

**Testimony follow-up**

LINDA Wengel [lwengel@msn.com]

**Sent:** Sunday, July 17, 2016 5:04 PM**To:** CouncilMail**Cc:** Town Center [lfohrkolb@yahoo.com]; Jeryl Baker [villagemanager@columbiatowncenter.org]; Kirsten Coombs [kcoombs1209@gmail.com]; Joel Broida [jbroida1@gmail.com]; Augusta Monique [moniqueaugusta@yahoo.com]; Lin Eagan [Lin.eagan@ca-board.org]

I am hoping that at the July 25th work session, we will be able to get answers to our questions about the DRRRA. If it is signed as is, will the Planning Board have the ability to say no to housing on the fire station site, will the public have an opportunity to help select a new library location and will the DAP and the Planning Board and DPZ have input on the SDP? Will the 16 step process still apply to every new FDP and SDP? We wonder if there will even be FDPs for the affordable housing sites.

We do understand the complexity of everything that is now before you, and are relying on your experience, community responsiveness, and good instincts to see it through to a satisfactory conclusion. Linda Wengel, Town Center Village Board

Sent from my iPad

## **TIF for downtown Columbia**

Robert A. Brown [rbrown1@umd.edu]

**Sent:** Sunday, July 17, 2016 5:30 PM

**To:** CouncilMail

Please not pass the TIF plan proposed by Kittleman - it is a boondoggle and raises taxes to benefit the developer. He calls himself a conservative?

Robert Brown

**Robert A. Brown, Ph.D., ABPP**

[p:410-992-4271](tel:410-992-4271) | [m:410-707-5562](tel:410-707-5562) | [e:rbrown1@umd.edu](mailto:rbrown1@umd.edu) | [a:10069-4](tel:410-10069-4)

Windstream Drive, Columbia, MD 21044

Get a signature like this: [Click here!](#)

**Banneker Fire House Issue**

Jeane Evans [sewjeane@outlook.com]

Sent: Sunday, July 17, 2016 5:45 PM

To: CouncilMail

I support my neighbors who are against building affordable housing units over the Banneker Fire House. I have lived in my Wyndham condominium for 15 years ' We all have heard the reasons that building housing over the Banneker Fire House is a bad idea....I won't bore you with them.

I watched the July 14<sup>th</sup> council meeting on TV. After watching for 4 and ¼ hours, The most obvious answer to the "downtown problem" is GOOD TRANSPORTATION Everybody who works, or shops or has dinner in town center can't live there, It's too expensive, there is no room to build more housing.....we don't need more Parking garages. If Montgomery County can have good transportation..... Why can't Howard County? We expect seniors, cleaning persons, teenagers,etc. To get around...why not make it easy and affordable ?

Sincerely .....Jeane Evans  
5837 Wyndham Circle # 103  
Columbia, Md

**Columbia development**

Rose Edwards [Rosewards@msn.com]

**Sent:** Sunday, July 17, 2016 6:03 PM

**To:** CouncilMail

Slow the pace of turning Columbia into another big city. That's why I left Baltimore. Creating 900 low income units is a reasonable amount. Stick to the original plan.



**Lisa Markovitz Downtown Columbia Testimony via email**

lmarkovitz@comcast.net

Sent: Sunday, July 17, 2016 6:36 PM

To: CouncilMail

Dear Council Members:

I am unable to appear in person to testify this month as I have a ruptured Achilles tendon, and am not mobile enough yet to go out much. Here is my testimony on the Downtown Columbia development legislation. Good luck with your very busy legislative agenda.

Sincerely,  
Lisa Markovitz

-----

I have concerns about the plans in the areas of affordable housing and the TIF. The County's plan claims to provide a larger number of affordable units than Council Member Terrasa's plan. I don't see that, because most of the units in the County's plan are not provided by Howard Hughes on their property so how can one count them as provided BY HH? If you take the units out that aren't provide BY them, then they are providing about 5 % of the total units. The rest are able to be provided under either plan, so there is no reason to put those on one side of this comparison. Thus, Council Member Terrasa's plan provides more units of affordable housing quite clearly. Her plan also seems to have these units spread out and not differentiated from market units much, as they are simply required in all the projects across the plan, versus on top of facilities, and in specified buildings.

Can HH "afford" to provide the affordable housing that is at least somewhere close to what other developers have to provide? Well, look at the total 6400 units and a sale or rental income estimate will tell you it seems a flat 15% reduced market unit amount is an utterly reasonable cost to fulfill this requirement.

Rules need to apply to all. I realize that this project is very large, and over a large period of time, but that doesn't make it necessary to have a completely different set of rules to apply, because the available profit is magnified as well, not just the costs. Columbia market rates are going to be good. I don't see big risk in filling these units, and this is not a blighted community, where we need developers to take big financial risks in order to get something done, so benefits are needed.

Given these facts, it's easy for me to support Terrasa's plan when it comes to affordable housing.

