.state.md.us; edward.kasemeyer@senate.state.md.us; gail.bates@senate.state.md.us;

eric.ebersole@house.state.md.us; guy.guzzone@senate.state.md.us

Cc:

CouncilMail; Kittleman, Allan

Subject:

Protect taxpayer dollars. Charge developers market-based school surcharge fees

Attachments:

hoco_surcharge_fee_petition_comments.pdf; hoco_surcharge_fee_petition_signatures.pdf

Greetings,

Over the past week, a petition was circulated through email and social media that asks the Howard County State Delegation to enable the county to charge market-rate school surcharge fees.

You may find the petition below:

https://www.change.org/p/howard-county-state-delegation-protect-taxpayer-dollars-charge-developers-market-basedschool-surcharge-

fees?recruiter=851318444&utm_source=share_petition&utm_medium=copylink&utm_campaign=share_petition&utm_ term=share petition

This stems from a simple observation comparing the average surcharge fee of \$5,138 as calculated by the County to the cost of building a new school - Hanover Hills cost \$57,000 per student. This is simply unsustainable and not fair to the County.

Residents agree and within one week, this petition has gathered over 750 signatures. It will continue to be active. Please consider the signatures as well as the comments left by the residents as you deliberate the proposal today.

Thank you.

change.org

Recipient:

Howard County State Delegation, councilmail@howardcountymd.gov, akittleman@howardcountymd.gov, frank.turner@house.state.md.us, shane.pendergrass@house.state.md.us, warren.miller@house.state.md....

Letter:

Greetings,

Protect taxpayer dollars. Charge developers market-based school surcharge fees.

Comments

Name	Location	Date	Comment
Wendy Williams-Abrams	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-23	Developers need to pay for the schools that are needed to support the new homes they're building. Each new student is costing the HoCo taxpayers tens of thousands of dollars.
Heather R Williams	Bethany Beach, DE	2018-01-23	I'm a retired MD teacher who has four grandsons going to Howard Co. schools. I'm appalled that this wealthy county hasn't maintained its prestigious reputation, the reputation it had when my daughter went to Hammond High. There is no excuse for Howard County's deterioration except the greed of developers. SHAME!
Elaine Morrison	Jessup, MD	2018-01-23	I am new to this but do I understand that thus far developers in Howard county have not had to pay a fee to support the schools? That would make no sense if they where able to build and walk away without some sort of fee paid to schools.
Karina Fisher	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-23	Our county cannot keep up with the booming student population by continuing to rely on portables We have 224 of them in our county that over 6,000 kids are educated in everyday. Our school conditions are declining, our teachers are eating and teaching out in what was supposed to be dedicated closet space, we have kids being denied water and bathroom breaks because there is no staff to escort them from the portables to the school and back, kids are sitting on the floor of the buses because there are not enough seats. We have have High Schools in the Eastern part of the county that the population has reached 140%. Our school projections actually show 200% capacity within several years. Howard County schools are what people move here for and pay extremely high taxes for. Our schools are a major selling point for businesses who seek a place to settle into. They are key to Howard County's economic infrastructure and they are declining!!!! We need a high school in the east yesterday since if it opened it
Susan Garber	Laurel, MD	2018-01-23	It is not a sustainable practice to charge developers only about 10% of what it actually costs to provide classrooms, roads, and services for new residents. To do so is like following the economic advice of the unsuccessful appliance store owner who sells each washing machines for \$40 less than he buys them for but thinks he'll make up the difference on volume. We can't "build our way" out of this deficit.
Drew Roth	Elkridge, MD	2018-01-24	I'm signing because my kid has no high school.
Lara Brown	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24	Developers need to pay for the crowding in schools & roads! We need less overcrowded schools! Portables have no bathrooms & force children outside in all kinds of bad weather!
Nhung Na	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24	Developers need to pay their share to support the schools, roads, and other facilities that suffer from new developments. Stop the greed and pay up!
Chao Wu	Clarksville, MD	2018-01-24	Totally agree

Name	Location	Date	Comment
Niki Mcguigan	Hanover, MD	2018-01-24	Our APFO laws are outdated and need to catch up with the times! Our schools need relief and HCPSS needs miney to build more schools.
John David Smith	Columbia, MD	2018-01-24	Requiring students to be taught in trailers should cost the people responsible (developers and their enablers in the county government) something.
Guohui Wang	Laurel, MD	2018-01-24	Н
Cherrie Webb	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24	Hoco needs to feel the haste to get APFO stronger and protect our schools. The prior amendments and guidance from special task forces to guide change in the recent past for APFO is not enough AT ALL. Real change is needed and it was needed several years ago.
Nancy Barker	Brookeville, MD	2018-01-24	Children come FIRST - NOT DEVELOPERS or HOUSING TRACTS. Howard needs Schools, roads and all the other infrastructure necessary. Builders are only thinking about how they can line their own pockets!#
Christina Morest	Laurel, MD	2018-01-24	Stop by any school and count the number of trailers used as classrooms.
Lisa Loveless	Laurel, MD	2018-01-24	We need to have the ability to increase fees to developers who for far too long have been paying low fees. We need to be able to pay for schools, roads and other infrastructure, before they become inadequate, we have not been able to keep up.
Kim Nagy	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24	Measures need to be taken to protect our overcrowded schools.
Sara Arditti	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24	I want the Howard County citizen taxpayers to stop subsidizing developer profits!
Susan Tsu-Thai	Elkridge, MD	2018-01-24	Developers should pay a fee per unit that is proportional to Howard County property tax. As the property tax increases, so should the developer fee.
Allison Page	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24	You need to take a break from giving the developers what they want, County Executives. Your people living here now are suffering in insufficient capacity schools and your most current redistricting is just a bandaid Fix the long term problem now.
Katie Schneider	Laurel, MD	2018-01-24	Please stop putting the developers ahead of our children.
Caroline Bodziak	Ellicott City, US	2018-01-24	We need the developers responsible for bringing in additional population to pay their fair share of the public facilities, esp. schools, needed to support that increased population.
Tara Scully	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24	Please give us responsible growth and make the developers pay to play in Howard County.
Amy Zwally	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24	Come on guys! This is a no brainer!
John mccahill	washington, DC	2018-01-24	This is a double no-brainer.