As for the TIF, I understand the district issue, the property tax expectations and what is and is not a direct benefit to the developer here. Yet, there are things the TIF is planning on funding that are typically costs the developer would incur due to their adding density to infrastructure, specifically herein, payments to upgrade roads. There are things in the TIF provided that developers don't typically fund as well. It makes sense to do a TIF, even in a prosperous area if SO many public works are needed to help the area with the changes, that it will get things started sooner and get more done to do a TIF; however, we really need to NOT include the County paying for these things instead of the developer where they are typically made to kick in more. I do not see details in the legislation, about how much the County is paying versus the developer. We have heard the developer is paying the "same" as the 2010 plan would cost them, but let's look at how this unbalanced scale got created, that we now have.

In 2010, CE Ken Ulman and the 2010 Council allowed 5500 units to be built without any affordable housing required. A fee was paid instead, but that never turned into actual units being provided. HH wants more density, and likely a faster pacing with the allocation needs, APFO delays, etc., and so they were back to the table. Let's start looking at the scale here with the County's plan. On HH's side: they get 900 more units; TIF financing offsets their need to fund infrastructure; most of the affordable units are provided elsewhere, so they are being allowed to only provide 5%, and they receive lowered parking requirements (so the max units can fit). On the other hand, the County gets from this deal.....um, the fact that the development will happen? Is that truly in question?

Given the requested amendments to the General Plan, and exemptions from APFO to reduce the waiting time to implement these units, it is clear that there is no desire to have development slowed to pace with the County's ability to provide infrastructure. Also, the developer will not be required to fund it, even what other developers typically have to fund. Therefore, being a realist, I support the TIF, because it is the only way the infrastructure is going to get done in any kind of timely fashion. So, should the developer pay more? Should we pace things more slowly to keep the quality of life decent for those here and those coming? Of course, but knowing, without the TIF, the development will come and the upgrades won't happen, that's not acceptable. So, yes, do the TIF, but let's be more clear about how it is being implemented.

I have heard that the developer will have to pay for any cost of the planned public works that is higher than the tax-increment funding, and that their profit is "capped" to a "reasonable" amount, and over that it is "shared" with the County. I am not seeing either of these clauses in the legislation, or developer agreement. I assume the overage, gap, payment being referred to as paid by the developer, is actually referencing the clause that the County is only pledging the TI money to pay the bond debt. So, the balance is the district TI amount then, but that's only paid by the developer where they own and continue to own those properties, and what if THAT is still not enough?

So, in closing, I request of the Council to please make the payments of infrastructure expenses in the scenario levels very clear about who is responsible, and to NOT ALLOW bonds to cost 12%, that's ridiculous. Why not use language tying to a specific market index rate? Lastly, please firm up the language and put it in the agreement, or legislation, this profit cap situation, and if there's a cap, and it's pretty much being guaranteed by all these benefits, why not have the rest go mostly to the County? Also, I cannot imagine why you would tie yours and future legislators' hands for 40 years on making any changes that might be needed.

Thank you for your considerations, and attention to these time-consuming, important matters. Have a nice recess.

Lisa Markovitz  
personally, and as President of The People's Voice, LLC

## Fire Station Housing Plan

Sandra Miller [myst.6@verizon.net]

**Sent:** Sunday, July 17, 2016 7:23 PM

**To:** CouncilMail

Council, with respect:

I have lived at Wyndham Condo for 21 years and when I bought it was with the understanding that the land the fire station is on was untouchable for any further construction. Now, it is being considered for 200 units to sit on top of the new fire station for housing. This is an unreasonable idea to begin with but also extremely unfair to use this property that owners were told was untouchable land per the County and we trusted that when we bought at Wyndham and were given land plans at purchase that showed that the land would not be used for further development.

I am asking, since designated other sites are within less than two miles ( the Flier building and the HC Library and Toby's site) from the fire station site, that all this is just too close a cluster of housing development and that this site not be considered further as a housing site. The other issue that so concerns the residents of both Banneker and Wyndham is that there is no room for parking and it is a dead end street, only one exit out of the property. It is a really bad choice for housing at this location. Please do not consider this location as a housing location.

I had planned to be at the meeting tomorrow but my car is in repair so I could not attend.

Thank you for your consideration in this important issue.

Sandra Miller  
5827 Wyndham Circle  
Unit #103  
Columbia, Md 21044

**Columbia downtown development**

Mary Ann Barry [mabarry4@comcast.net]

**Sent:** Sunday, July 17, 2016 8:35 PM

**To:** CouncilMail

I do not support public financing of the infrastructure that the developers should be providing.

We also should be sure there is affordable housing.

Mary Ann Barry  
5464 Wild Lilac  
Columbia, Md 21045

## **Development and raising taxes**

Bonnie Stuart [bstuart1022@aol.com]

**Sent:** Sunday, July 17, 2016 10:48 PM

**To:** CouncilMail

I strongly opposed the Kittlemans plan to continue developing the town center in Howard County and increasing current property owners property taxes by \$2,00.00 plus to complete this project.

We the people have had no say in this.

Thanks for your support for the people

Bonnie Stuart  
11170 Chambers Ct  
Unit H  
Woodstock, Md. 21163

Sent from my iPad

**Downtown Columbia**

no-reply@howardcountymd.gov

Sent: Sunday, July 17, 2016 11:38 PM

To: billwoodcock17@gmail.com

**First Name:** William  
**Last Name:** Woodcock  
**Email:** [billwoodcock17@gmail.com](mailto:billwoodcock17@gmail.com)  
**Street Address:** 6127 Orient Lane  
**City:** Columbia  
**Subject:** Downtown Columbia

Dear Members of the County Council, My name is Bill Woodcock and I live at 6127 Orient Lane, Columbia, MD 21045. I'm submitting written testimony to address the entirety of the bills submitted thus far regarding the redevelopment of Downtown Columbia-- the Administration's bill package, in addition to those submitted by Councilmember Jen Terrasa. I commend all those involved with discussing and negotiating and writing all the local resolutions and bills-- of which there are currently 11-- before you. I'm also submitting written testimony, rather than oral, so that the message I need to share with is neither lost nor diluted. I hope also, that you will read thoroughly and consider seriously what I'm writing. Because all of you have a once in a lifetime opportunity. And each of you have an opportunity to create and cement a legacy, as elected officials and as stewards of this community. And my view is that, to realize that opportunity, some big questions have to be answered here about downtown redevelopment. Maybe these questions have been answered. But maybe, some of them haven't even yet been asked? I was reading social media last week, specifically Facebook posts about downtown redevelopment, and a supporter of downtown redevelopment, who has long been known to support the Administration's package, in trying to convince a dissenter, attempted to draw a picture of a redeveloped Columbia as, "picture Bethesda or Reston". As models of what a redeveloped Columbia could be. Well. I believe in downtown redevelopment. I know a lot of people who want to move here. Because the way Columbia and Howard County are planned and designed makes sense. It's well managed. It's not....wait for it.... places like Bethesda or Reston. So no. I don't want Bethesda or Reston here. And a lot of people in Bethesda or Reston, don't want Bethesda or Reston where they live! And what also strikes in the comparison to other suburbs is... this is a once in a two generation opportunity. That's that legacy thing I talked about earlier. And, 40 or 50 years from now, do we want our children and grandchildren, maybe even great grandchildren, to say, "Yep, they redeveloped Columbia all right. Made it look just like Bethesda or Reston. Boy, did they do great!" I don't think we do. I think we want history to think of us-- all of us-- as visionaries and people who cared deeply about this community. And before us is a chance to do that. To create something visionary. So I'm going to use the balance of this testimony to discuss what I think visionary looks like. Most of which is in the context of these pieces of legislation, but some of it isn't. First, if we're going to create Downtown Columbia, let's create it. I keep hearing about Oakland Mills as being part of "Downtown Columbia". Then let's expand the Tax Incentive Financing (TIF) area to include the Oakland Mills Village Center area. Second, a question: we want to beat our chests here and say we're creating something "world class" in Columbia. Let's stop