Name	Location	Date	Comment
Karen Breeden	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24	I've lived this growth explosion over the last several decades. The developers have been in control and now the county is showing the results. Why must the kids in Howard County have to suffer with substandard buildings because the developers paid off the county? This MUST be changed!!!
Vladimir Talanov	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24	Many county schools are overcrowded.
Elizabeth Walsh	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24	Our kids' education and safety must come before Developer profit. Doubling or even tripling the current schools surcharge still won't bring our rates in line with other counties' or pay for our current or projected needs. Developers should not be permitted to "buy in" to closed schools.
joan corcoran	Catonsville, MD	2018-01-24	I agree with the need.
Peter Pavlov	columbia, MD	2018-01-24	We need to stop the uncontrolled development and focus on preserving and improving our parks and wilderness areas.
Jim Reynolds	Elkridge, MD	2018-01-25	Howard County Government is potentially corrupt.
Jim Reynolds	Elkridge, MD	2018-01-25	It is unbelievable we are even in this situation.
Francesca Galbani	Sykesville, Italy	2018-01-25	This should not even be an issue: developers are getting rich, and our infrastructure - schools, roads - are paying the price.
Courtney Skinner	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-25	My children deserve to have enough resources in their schools to learn
Ruth Lyons	Highland, MD	2018-01-25	Developers need to help build the infrastructure necessitated by their "progress". Schools are part of that infrastructure that needs funded by them. Why does the council let them keep developing at the expense of the rest of us taxpaying property owners?
Christine McGrath	Elkridge, US	2018-01-25	We need stricter APFO laws! They are outdated and favor the developers. We can not keep growing at this rate.
Diane Butler	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-25	Howard County is woefully behind in developer impact fees and it has put us at a disadvantage in keeping up with school construction, proper planning, and school site acquisition.
Ajay Yadava	Bethesda, US	2018-01-25	Our APFO laws are outdated and need to catch up with the times! Our schools need relief and HCPSS needs money to build more schools. APFO should not allow new builders to build houses in the communities where there is an existing problem of overcrowding of government facilities. APFO should charge the developer to contribute a fair share of enhancement and enlargement to increase the public facilities/ systems that will be affected by their incoming/ growth.
Kathryn Held	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-25	More development = more residents = more kids = need for more schools. Those responsible for the development need to bear a large part of the cost for the 7new schools.

Name	Location	Date	Comment
Dawn Popp	Elkridge, MD	2018-01-25	Developers benefit from our excellent schools in the form of higher selling prices for their properties. It's time they pay their fair share.
Meaza Hagos	Odenton, MD	2018-01-26	Our children deserve a quality education!
Irene B	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-26	Stop just favouring the developers and work for the entire community! The families, children and community make is so developers want to come here. Please do the right and just thing!
beth webb	Columbia, MD	2018-01-27	All of our students deserve a seat INSIDE of a school which can only be accomplished if capacity is added simultaneously to housing development.
Cathy Nagle	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-27	Howard County is far behind in developer impact fees, especially compared to neighboring counties, and it has put us at a disadvantage in keeping up with school construction, proper planning, and school site acquisition. As the fastest growing county in Maryland, it is well past time for developers to pay adequate fees to support Howard County's infrastructure, especially our schools.
Barbara Krupiarz	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-27	I have an 8th grader going to Howard High next year. The Jump Start program barely made a dent in the huge overcrowding of that school. We moved to Howard County for the schools, but now I worry that my son will not get an equitable education.
Judith Schardt	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-27	Let's make the money grubbing builders responsible for money needed alleviate increased school overcrowding.
Beth Stolte	Columbia, MD	2018-01-27	The quality of education goes down as overcrowding increases. My oldest will start high school in 2022, the earliest year possible for a new HS to open and alleviate dangerous overcrowding. Howard County is in this position because of old AFPO laws that allowed housing to be built in already overcrowded neighborhoods. The updated APFO will put stricter school capacity rules on new housing.
Sarah Cheng	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-27	Howard County schools need relief!
Tanya Eusebe	Laurel, US	2018-01-28	We need to stop putting developer's interests over our kids!
Marvin Redd	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-28	Because everyone losses with overcrowded schools-the students and the taxpayers!
Marcia Morales	Jessup, MD	2018-01-29	We are failing our kids!!! 20-30 kids per class - that is insane!!! How can teachers effectively teach and make sure that those with special needs are getting the help & support they need!!!
Jocelyn Casto	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-29	School seats are not keeping pace with development!
Douglas Kornreich	Hanover, MD	2018-01-29	To keep up with the pace of development, the developers need to pay the additional costs placed on the county by their development.
Flora Yang	Arlington, VA	2018-01-29	We should put our kids' interests over developer's!

Name	Location	Date	Comment
Janet Saunders	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-29	The roads are overwhelmed by the amount of cars traveling our county. On my 2 lane road, if I 70 gets an accident in the morning, it takes forever to get out of my driveway.
Rosa Lee Leith	Berlin, MD	2018-01-29	I lived in Howard County for almost 40 years, raised my children there, and know the frustrations of my friends and neighbors. This is so important! Please sign!
Dina Cooke	West Friendship, MD	2018-01-29	End massive development without consideration for infrastructure.
Genevieve McCardell	Columbia, MD	2018-01-30	I have lived in Columbia since 1971 and the growth in the eastern part of the county is unsustainable. Please make these developers pay!!
Karen Bradley Ehler	Columbia, MD	2018-01-30	We cannot let corporations and builders take advantage of us. We need money for new schools and improvement/expansion of current schools. We are way behind and need to catch up with current times and practices and market rates.
Susan Kunkel	Woodstock, ME	2018-01-30	The county must stop subsidizing developers. Everyone suffers when we allow overcrowding to continue, especially our children.
Scott Garland	Arlington, VA	2018-01-30	Scott Garland
Kirsten zwarick	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-31	APFO is outdated. Redistricting is not the solution to overcrowding in our schools.
H. Wolfgang Hohenner	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-31	I think that the developers are sidestepping their responsibility for the growth that they cause. Their only interest is in maximizing their profits, and they do not care whether our schools are overcrowded by their development. The taxpayers are left holding the bag to pay for the additional schools and roads.

change.org

Recipient:

Howard County State Delegation, councilmail@howardcountymd.gov , akittleman@howardcountymd.gov , frank.turner@house.state.md.us , shane.pendergrass@house.state.md.us , warren.miller@house.state.md....

Letter:

Greetings,

Protect taxpayer dollars. Charge developers market-based school surcharge fees.