using that term so loosely. What do world-class cities have? A landmark. The Sydney Opera House. The Empire State Building. Big Ben. What is Columbia's landmark? I suggest that it's Merriweather Post Pavilion. And as such, MPP has to be taken care of. It's been renovated. It must also be provided for in terms of parking and other infrastructure and it must be transferred over. There are good people who want to cultivate Merriweather and make it what they want it to be. Younger people for whom this is literally their life's work. Let them have that chance. I would like to see Howard Hughes commit to a date certain at which Merriweather would be transferred. It should be transferred before any downtown Columbia redevelopment legislation is enacted. Third, there's a lot of jobs that are projected to be created and brought to Downtown Columbia. By my read, 19,000. Over twice the number of residents the 6,400 projected residential units will house, and one job for about every 15 Howard Countians. With the workplace moving farther from physical structure and hierarchical offices, and towards hotelling situations and telework, I'm not sure if all of those projected 4.3 million square feet of commercial space will be needed. I'd love to see some forward-projecting data that supports this figure. Fourth, the TIF figure. A TIF is an unusual funding mechanism for this, I find. It's been pointed out to me that Arundel Mills, for example, was built using a TIF mechanism. And I pointed out to my friend, that the Arundel Mills area was woods. This is not Arundel Mills. It's already a successful area and so to ensure continued success, I find myself not so much against the TIF, but curious about how it will be backstopped should the economy run into problems and revenue projections not meet the mark. I would suggest that the developer, property owners, and tenants would share the responsibility somehow, but if it looks like meeting the TIF targets means levying fees and charges that places rents out of market-- what then? Not sure I've heard an answer to this question. And fifth, for the county's investment, what are we getting? Are we getting a sustainable Columbia? How will commercial and residential space be built? For example, sustainable, certified space would make sense. Achieving the dream of a carbon neutral, green Columbia-- that would be wonderful! Game changing. Legacy defining. But if we're just going to build little squares with lots of back-in, slanted parking-- not so excited about that. That's kinda lame in fact. So I'd like to see some development details? Maybe these exist already, at least in part. Sixth, this part about affordable housing. Those who know me know I'm not a fan of the Rouse Vision. But conceptually, what Jim Rouse talked about was very important and should be maintained. And chief among these tenets was housing for all income levels, spread throughout Columbia. Therefore, I'm not in favor of developments that are entirely targeted towards lower income levels. I am in favor of every development offering a mix of housing options. And newer ways to explore housing with lower rent, such as smaller apartments to take advantage of some current housing preferences, should be explored. And implemented! And these apartments should all be built of the same materials, development by development. Seventh, and last, I don't see "jigsaw parts" on either of these packages. For example, I see a transit center discussed, but what's the broad vision for it? It doesn't need to be defined totally, but is this an enhanced county system? Spurs of Baltimore light rail and Washington Metro? A direct line to BWI? A maglev train stop? Some ideas, please. Same thing goes for the vision of a downtown Columbia school. Where would that go, even conceptually? Right now I don't think we know. And we should! So I am urging all of you, Councilmembers, and the Administration to put all this together. I commend Councilmember Terrasa for her plan, but there shouldn't just be a "Terrasa Plan". There should be a Ball Plan. A Fox Plan. A Sigaty Plan. And a Weinstein Plan. It makes sense to do so, don't you think? That way you can listen to people, add your own ideas, get your plans together, synthesize with other plans that already exist, and forge a result that produces not a solution agreed upon by a committee, which contains nothing about which anyone is passionate. Rather, the forged result should be a grand plan, which is achievable, and which brings glory not just to Howard Hughes Corporation, or to any of you, but to all

**Message:**



Howard County, for many decades to come. I regret that I'm not available in person to ask questions, but I urge any of you to contact me at 410-963-0717 or at [billwoodcock17@gmail.com](mailto:billwoodcock17@gmail.com). Thank you.



**Re: [HOWARD-CITIZEN] A Guide for the Downtown Columbia Legislative Package -- TIF**

Barbara Russell [babsrussell@comcast.net]

Sent: Monday, July 18, 2016 3:19 AM

To: HOWARD-CITIZEN@yahooogroups.com

Cc: Kittleman, Allan; CouncilMail

To all,

Been out of the loop for a short while.

Thank you Charles for the info below. It is very helpful.

For years the Ulman and I believe now the Kittleman administrations have been touting the awards Columbia and Howard County have received from national groups for being one of the best counties, towns, cities in the USA in which to live. Then, in 2010 the county passed legislation increasing the density allowed for downtown Columbia to 5500 housing units greatly increasing the value of the Howard Hughes (HH) property. HH is building here because it knows it will be a very very profitable venture.

Is there no limit to which the HH corporation will go to squeeze every last dollar of profit from their project at the expense of the Howard County tax payers? The answer to that question apparently is -- no, as long as they can get away with it.

This leads to the more relevant question. Is there no limit that the elected representatives of Howard County will go to do whatever HH asks for at the expense of the Howard County tax payers? The answer to that question apparently is -- no, as long as they can get away with it.

Democrats, Republicans -- it doesn't make any difference. As a lifelong Democrat, in the last two county elections, I publicly supported and campaigned among my fellow Democrats for the Republican candidates for County Executive based on the two Democratic candidate's support for the give-away to GGP/HH on downtown development. The first Republican I supported joined the administration of the Democratic County Executive he ran against. The second Republican is apparently continuing the give-away to HH with the TIF, the ridiculous affordable housing proposal, tearing down a perfectly good library (after spending money to improve it on two recent occasions) and the list goes on.

This also amazes me because I thought Republicans are supposed to be good at business and I believe these are the worst business deals in the history of the county for at least the last 50 years.

But, as long as citizens continue to accept this behavior from our local politicians by not voting them out of office, they will continue to ignore us. Jen Terrasa is the exception this time around. Although, I will say that I believe Howard County voters did send a message in the last election with regard to at least two supporters of the GGP/HH give away -- just my opinion -- but the others don't seem to get it.

Barbara

On Jul 8, 2016, at 5:07 PM, Charles Scott [cscott@Loyola.edu](mailto:cscott@Loyola.edu) [HOWARD-CITIZEN] wrote:

Below is a description--my understanding, as an Economist--of what Tax Increment Financing (TIF) is and how it relates to the current proposal. My definition of TIF is from Wikipedia, but I also looked at the state of Maryland implementation of TIF at [Planning.maryland.gov](http://Planning.maryland.gov).

I strongly disagree with the use of TIF in Columbia Town Center, as I lay out below. I have not read the proposal, so the application of TIF in the proposal may vary from my description in specifics. However, the idea of using a funding method intended to "jump-start" development in an area like Columbia where development is well underway, does not seem appropriate, or necessary.

TIF--Tax Increment Financing--consists of

1. Designating a TIF district. This will include the target for development, and additional territory "that would likely be affected by the development." How this district is defined is very important, as all new tax revenue (tax increment) collected during the time horizon defined in the TIF will go to paying for the development (paying for the bonds).

2. Issuing bonds for funding the development chosen to be done.

3. Applying any increment in tax revenue in the designated district to pay off the bonds.

If the property values in the TIF district are increased by the development, these properties will incur increased property taxes on the increased value. This additional tax would then be applied to paying for the development. The main use of TIFs has been to redevelop "blighted" areas that would not be redeveloped without this preferential (public) funding. I say public funding because the bonds used to fund the development are paid for out of future tax revenue.

NOTE: California, where TIFs were first used, has chosen to restrict the use of this type of financing.

In Columbia's situation,

1. The proposed development area is not blighted.

2. Property values continue to rise in Columbia without this development. This underlying increment to the tax base would be captured to pay for the bonds used to finance the development, rather than being available for other public expenditures.

3. The housing proposed will bring more residents to the county, causing there to be a need for added infrastructure--roads, schools, etc. Not only is there limited provision for this infrastructure by the developer in the current legislation, with the TIF, any new revenues (in the designated TIF district) would now go to paying for the development itself, not the added infrastructure. How would we then pay for the added need for roads and schools? The only option would be to tax non-TIF district tax payers.

4. The residents near the fire house (Banniker) fear that their property values will actually fall due to the affordable housing proposed over the fire house (based upon their association's representative testimony at Wilde Lake Middle School). If this were to occur, how would the bonds--read county financial obligation--be paid off?

5. TIF sounds like a subsidy to the developer. In fact, it is public funding of the development in such a way that the cost is deferred to after the expense of the development occurs. It appears to be "free" since this funding is out of "incremental" revenue. However, these increments to taxes might not be a result of the development itself, and therefore applying these funds to the TIF financed development means that these funds are not available for other projects. These other needs--schools, roads, public services, etc.--must be funded out of other tax sources, or not done at all.

6. TIF was developed as a means to foster development that would not have occurred otherwise. Unless the developer is allowed to ignore their obligation to provide affordable housing as part of their currently authorized 5500 units, the proposed affordable housing will occur without TIF. Why publicly pay for (TIF) what the private market will already provide--if Howard Hughes is held to their obligations.

7. The current proposal claims to provide low income housing. However, it actually allows Howard Hughes to provide NO affordable housing in the 5500 units it is authorized to build. The affordable housing is then provided at County taxpayer expense--through TIF--on County land! There is much here for Howard Hughes, but NOT MUCH for the County. It is window dressing to hide the fact that Howard Hughes is not being required to provide any affordable housing.

8. Jen Terrasa's proposal holds Howard Hughes accountable for their obligation to provide affordable housing as part of the 5500 units authorized, without restricting future tax revenues to pay for it. Howard Hughes was aware of the type of community they were buying into, and what the expectations were with respect to development. Councilwoman Terrasa's proposal is just holding them accountable for what Columbia was intended to be.

Charles Scott

Sent from my iPad

On Jul 6, 2016, at 10:10 PM, 'Stu Kohn' [stukohn@verizon.net](mailto:stukohn@verizon.net) [HOWARD-CITIZEN] <[HOWARD-CITIZEN@yahoogroups.com](mailto:HOWARD-CITIZEN@yahoogroups.com)> wrote:

All,

In an attempt to keep you informed as to activities relating to the Downtown Columbia Legislation the Howard County Citizens Association (HCCA) has been working to try and obtain a fair process for concerned citizens to have a solid voice in the legislative process regarding this most complex package. We have been communicating with our officials to try and ensure we ALL get the picture. There are two attachments for your use. They are the "Downtown Columbia Legislative Package" and "Downtown Columbia Legislative Schedule Overview – July 2016". The contents are provided below:

Stu Kohn

HCCA, President

=====

**Subject: Downtown (DT) Columbia Legislative Package**

Prepared by: Stu Kohn, President HCCA

The information below is a composite list of the array of Bills and Resolutions which comprise the Downtown Columbia legislative proposals. The proposed schedule as stated on the County Council website -- Upcoming Council Meetings is as follows:

Friday, July 8 – Legislative Session – 10:00am

Monday, July 11 – Special Leg Work Session – 8:30am

Thursday, July 14 – Special Public Hearing – 6:00pm

Monday, July 18 – Legislative Public Hearing – 6:00pm

Monday, July 25 – Legislative Work Session – 8:30am

Friday, July 29 -- Legislative session – 10am

See attachment “Downtown Columbia Legislative Schedule Overview – July 2016” as well as the contents below we received from Jessica Feldmark, Administrator, Howard County Council. Please note the Rules of Engagement when Testifying as described when referring to July 14.