Signatures

Name	Location	Date
APFO Reform	Columbia, MD	2018-01-22
Wendy Williams-Abrams	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-23
Ginger Burcham	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-23
Lisa Balighian	Columbia, MD	2018-01-23
Karen Aaby	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-23
Heather R Williams	Bethany Beach, DE	2018-01-23
Jen Giro	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-23
Jennifer Flury	Alabama	2018-01-23
Hiruy Hadgu	Alabama	2018-01-23
David George	Laurel, MD	2018-01-23
Judy Fisher George	Laurel, MD	2018-01-23
Louis Toler	Palm Desert, CA	2018-01-23
Geofrrey Pickett	Glen Burnie, MD	2018-01-23
Jennifer Spiegel	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-23
Susan Imbach	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-23
Sondra Hess	baltimore, MD	2018-01-23
Patricia Barget	Fawn Grove, PA	2018-01-23
NEil Doran	Laurel, MD	2018-01-23
Telicia Perry	Colesville, MD	2018-01-23
Liz Esker	Elkridge, MD	2018-01-23

Name	Location	Date
Rebecca Vivrette	Elkridge, MD	2018-01-23
Kristin Sherwood	Alabama	2018-01-23
Meg Ricks	Elkridge, MD	2018-01-23
Michele Cavey	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-23
Kimberly Worley	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-23
Ken McKirahan	Laurel, MD	2018-01-23
Elaine Morrison	Jessup, MD	2018-01-23
Khaleda Hasan	Laurel, US	2018-01-23
Debbi Lieman	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-23
Traci Barnhart	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-23
Amy Gomez	Alabama	2018-01-23
Megan Greco	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-23
Brian Vivrette	Elkridge, MD	2018-01-23
Leila Scott	columbia, MD	2018-01-23
Michelle Markow	Columbia, MD	2018-01-23
Sameer Ahirrao	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-23
Kelly Hall	Columbia, MD	2018-01-23
Lorri Raney	Odenton, MD	2018-01-23
Sarah Wheedleton	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-23
sang paik	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-23
Karina Fisher	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-23
Russell Roder	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-23

Name	Location	Date
Sarah Strong	Alabama	2018-01-23
Michelle Gomez	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-23
Jessica Hicks	Elkridge, MD	2018-01-23
Jennifer Grams	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-23
sarah Roogow	Hanover, MD	2018-01-23
Susan Garber	Laurel, MD	2018-01-23
Lucia Moore	US	2018-01-23
Rohini Gupta	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-23
Vick Dias	Elkridge, MD	2018-01-23
Rosanna Gambo	Elkridge, MD	2018-01-23
Mirentxu Lorimer	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-23
Vicky Cutroneo	Woodbine, MD	2018-01-23
Keefe Hogan	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-23
Amy Kilrane	Ellicott City, US	2018-01-23
Lauren Palguta	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-23
Beverly Poole	Leland, NC	2018-01-23
Lisa Markovitz	Alabama	2018-01-23
Melissa Metz	Alabama	2018-01-23
Randy Murbach	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-23
Drew Roth	Elkridge, MD	2018-01-23
Nicholas Craft	Manassas, MD	2018-01-24
Chris Dalton	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24

Name	Location	Date
Deb Maggio	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Lisa Link	Columbia, MD	2018-01-24
Cassie Fennern	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Elena Lewis	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Judith Johnson	Alabama	2018-01-24
Sara Britt	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Brendan Conway	Elkridge, MD	2018-01-24
Lara Brown	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Nhung Na	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Annie Sills	Millersville, MD	2018-01-24
Linda Shafran	Oak Park, IL	2018-01-24
Nancy Rowe	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Daniel Roman	Jessup, MD	2018-01-24
Chao Wu	Clarksville, MD	2018-01-24
Vanessa Lincoln	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Xia Chen	Clarksville, MD	2018-01-24
Simon Liu	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Premal Bhardwaj	Columbia, MD	2018-01-24
Heather Sites	Ellicott City, US	2018-01-24
Niki Mcguigan	Hanover, MD	2018-01-24
R Cavey	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Lisa Harbaugh	Clarksville, MD	2018-01-24

Name	Location	Date
Nancy Link	Myrtle Beach, SC	2018-01-24
Gina Edmison	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Anne Brown	Columbia, MD	2018-01-24
Judy Zhang	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Nellie Zamborsky	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
John David Smith	Columbia, MD	2018-01-24
Guohui Wang	Laurel, MD	2018-01-24
Anne Marie Madairy	Elkridge, MD	2018-01-24
Stef Hendershot	Pasadena, MD	2018-01-24
Beth Magen	Columbia, MD	2018-01-24
sachin khed	Columbia, MD	2018-01-24
Athena Fischer	Columbia, MD	2018-01-24
Kimberly Keating	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Sarah Bayne	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Kelly Caponera	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Lindsey Hendren	Elkridge, MD	2018-01-24
Christine Gorschboth	Elkridge, MD	2018-01-24
Jessie Ryan	Baltimore, MD	2018-01-24
Jiuhua Chen	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
joanne saukas	Columbia, MD	2018-01-24
Yujie Wang	Columbia, MD	2018-01-24
Melissa Helicke	Columbia, MD	2018-01-24

Name	Location	Date
Sherri Ross	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
zhiwen Yang	Clarksville, MD	2018-01-24
Ines Douglass	Elkridge, MD	2018-01-24
Cherrie Webb	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Lauren Giles	Laurel, MD	2018-01-24
David Langlois	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Amy Grutzik	Crownsville, MD	2018-01-24
Elizabeth Mahler Noll	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Robyn Thompson	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Gang Li	Columbia, MD	2018-01-24
Regina Wilkerson	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Patricia Barron	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Royden Hutchison	Columbia, MD	2018-01-24
hongwu Shen	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Alice Lee	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Joanne Gales	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Noreen Naroo-Pucci	Elkridge, MD	2018-01-24
Alexa Chestnut	Columbia, MD	2018-01-24
Yan Wang	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
jerry jiang	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Bin Tan	Ellicott city, MD	2018-01-24
Hetal Thukral	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24

Name	Location	Date
Marci Isaacs	Laurel, MD	2018-01-24
Hills Marchele	Glenwood, MD	2018-01-24
Azizuddin Mir	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Nancy Barker	Brookeville, MD	2018-01-24
Mary Wagner	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Christina Morest	Laurel, MD	2018-01-24
Joanne Heckman	Columbia, MD	2018-01-24
Shijun Huang	Clarksville, MD	2018-01-24
Aracelli Flores	Elkridge, MD	2018-01-24
BONNIE BRICKER	Elkridge, MD	2018-01-24
Stephanie Kehres	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Faith Keller	Columbia, MD	2018-01-24
Jill Porter	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Maureen Belgen	Elkridge, MD	2018-01-24
Ann Blank	Alabama	2018-01-24
Katherine Brandenburg	Elkridge, MD	2018-01-24
Amanda Brooks	Severn, MD	2018-01-24
Inga Colley	Elkridge, MD	2018-01-24
Damus Almoza	Laurel, MD	2018-01-24
Amanda Liberman	Ellicott city, MD	2018-01-24
Susan Defibaugh	Alabama	2018-01-24
Carolyn Pilcher	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24