#### **July 2016 Legislative Schedule Overview for Legislation Regarding Downtown Columbia**

Given the robust legislative agenda pending before the County Council this month and in anticipation of significant public participation, the Council has augmented its regular legislative schedule with additional meetings – one work session and one public hearing – focused specifically on the legislation related to Downtown Columbia (listed at the end of this document). The timeline below outlines the Council's legislative schedule for July with brief descriptions of the process the Council will follow at each meeting.

#### **Friday, July 8, 10:00 a.m. - legislative session**

*This is the Council's regular legislative session, which happens to fall later than usual this year due to holiday observances for the Fourth of July and Eid Ul Fitr. At the end of this legislative session, there will be initial presentations of the Downtown-related legislation – approximately 10 minutes each for three legislative packages (the Administration's affordable housing package, Councilwoman Terrasa's affordable housing package, and the TIF package). At the end of each presentation, Council Members will have an opportunity to raise issues and questions to be addressed at the work session on July 11. The Council will not begin discussion at this session; it will simply be identifying topics of discussion for the work session.*

#### **Monday, July 11, 8:30 a.m. - special legislative work session (Downtown only)**

*This special legislative work session will provide an opportunity for the Council to begin more in-depth discussion of the legislation related to affordable housing in Downtown Columbia and the proposed TIF for Downtown Columbia. Legislative work sessions are open meetings. The public is welcome to attend; however, testimony is not taken at a work session.*

#### **Thursday, July 14, 6:00 p.m. - special public hearing (Downtown only)**

*This will be a special public hearing focused only on legislation related to Downtown Columbia. All of the Downtown legislation will be heard together as a group. Sponsors will not present their legislation at this hearing, as those initial presentations will have already been completed on July 8. Members of the public will have the opportunity to testify on any or all of the legislation. Each person, whether testifying as an individual or as the representative of an organization, will have up to five minutes to testify, additional minute if the testimony will address both affordable housing and the proposed TIF.*

#### **Monday, July 18, 6:00 p.m. – regular legislative public hearing**



*This is the regular legislative public hearing for all legislation introduced in July, including the Downtown-related legislation. The hearing will begin at 6:00 p.m. Downtown-related legislation will be at the end of the agenda. Once again, all of the Downtown legislation will be read together as a group and members of the public will have up to five minutes to testify, with an additional minute if the testimony will address both affordable housing and the proposed TIF.*

**Monday, July 25, 8:30 a.m. - legislative work session**

*This is the Council's regular legislative work session for July. As is standard practice, the agenda for the work session will be determined following the regular legislative public hearing. It is anticipated that this work session will include further discussion of Downtown-related legislation, and it may include other legislation as well. Legislative work sessions are open meetings. The public is welcome to attend; however, testimony is not taken at a work session.*

**July 29, 10:00 a.m. - legislative session**

*This is the annual wrap-up legislative session to give final consideration to July's legislation before the Council's August recess. At this session the Downtown-related legislation could be tabled through the August recess.*

**Councilwoman Jen Terrasa's Legislative Package Addressing Affordable Housing (AH) in Downtown (DT) Columbia**

Note: Go to the link -- <http://cc.howardcountymd.gov/About-Us/Commissions-Task-Forces-and-Special-Reports/Affordable-Housing-in-Downtown-Columbia> to see the contents of all the Bills, Resolutions, Tax Increment Financing (CB-56), and other information such as the Planning Boards recommendations, and the Development Rights and Responsibilities Agreement (DRRA), etc. below.

On March 31, 2016, the Howard County Department of Planning and Zoning issued technical staff reports on the proposals for affordable housing in Downtown Columbia regarding

[Technical Staff Report on Councilwoman Terrasa's proposal \(GPA 2016-02 and ZRA-162\)](#)

[Technical Staff Report on County Executive Kittleman's proposal \(GPA 2016-03, ZRA-170, and DRRA\)](#)

**Associated Bills:**

**CB-43** – AN ACT amending the Downtown Columbia Plan to establish an Affordable Housing Inclusionary Zoning provision for Downtown Columbia, under certain conditions; amending certain Community Enhancements, Programs, and Public Amenities (CEPPAs) requirements regarding affordable housing; and generally relating to planning, zoning and land use in Howard County.

*Number of Pages = 6*

**CB-44** – AN ACT amending the Howard County Zoning Regulations' New Town (NT) District Downtown Revitalization regulations to include a 15 percent Affordable Housing Inclusionary Zoning provision for Downtown Columbia, under certain conditions; and generally relating to the NT District. *Number of Pages = 9*

**CB-45** – AN ACT amending the Howard County Code's Downtown Columbia provisions regarding affordable housing payments required by Community Enhancements, Programs, and Public Amenities (CEPPAs) to reflect an inclusionary zoning provision for Downtown Columbia; and generally relating to affordable housing in Downtown Columbia. *Number of Pages = 37*

**County Executive Legislative Package Addressing AH in DT Columbia, as well as a TIF for DT Columbia**

**Associated Bills:**

**CB-52** – AN ACT amending the Downtown Columbia Plan, a General Plan Amendment, to revise the Downtown Columbia affordable housing program; setting forth methods for the development of affordable housing; revising the Downtown Revitalization Phasing Progression to reflect the timing of affordable housing development; amending certain Community Enhancements,

Programs and Public Amenities to reflect the methods for the development of affordable housing; and generally relating to planning, zoning and land use in Howard County. *Number of Pages = 21*

**CB-53** – AN ACT amending PlanHoward 2030, the general plan for Howard County, in order to amend the number of housing unit allocations available to developers of new residential units in Downtown Columbia for the period 2015 - 2030; and generally relating to planning, zoning and land use in Howard County. *Number of Pages = 4*

**CB-54** – AN ACT requiring a new configuration of affordable housing in Downtown Columbia under certain conditions with certain alternatives; amending and providing for certain parking requirements related to residential units in Downtown Columbia; providing certain requirements for certain plans; requiring that certain types of construction provide for art in the community; and generally relating to the Howard County Zoning Regulations. *Number of Pages = 9*

**CB-55** – AN ACT amending the County Code by clarifying that certain moderate income housing units are provided in certain Zoning Districts as required by the Howard County Zoning Regulations or when required by certain plans; exempting Downtown Columbia from a certain provision of the Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance; amending certain payments for affordable housing required by each developer of residential property within Downtown Columbia under certain conditions; and generally relating to development in Downtown Columbia. *Number of Pages = 4*

**CB-56** – AN ORDINANCE levying and providing for the collection of a special tax on property within the special taxing district in the downtown Columbia area of Howard County, Maryland known as the “Crescent Special Taxing District” (the “Special Taxing District”) pursuant to the Rate and Method identified herein and for various matters relating thereto; authorizing and empowering the County to issue up to \$90,000,000 of its special obligation bonds at a maximum interest rate not to exceed 12% per annum in order to finance or reimburse the cost of certain public improvements relating to the Special Taxing District and the Development District (as defined herein) and other costs permitted under the Acts (as identified herein); providing that such bonds and the interest thereon shall never constitute a general obligation of the County or a pledge of its full faith and credit; providing for the further specification, prescription, determination, provision for or approval of various other matters, details, documents and procedures in connection with the authorization, issuance, security, sale and payment for any such bonds; making

certain legislative findings; and generally providing for the levy, imposition, collection and application of such special tax and the issuance of an initial series of bonds in accordance with the Acts identified herein. *Number of Pages = 63*

**Associated Resolutions:**

**CR-103** – A RESOLUTION approving and authorizing the execution of a Development Rights and Responsibilities Agreement by Howard Research And Development Corporation and Howard County in accordance with Title 16, Subtitle 17 of the Howard County Code; authorizing the Executive to make changes to the Agreement, under certain conditions; authorizing the County Executive to execute the Agreement; providing for the effective date of this Resolution, and generally relating to the Agreement. *Number of Pages = 59*

**CR-104** – A RESOLUTION pursuant to Section 4.201 of the Howard County Code, authorizing the County Executive’s sale of certain real property known as the “Flier Building” owned by Howard

County, Maryland, containing approximately 2.159 acres, and located at 10750 Little

Patuxent Parkway, Maryland; waiving the advertising and bidding requirements of Section

4.201 of the Howard County Code; and providing that the County Executive is not bound to

sell the property if he finds that it may have a further public use. *Number of Pages = 4*

**CR-105** – A RESOLUTION adopted pursuant to Sections 12-201 et seq . of the Economic Development Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland (the “Tax Increment Financing Act”) and Sections 21-501 et seq. of the Local Government Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland (the “Special Taxing District Act”, and collectively with the Tax Increment Financing Act, the “Acts”) providing for the designation of contiguous property in the downtown Columbia area of Howard County as a development district for purposes of the Tax Increment Financing Act (the “Development District”) and for the designation of a separate area within the development district as a special taxing district for the purposes of the Special Taxing District Act (the “Special Taxing District”, and collectively with the



Development District, the “Districts”); creating certain special funds pursuant to the Acts; providing for the deposit and use of moneys in such special funds; pledging that the County will allocate and divide property taxes on real property within the Development District so that the portion of the real property taxes levied on the amount by which the assessable base of the real property in the Development District exceeds the original taxable value (the “Tax Increment”) will be allocated and paid into one of the special funds, and providing for the levy and collection of special taxes or ad valorem taxes to be deposited to the other special fund in the event the real property taxes levied on the Tax Increment are or will be insufficient to pay debt service on certain bonds issued under the Acts; and providing for, finding, and determining matters in connection therewith. *Number of Pages = 19*

<Downtown Columbia Legislative Package.docx>

<Downtown Columbia Legislative Schedule Overview - July 2016 - final.pdf>

---

Posted by: Charles Scott <[CScott@loyola.edu](mailto:CScott@loyola.edu)>

NOTE 1: When you choose REPLY, it will go to the entire group.  
To send to one member, enter that address in the TO window.