Name	Location	Date
Cathy Cross	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Xinlian Chen	Clarksville, MD	2018-01-24
Reema Dunn	Elkridge, MD	2018-01-24
Shenshen Jin	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Rachel Thomson	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Saif Rehman	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Lisa Loveless	Laurel, MD	2018-01-24
Jeffrey Colley	Elkridge, MD	2018-01-24
Kim Nagy	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Harry Guo	Clarksville, MD	2018-01-24
Shijun Zhu	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Kristin Pichon	Elkridge, MD	2018-01-24
Sara Arditti	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Jeannie-Marie Leoutsakos	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Steven Kain	Columbia, MD	2018-01-24
Laura Crandon	Clarksville, MD	2018-01-24
Susan Tsu-Thai	Elkridge, MD	2018-01-24
Joanne Frey	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Mary Barton	Columbia, MD	2018-01-24
Jun Gui jun	Catonsville, MD	2018-01-24
Adrienne Ivory	Severna Park, MD	2018-01-24
Shana Bynon	Columbia, MD	2018-01-24

Name	Location	Date
Nancy Corazzi	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Susan Rosenquist	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Paul Muma	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Shoshana Hutchinson	Silver Spring, MD	2018-01-24
Liz Kato	Reisterstown, MD	2018-01-24
Ginna Rodriguez	Maryland	2018-01-24
Allison Page	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Allison Anderson	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Tammy Maben	Elkridge, MD	2018-01-24
Tracy McEvoy	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
cathy stogel	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Anita Davis	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Pamela Beer	Columbia, MD	2018-01-24
Kate Callahan	Columbia, MD	2018-01-24
Kendra Reinmann	Alabama	2018-01-24
Katie S	Laurel, MD	2018-01-24
Amy Rigney	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Terri Marcus	Elkridge, MD	2018-01-24
jackie crizer	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Pamela Rayne	Alabama	2018-01-24
Casey Shoemaker	Alabama	2018-01-24
Jennifer Kincaid	Olney, MD	2018-01-24

Name	Location	Date
John Mondy	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Carol Christens-Barry	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
christine brady	springfield, MA	2018-01-24
Marilyn Gardner	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Michele Shrum	Laurel, MD	2018-01-24
Joy Emery	Elkridge, MD	2018-01-24
Ken Berlack	Columbia, MD	2018-01-24
J Lu	Baltimore, MD	2018-01-24
Patricia Molen Van Ee	Columbia, MD	2018-01-24
Carole Liberman	Columbia, MD	2018-01-24
Caroline Bodziak	Ellicott City, US	2018-01-24
Michael Servedio	Silver Spring, MD	2018-01-24
Seth Carlson	Cockeysville, MD	2018-01-24
Sally Marshall	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Andrea Bento	Columbia, MD	2018-01-24
Matt Moore	Baltimore, MD	2018-01-24
Vanessa Zawodny	Towson, MD	2018-01-24
Ramesh Gopalakrishna	Ellicott city, MD	2018-01-24
Adeline A	Elkridge, MD	2018-01-24
Paul Halvorsen	Odenton, MD	2018-01-24
Patricia Hersey	Columbia, MD	2018-01-24
Tejas Doshi	Reisterstown, MD	2018-01-24

Name	Location	Date
Melissa Kistler	Baltimore, MD	2018-01-24
Stephanie Shane	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Evan Armour	Smarr, GA	2018-01-24
Brad Slater	Columbia, MD	2018-01-24
Sarah Elwell	Baltimore, MD	2018-01-24
John Speicher	Alabama	2018-01-24
Carsten Vala	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Matthew Katenkamp	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Adam Weber	Hood River, OR	2018-01-24
Anita Greenstone	Olney, MD	2018-01-24
Satish Potluri	Hyattsville, MD	2018-01-24
Charity Hildebrand	Sykesville, MD	2018-01-24
Jeanna Thomas	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Jacqueline Leach	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Tara Scully	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Paul Collins	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Shari Orszula	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
William Hutchinson	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Pam DeSantis	Woodbine, MD	2018-01-24
Marilyn Rottier	Fort Lauderdale, FL	2018-01-24
Daniel Diep	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Melinda Roch	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24

Name	Location	Date
Joanne Donohue	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Amy Zwally	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Becca Niburg	Laurel, MD	2018-01-24
Harry Norris	Alabama	2018-01-24
Kirsten zwarick	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
John mccahill	washington, DC	2018-01-24
Deval Bhardwaj	Columbia, MD	2018-01-24
Laura Sullivan	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Jill Christ	Alabama	2018-01-24
Kuplan Thuraisamy	Washington, DC	2018-01-24
Vlad Patrangenaru	Hyattsville, MD	2018-01-24
Lara Philippi - Khleif	Clarksville, MD	2018-01-24
Diana Oram	Silver Spring, MD	2018-01-24
Emily Rice	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Karen Breeden	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Kelly Breeden	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Vladimir Talanov	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Lu H	Laurel, MD	2018-01-24
Wookeun Jeong	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Yuji Zhang	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Elizabeth Walsh	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Priscilla Philippi	Columbia, MD	2018-01-24

Name	Location	Date
Kevin Howard	New Albany, OH	2018-01-24
Aurora Schmidt	Laurel, MD	2018-01-24
Keith B	Saint Paul, MN	2018-01-24
Rebecca Morris	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Jodi Cosgrove	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Jill Rauss	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Daniel Edwards	Columbia, MD	2018-01-24
Barbara Giannini	Elkridge, US	2018-01-24
John Rayne	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Joan Nuetzel	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Kay K Hartleb	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
B Gonzalez	Clarksville, MD	2018-01-24
China Williams	Catonsville, MD	2018-01-24
Sun Kim	Laurel, MD	2018-01-24
Zoya Philippi	Clarksville, MD	2018-01-24
Carolina Dignan	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Christy Emanuel	Alabama	2018-01-24
Christine McComas	Woodbine, MD	2018-01-24
Stephanie Carr	Washington, DC	2018-01-24
Cristen Noemer	Ellicott city, MD	2018-01-24
Lada Onyshkevych	Columbia, MD	2018-01-24
Shawn Vollmerhausen	Silver Spring, MD	2018-01-24

Name	Location	Date
Jennifer Feeney	Alabama	2018-01-24
Amy Smith	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Stacy Pomeroy	Laurel, MD	2018-01-24
willliam nichols	ellicott city, U.S. Virgin Islands	2018-01-24
Danelle De Graw	Millersville, MD	2018-01-24
Joel Hurewitz	Columbia, MD	2018-01-24
Judith Birnbaum	Elkridge, MD	2018-01-24
Merrillyn Hill	Alabama	2018-01-24
Christie Speich	Jessup, MD	2018-01-24
Haiou Qu	Silver Spring, MD	2018-01-24
Dong Zhao	Columbia, US	2018-01-24
Laura Jones DiCarlo	Jessup, MD	2018-01-24
joan corcoran	Catonsville, MD	2018-01-24
Peter Pavlov	columbia, MD	2018-01-24
Mariah Miano	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Wen Huang	Clarksville, MD	2018-01-24
Jessica Lifson	Reisterstown, MD	2018-01-24
Patrick Kearney	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Katie Cervi	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Laura wisely	Laurel, MD	2018-01-24
Lauren Polon	Alabama	2018-01-24
Melissa Whipkey	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24

Name	Location	Date
jennifer cavey	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Jennie Doumaux	Laurel, MD	2018-01-24
Erin Snodgrass	Deale, MD	2018-01-24
Michelle Wood	Columbia, MD	2018-01-24
Susan Gorel	Jessup, MD	2018-01-24
Melissa Mannion	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Paul Markovitz	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-24
Natalie Cybyk	Columbia, MD	2018-01-25
Katherine Rose	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-25
Habtom Tekle	Laurel, MD	2018-01-25
Sharae McLaurin	Elkridge, MD	2018-01-25
Seth Bloom	Laurel, MD	2018-01-25
Ritu Mathur	Hanover, MD	2018-01-25
SHASHANK PATEL	BALTIMORE, MD	2018-01-25
Mary Ferma	Maryland	2018-01-25
Kathy Boyer-Shick	Elkridge, MD	2018-01-25
Megan Tiralla	Elkridge, MD	2018-01-25
Richard Baker	Reisterstown, MD	2018-01-25
Shannon Franks	Odenton, MD	2018-01-25
Tracie O'Connell	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-25
Jim Reynolds	Elkridge, MD	2018-01-25
Kevin Callaghan	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-25

Name	Location	Date
Michelle Magee	Alabama	2018-01-25
Denee Barr	Columbia, MD	2018-01-25
John Baker	Columbia, MD	2018-01-25
Mary Leonard	Laurel, MD	2018-01-25
Julie Wong	US	2018-01-25
Fahad Zaman	US	2018-01-25
carlos jesus	US	2018-01-25
Gade Christopher	US	2018-01-25
Francesca Galbani	Sykesville, Italy	2018-01-25
Gail Williams-Brown	US	2018-01-25
Steven Burns	US	2018-01-25
Joshua Meyers	US	2018-01-25
Tammy Spengler	Columbia, MD	2018-01-25
Elizabeth Teachey	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-25
Linda Senula	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-25
Courtney Skinner	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-25
Stacy Valentine	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-25
Linda Boit	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-25
Kathleen Martin	Elkridge, MD	2018-01-25
Chris Pereira	Silver Spring, MD	2018-01-25
Emily Quinn	Elkridge, MD	2018-01-25
Katrina Vala	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-25

Name	Location	Date
Timothy Prestel	Laurel, MD	2018-01-25
Stenia Reid-Hall	Cape Coral, FL	2018-01-25
Katie Kashkett	Columbia, MD	2018-01-25
Kerry Mannion	Leonardtown, MD	2018-01-25
Daniel Duesterhaus	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-25
Ruth Lyons	Highland, MD	2018-01-25
Lorna Browne	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-25
Tina Bowers	Clarksville, MD	2018-01-25
Richard Kohn	Columbia, MD	2018-01-25
Sharon McDowell	Columbia, MD	2018-01-25
Mary Mauser	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-25
Kathy Schappell	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-25
Linda Carmody	Elkridge, MD	2018-01-25
jopi Shen	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-25
Holly Schluederberg	Alabama	2018-01-25
Shannon Adler	Elkridge, MD	2018-01-25
Helen Rabush	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-25
Christopher Seybolt	Alabama	2018-01-25
Alex Fernandez	US	2018-01-25
Ellen Consoli	Laurel, MD	2018-01-25
Sara Flannery	US	2018-01-25
Jen Perry	Alabama	2018-01-25

Name	Location	Date
Marya Rud	US	2018-01-25
David Johnson	US	2018-01-25
Linda Price	US	2018-01-25
Ebony Harris	US	2018-01-25
Thomas Farrar	US	2018-01-25
Bryan Monroe	US	2018-01-25
JAMAL Zumot	US	2018-01-25
Andrew Bouton	US	2018-01-25
Prabhu Chan	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-25
George Bennett	Hampton, VA	2018-01-25
Tawana Smith	US	2018-01-25
Christine McGrath	Baltimore, MD	2018-01-25
Diane Butler	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-25
navjot sidhu	Columbia, MD	2018-01-25
Ellen Long	Charleston, SC	2018-01-25
Meagan Braganca	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-25
Amanda Beal	Alabama	2018-01-25
William Hong	Alabama	2018-01-25
Pamela Hess	US	2018-01-25
Yi Zhang	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-25
Kristen Legge	Elkridge, MD	2018-01-25
Qiong Zhong	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-25

Name	Location	Date
Theresa Berger	US	2018-01-25
Ruth Mause	US	2018-01-25
William McNeill	Alabama	2018-01-25
Shawn Storms	Baltimore, US	2018-01-25
Dimple Gill	Alabama	2018-01-25
Teresa Faulhaber	US	2018-01-25
Carmen Hidalgo	Columbia, MD	2018-01-25
Kathleen Pukacz	Baltimore, MD	2018-01-25
Ajay Yadava	Bethesda, US	2018-01-25
Wendy Vlissides	Great Falls, VA	2018-01-25
Ann Coren	Columbia, MD	2018-01-25
Brian Jaszczak	Hicksville, NY	2018-01-25
Michael Teitelbaum	Severna Park, MD	2018-01-25
Jolene Mosley	Columbia, MD	2018-01-25
Julia You	Alabama	2018-01-25
Kathryn Held	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-25
Kristy Mumma	Washington, DC	2018-01-25
Deborah Markowitz	Alabama	2018-01-25
Amber Butler	US	2018-01-25
Kristine Freund	US	2018-01-25
Karen Seal	Falls Church, MD	2018-01-25
Carolyn Weibel	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-25

Name	Location	Date
Kim Neschis	Alabama	2018-01-25
M Bren	Silver Spring, MD	2018-01-25
Kyle Easton	Baltimore, MD	2018-01-25
Shipra Sachdeva	Pasadena, MD	2018-01-25
donna asher	US	2018-01-25
Carolyn Houston	Alabama	2018-01-25
Dawn Popp	Elkridge, MD	2018-01-25
Iris Ritter	Sykesville, MD	2018-01-25
Indralal Jay	Gaithersburg, MD	2018-01-25
Eric Miller	Columbia, MD	2018-01-25
Natalie Kelly	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-25
Carmen pfeifer	ellicott city, MD	2018-01-25
Denise Gustafson	Columbia, MD	2018-01-25
Lisa Dolezel	Laurel, MD	2018-01-25
Chhinder Sodhi	Columbia, MD	2018-01-25
Gerald Neumaier	Washington, MD	2018-01-25
Mary McClymonds	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-25
anne mav	Oakland, CA	2018-01-25
Cynthia Caplin	Columbia, MD	2018-01-25
Venkat N	Columbia, MD	2018-01-25
xinning yang	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-25
Melissa Boley	Alabama	2018-01-25

Name	Location	Date
arun fernandez	Elkridge, MD	2018-01-26
Wendy Heger	Laurel, MD	2018-01-26
Renu P	Elkridge, MD	2018-01-26
Jermaine Wilson	Elkridge, MD	2018-01-26
Amol Potdar	Cary, MD	2018-01-26
Kristie Sochacki	West River, MD	2018-01-26
Nidhin Jacob	Alabama	2018-01-26
Sherry Bialecki	US	2018-01-26
Carlo Kurz	Massapequa, NY	2018-01-26
Adam Kaminski	US	2018-01-26
Jason Schiller	Laurel, MD	2018-01-26
Dave Polonsky	Elkridge, MD	2018-01-26
Kaitlyn Stewart	Savage, MD	2018-01-26
soon park	Clarksville, MD	2018-01-26
Laura Bauman	Elkridge, MD	2018-01-26
Andrew Hill	Jessup, MD	2018-01-26
Vidhya Prasad	Hanover, MD	2018-01-26
Jeff Johnston	Laurel, MD	2018-01-26
Karen Shimer	Alabama	2018-01-26
Steve Brandenburg	Elkridge, MD	2018-01-26
Sirina Sucklal	Laurel, MD	2018-01-26
John Garber	Laurel, MD	2018-01-26

Name	Location	Date
Anna Nemirovsky	Ellicott city, MD	2018-01-26
Nancy M. Foltz	US	2018-01-26
Alberto Diaz	Alabama	2018-01-26
Donald MacLean	Laurel, MD	2018-01-26
grace park	Baltimore, MD	2018-01-26
joon suh	Bowie, MD	2018-01-26
Cristina Sovereign	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-26
Candy Zhang	Clarksville, MD	2018-01-26
Elena Talanova	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-26
Robert Long	Baltimore, MD	2018-01-26
Michelle Kopp	Columbia, MD	2018-01-26
Nick Hudert	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-26
Michelle Pilipovskiy	Elkridge, MD	2018-01-26
Kim Kennedy	Alabama	2018-01-26
Irina Vinogradova	Springdale, PA	2018-01-26
Meaza Hagos	Odenton, MD	2018-01-26
Tanya Thompson	Columbia, MD	2018-01-26
Zhanna S	Baltimore, MD	2018-01-26
Hui Ma	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-26
Gopakumar Vasudevan Nair	Baltimore, MD	2018-01-26
Karla Bradley	Germantown, MD	2018-01-26
Ivana Rafiq	Elkridge, MD	2018-01-26

Name	Location	Date
Keysha Porte-Janniere	Laurel, MD	2018-01-26
Lenny Ballista	Elkridge, MD	2018-01-26
Waynetta Haynes	US	2018-01-26
Leticia Mandujano	US	2018-01-26
alex chop	US	2018-01-26
RedElisa Mendoza	Miami, FL	2018-01-26
Lawrence Moon	US	2018-01-26
Melissa Kay	Columbia, MD	2018-01-26
Amanda eriksen	Columbia, MD	2018-01-26
Catherine Boyd	Hyattsville, MD	2018-01-26
Linda Calomeris	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-26
Margaret Whyte	Laurel, MD	2018-01-26
Buffy I	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-26
Juvin Jacob	Alabama	2018-01-26
April Arnold	Columbia, MD	2018-01-26
Phil Ranker	Laurel, MD	2018-01-26
Karlie Hayden	Elkridge, MD	2018-01-26
wendy allen	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-26
Madeline Diep	Hyattsville, MD	2018-01-26
Rhys ARTHUR	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-26
Matt Breon	Baltimore, MD	2018-01-26
Cynthia Fikes	Columbia, MD	2018-01-26

Name	Location	Date
Brendan Gotowka	Apo, AE	2018-01-26
Karen Johnson	Reisterstown, MD	2018-01-26
Allison Jones	Columbia, MD	2018-01-26
carol fox	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-26
Erika Schreiber	Millersville, MD	2018-01-26
Irene B	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-26
karen emmerich	Frederick, MD	2018-01-26
Wendy Kay	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-26
Jane Whyte	Laurel, MD	2018-01-26
Lisa G	Laurel, MD	2018-01-26
Douglas Bice	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-26
Susan Miller	Alabama	2018-01-26
Peter Oswald	New York, NY	2018-01-26
Hans Raven	Laurel, MD	2018-01-26
Nicole E	Hyattsville, MD	2018-01-27
Georgea Moore	Columbia, MD	2018-01-27
Beth Barkley	Clarksville, MD	2018-01-27
beth webb	Columbia, MD	2018-01-27
Carleen Pena	Reisterstown, MD	2018-01-27
Kelley Israel	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-27
Jean McCaffrey	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-27
Carrie Freiert	Millersville, MD	2018-01-27

Name	Location	Date
Harriette Page	Reisterstown, MD	2018-01-27
Elaine Fischer	Roanoke, VA	2018-01-27
Natalie Goodman	Glenwood, MD	2018-01-27
Nigel Isaacs	Laurel, MD	2018-01-27
Cindy Bonner	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-27
Christine Burleigh	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-27
Donna Entwistle	Smithtown, NY	2018-01-27
Wendy Turner	Millersville, MD	2018-01-27
Heather Ordonez	Elkridge, MD	2018-01-27
Elizabeth Garstecki	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-27
Tiffany Preddy	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-27
Sheryl Goering	Columbia, MD	2018-01-27
Melissa FitzGibbon	laurel, MD	2018-01-27
Tim Lane	Ellicott City, US	2018-01-27
kim harvill	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-27
Cathy Nagle	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-27
Richard Deutschmann	Baltimore, MD	2018-01-27
FRANK WILLIAMS	Columbia, MD	2018-01-27
Deeba Jafri	Elkridge, MD	2018-01-27
Sofiya Kagna	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-27
Becki Kuhn	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-27
Peihua Jiang	Clarksville, MD	2018-01-27

Name	Location	Date
Richard Nagle	Columbia, MD	2018-01-27
Brenda Harris	Laurel, MD	2018-01-27
Jane Neville	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-27
Karen Anderson	Ellicott City, US	2018-01-27
Kamilia Comastro	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-27
Miriam Hays	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-27
Ronald Mutchnik	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-27
Barbara Krupiarz	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-27
Lauren Leo	US	2018-01-27
Judy Herrmann	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-27
Keitgh KUHLEMEIER	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-27
steve diehl	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-27
Robert Ferguson	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-27
Jeanne Ho	Alabama	2018-01-27
Harry Rowell	Elkridge, MD	2018-01-27
Glenn Wolfe	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-27
Stacy Witt	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-27
Debra DelGaudio	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-27
Matt Seymour	Severna Park, MD	2018-01-27
Lisa Wilson	Towson, MD	2018-01-27
David Lepson	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-27
Christopher Price	Baltimore, MD	2018-01-27

Name	Location	Date
Anita Marino	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-27
Jillian O'Brien	Columbia, MD	2018-01-27
Judith Schardt	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-27
William Grier	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-27
Beth Stolte	Columbia, MD	2018-01-27
Marie Raven	Laurel, MD	2018-01-27
Jill Jewett	Alabama	2018-01-27
Rochelle Baugh	Alabama	2018-01-27
Elizabeth Hervochon	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-27
Kathy Rivers	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-27
Mary Maiocco	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-27
Alisa Brandes	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-27
Rebecca Stratis	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-27
Toni Achey	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-27
Christina Moran	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-27
Michele ONeill	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-27
Betty Sloan	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-27
Kimberlee Wilson	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-27
Bethany Dipaula	Ellicott city, MD	2018-01-27
Karen Raucher	Columbia, MD	2018-01-27
Chris DuMont	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-27
Julie Merson	Elkridge, MD	2018-01-27

Name	Location	Date
Allyson Toronto	Alabama	2018-01-27
Ben Riley	Columbia, MD	2018-01-27
Georgette McLean	Elkridge, MD	2018-01-27
Sarah Cheng	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-27
Alec Livieratos	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-27
Deborah Marshall	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-28
Sonia Chapin	Alabama	2018-01-28
Matt Moran	Columbia, MD	2018-01-28
Penelope Reardanz	Columbia, MD	2018-01-28
Melissa Schneider	Laurel, MD	2018-01-28
Jo Hudert	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-28
Kathleen Benditt	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-28
Dana Heidebrecht	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-28
Jennifer Soler	Columbia, MD	2018-01-28
Franklin Marcus	Elkridge, MD	2018-01-28
Nutan Mathur	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-28
Ginger Gauert	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-28
Jennifer Kubina	Columbia, MD	2018-01-28
Sara Vincent	Ellicott city, MD	2018-01-28
Tanya Eusebe	Laurel, US	2018-01-28
Melissa Kominos	Glenwood, MD	2018-01-28
Jacob Illum	Columbia, MD	2018-01-28

Name		Location	Date
Trish McDon	ald	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-28
Catherine Co	onley	Elkridge, MD	2018-01-28
Laura Noel N	1cKinnon	Halethorpe, MD	2018-01-28
Ann Mulholle	en	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-28
Wendy Fitzsi	mmons	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-28
Melanie Cols	on	Alabama	2018-01-28
Marvin Redd		Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-28
Amy Rossi		Ellicott City, MI	2018-01-28
Michael Durc	łock	US	2018-01-28
June Higgins		Columbia, MD	2018-01-28
Kata Vehar-K	enyon	Columbia, MD	2018-01-28
Eric Heinlein		Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-28
Aggie Wojdor	า	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-28
Rajit Garg		Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-28
Johnette Anto	one	Millersville, US	2018-01-29
Sean McGowa	an	Columbia, MD	2018-01-29
Marcia Moral	es	Jessup, MD	2018-01-29
Deepa Ragh		Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-29
Brian Morriso	n	US	2018-01-29
Pamela Perna	l	Millersville, MD	2018-01-29
Pamela Bolto	n	Mount Airy, MD	2018-01-29
Tracy Hill		Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-29

Name	Location	Date
Erin Cutroneo	Boston, MA	2018-01-29
Kirstyn Estes	Alabama	2018-01-29
Gayle Gerdes	Clarksville, MD	2018-01-29
Jocelyn Casto	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-29
Nicole Pilevsky	Columbia, MD	2018-01-29
Beverly Cihan	Glenwood, MD	2018-01-29
Mary Sedlack	Reisterstown, MD	2018-01-29
Katy Petty	Clarksville, MD	2018-01-29
Connie G	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-29
Douglas Kornreich	Hanover, MD	2018-01-29
Lisa George	Clarksville, MD	2018-01-29
Stuart Sedlack	Florida	2018-01-29
Pete Kuhn	Baltimore, MD	2018-01-29
Flora Yang	Arlington, VA	2018-01-29
CHeryl Ketterer	Alabama	2018-01-29
Sharon Benz	Millersville, MD	2018-01-29
James Coyle	Clarksville, MD	2018-01-29
Doug Berger	Arlington, VA	2018-01-29
Rachel Tarp	Columbia, MD	2018-01-29
Lucy Zerbe	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-29
Laura DeFrancesco	Millersville, MD	2018-01-29
Jill Kamenetz	Columbia, MD	2018-01-29

Name	Location	Date
Linda Martinak	US	2018-01-29
Lisa Kim	Laurel, MD	2018-01-29
Laura Forrest	Alabama	2018-01-29
Indu Kumar	Annapolis, MD	2018-01-29
Janet Saunders	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-29
Candace Cangialosi	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-29
LAURA LUDEMANN	Florence, SC	2018-01-29
Chau Whatley	Millersville, MD	2018-01-29
Rosa Lee Leith	Berlin, MD	2018-01-29
Rolando Valenzuela	Washington, MD	2018-01-29
Angela de Krafft	Fountain Inn, SC	2018-01-29
Christopher Forrest	Alabama	2018-01-29
Kathy Chappell	Glenwood, MD	2018-01-29
Carrie Pirie	ELLICOTT CITY, MD	2018-01-29
Jennifer Wendel	Millersville, MD	2018-01-29
dave benton	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-29
Sharon Schmidt	Alabama	2018-01-29
katelyn chewning	Woodbine, MD	2018-01-29
Aileen Musselman	US	2018-01-29
Carolan Stansky	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-29
Dina Cooke	West Friendship, MD	2018-01-29
ASHLEY ROYLE	Sykesville, MD	2018-01-30

Name	Location	Date
Nicole Schmidt	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-30
Erin Murphy	Woodbine, MD	2018-01-30
Vidya Sridhar	Columbia, MD	2018-01-30
Cara Steib	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-30
Wendy Lessels	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-30
Ian McClymonds	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-30
Badri Shirgur	Columbia, MD	2018-01-30
Vaishali Jahagirdar	Columbia, MD	2018-01-30
Elizabeth Winters	Mount Airy, MD	2018-01-30
Debbie Tow	Clarksville, MD	2018-01-30
Suzy Hill	Clarksville, MD	2018-01-30
Robert DeSantis	Alabama	2018-01-30
Lisa Shaw	Columbia, MD	2018-01-30
Danielle Schum	Columbia, MD	2018-01-30
Rachel Trager	Crownsville, MD	2018-01-30
Paul Beares	Reisterstown, MD	2018-01-30
Karen DeBlasio	Columbia, MD	2018-01-30
Diana Quinn	Laurel, MD	2018-01-30
Jen Browne	Glenwood, MD	2018-01-30
Beverly Hovmand	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-30
Padma Reddi	Clarksville, MD	2018-01-30
Del walcker	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-30

Name	Location	Date
Heather Smoll-Romanowicz	Baltimore, MD	2018-01-30
Karen Bradley Ehler	Columbia, MD	2018-01-30
Joy Marsh	Alabama	2018-01-30
Susan Kunkel	Woodstock, ME	2018-01-30
Scott Garland	Arlington, VA	2018-01-30
David Goodman	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-30
Brad Richards	Austin, TX	2018-01-30
Amanda Harris	Elkridge, MD	2018-01-30
John Cesca	Millersville, MD	2018-01-30
Mary Ann Reichard	Maryland	2018-01-30
Alexis Sassi	Columbia, MD	2018-01-30
Vanessa Duffy	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-30
Abby Gurian	Glenwood, MD	2018-01-31
Tanya Juley	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-31
Gabsang Lee	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-31
Kathie Halbert	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-31
Kate Hudkins	Washington, DC	2018-01-31
Marge Cudzilo	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-31
Michael Mcallister	Columbia, MD	2018-01-31
Marybeth Steil	Columbia, MD	2018-01-31
H. Wolfgang Hohenner	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-31
Kimberly Hamby	Laurel, MD	2018-01-31

Name	Location	Date
Jenny Jiang	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-31
Mary Pierce	Toronto, MD	2018-01-31
Alan Sellers	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-31
Sandra Berger	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-31
Christine Lowe	Ellicott City, US	2018-01-31
Lorraine Dunn	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-31
Robert Flowers	US	2018-01-31
Johanna Maleh	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-31
David Roseman	Ellicott City, US	2018-01-31
Alisa Walterhoefer	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-31
Debbi Kim White-Torruellas	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-31
Susann Mick	Wiesbaden, Germany	2018-01-31
Douglas Rider	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-31
Fern Babkes	Glenwood, MD	2018-01-31
Sherie Belt	Ellicott City, MD	2018-01-31
Becky Jordana	Washington, DC	2018-01-31

Sayers, Margery

From:

Stu Kohn <stukohn@verizon.net>

Sent:

Sunday, February 04, 2018 4:28 PM

To:

CouncilMail; Kittleman, Allan; Wilson, B Diane; howard-citizen@yahoogroups.com

Subject:

Super Bowl Monday -- Council's Legislative Hearing - 5 Feb 2018

All,

Tomorrow, 5 Feb at 7PM could be considered the Howard County Legislative Super Bowl for our decision makers – the County Council. They will be voting on several important Bills and Resolutions which will undoubtedly have a major impact regarding our future. See https://apps.howardcountymd.gov/olis/PendingLegislation.aspx. These are CB1 thru CB4 and CR10. They represent the Adequate Public Facilities (APFO) revisions, proposed Salary increases for the County Council, and County Council Procedural Changes, in particular eliminating Groups from testifying for 5 minutes. The Howard County Citizens Association (HCCA) sent written testimony to the Council on these Bills. See http://howardcountyhcca.org/member-info/reports-documents-and-testimonies/.

HCCA has been very involved in APFO for many years in an attempt to make it much stronger. One of these areas is Quality of Life. We would like to ensure that development does not outpace the ever increasing need of adequate Health (Hospital), Police, Fire, and Emergency Medical Services (EMS). To this end, Councilperson, Jen Terrasa is introducing **Amendment 8** to try and have her Council colleagues approve a very worthwhile endeavor. Go to https://apps.howardcountymd.gov/olis/LegislationDetail.aspx?LegislationID=2955. At the first go around Councilpersons Terrasa and Ball sponsored a similar Amendment, but their attempt was unfortunately defeated 3 to 2. We are very appreciative they made the attempt. This was the first time after all these years our decision makers not only listened but took action. <a href="https://example.com/emails-com

We fully support the increase of salaries for both County Council Members and the County Executive regarding CB3 and 4 respectively. In both 2010 and 2014 we went before the Compensation Review Commission to advocate for salary increases for both entities.

I am pleased to announce that we are working with the Councilperson Terrasa to ensure that the 5 minute rule for Groups is not eliminated. See **Amendment 2** introduced by Councilpersons Jen Terrasa and Greg Fox. Please see https://apps.howardcountymd.gov/olis/LegislationDetail.aspx?LegislationID=2973. We want to table.

We cannot afford to commit any fumbles, because it would be difficult to recover on such important legislation. Hopefully, the Council's decisions tomorrow will bring a Super Legislative Bowl so the citizens will all be winners and extremely proud.

Sincerely,

Stu Kohn HCCA, President

TODD D. BROWN | SHAREHOLDER T 301.230.6579 E tbrown@shulmanrogers.com

February 2, 2018

VIA FEDERAL EXPRESS

Mary Kay Sigaty, Chair and Members of the Howard County Council 3430 Court House Drive Ellicott City, Maryland 21043

Re: CB 1-2018 – Proposed Amendment 1

Dear Chair Sigaty and Members of the County Council:

On behalf of The Howard Research And Development Corporation (HRD), this letter expresses HRD's opposition to proposed Amendment 1 to CB 1-2018.

CB 1-2018 provides modest flexibility to adjust development sequencing through a limited redistribution of approved housing allocations. Any redistribution under CB 1-2018 is limited to the number of housing allocations approved by the FDP. Thus, any redistribution is entirely within the FDP's previously approved numeric limits, and occurs only after the Planning Board has evaluated the FDP's overall impacts.

Amendment 1 would tie the limited flexibility in CB 1-2018 to the removal of important flexibility in the Downtown Columbia Plan and Zoning Regulations. As such, Amendment 1 would penalize a petitioner, saying: "If you use this flexibility, you can't use that flexibility." This ignores the essential public policy supporting the flexibility in the first instance.

When it approved the Downtown Columbia Plan and Zoning Regulations, the Council recognized the complexity associated with Downtown Revitalization and that adjustments would sometimes be both desirable and necessary, subject to appropriate standards. The same rationale applies to CB 1-2018. Moreover, because any redistribution under CB 1-2018 is limited to the number of previously approved allocations, the adjustment is wholly internal to the project.

Lastly, we feel it is important to mention the Development Rights and Responsibilities Agreement governing Downtown Columbia. Under the DRRA, the County agreed it is in the best interests of the County and its citizens that Downtown be developed in accordance with the Zoning Regulations, which include the CEPPA flexibility provisions. The Council should not support a back-door effort to change that agreement.

HOWARD COUNTY COUNCE RECEIVED

Mary Kay Sigaty, Chair and Members of the Howard County Council February 2, 2018 Page 2

Sincerely,

SHULMAN, ROGERS, GANDAL, PORDY & ECKER, P.A.

By: 1100

cc:

Greg Fitchitt

Arianne Monroe, Esq.

41695943_1