NOTE 2: HCCA does not take responsibility for the content of messages posted on the listserve; assertions should be verified before placing reliance on them.

▪

**VISIT YOUR GROUP** **New Members 2** |

[Privacy](#) • [Unsubscribe](#) • [Terms of Use](#)

**TIF Legislation - CB 2016-56 and CR 2016-105 (IN FAVOR)**

Michael W. Davis [MDavis@darslaw.com]

Sent: Monday, July 18, 2016 7:01 AM

To: CouncilMail

Dear Members of the County Council,

Last week, I attended the public hearing regarding the TIF legislation that is currently pending before you. I was struck by a few common misunderstandings that were being discussed by some of the people providing testimony.

**1. The TIF is not a taxpayer giveaway to Howard Hughes.** It might be better to think about it as a joint venture. While Howard Hughes and other property owners are poised to invest the initial \$618,000,000 of what will total \$2.2 billion into downtown Columbia, the County is only investing the increased tax dollars that will flow from the Hughes' investment in order to jumpstart the process.

**a. Why use TIFs?** As one member of the Council noted, something was going to be built on the land anyway, so why are we doing the TIF? The answer is that we don't want just anything built. We already got that from The Rouse Company when they developed around The Mall - unimaginative, low density housing and box restaurants surrounding The Mall. That was pretty much what The Rouse Company was proposing for the Crescent back in 2005. We rejected that approach in 2010 with the Downtown Columbia Plan. We wanted better. And infrastructure investments to be funded with TIF proceeds are part of any exceptional community like the one proposed in the Plan.

**b. Howard County's Role.** Should Howard County Government play a role in developing the needed infrastructure for our community? Absolutely! That's exactly what government does. Roads, schools, public buildings, and other necessary amenities are all a part of what government provides. Just take a look at our Capital Budget.

**c. Benefits for the Entire County.** If the Crescent area and other areas around Merriweather were built as The Rouse Company originally envisioned, how much additional tax revenue would have been generated? It's hard to give an exact number, of course, but it would be a small fraction of what will be generated by the proposed construction now under consideration. By using the taxes generated by the "increment" between what could have been built and what will actually be built, we can accelerate the construction for everyone's benefit – for jobs, for housing, for retail and for business. And, because of the guarantees provided by Howard Hughes, current Howard County taxpayers will be protected. Thus, the goal is for the downtown to be positively contributing to Howard County's tax base long into the future.

**2. The Vision for Downtown Columbia is Already Established.** The Downtown Columbia Plan set a vision that has guided us for six years of a 30-year process. Because of the dissension among you regarding the TIF and Affordable Housing, the discussion regarding the vision for the future of downtown Columbia has been reopened. Listening to the many people who provided testimony regarding whether or not we want a "vital" or "vibrant" downtown brought back all the memories what most of you dealt with as you created the Downtown Columbia Plan throughout 2009 and early 2010. Hopefully, we will not go down that path again. There is no need to change that vision now.

**3. TIF funding is Not Just for Blighted Areas.** TIFs are commonly used for public projects, whether or not in a blighted community. TIFs can be and are used to accelerate desirable public projects so that economically feasible development that benefits the community can be provided. The "but for" test is the key to determining whether or not TIF financing should be considered. The question is this:



but for the use of TIF financing, would downtown Columbia be developed to its maximum and best potential in a timely manner? The Downtown Columbia Plan set the vision for the maximum and best potential that was desired by the community. The Plan further anticipated that TIF financing would be required to achieve that potential. Thus, it can be fairly inferred that the passing of the Downtown Columbia Plan unanimously in 2010 was the answer to the "but for" test.

a. **Confirmation at the Polls.** It should be noted that many of the opponents to the 2010 Downtown Columbia Plan decided to run one of their vocal leaders, Alan Klein, against Mary Kay Sigaty to show the strength of their position and, perhaps, to find a way to undo what was already accomplished. Mary Kay Sigaty, as member of the County Council in whose district the downtown is located, was one of the key leaders in getting the Downtown Columbia Plan passed. In a very hotly debated primary election in 2010, Alan Klein was defeated by a 62.3% to 37.7% margin. It wasn't even close.

4. **No Taxpayer Responsibility.** The taxpayers of Howard County will not be responsible for paying for the TIF. As set forth in the preamble to CB56 and in Section 3 thereof, "such bonds and the interest thereon shall never constitute a general obligation of the County or a pledge of its full faith and credit." The mechanism for paying for the tax is that it will be paid from the taxes collected based on the increased incremental of the property taxes. Moreover, should the increase in anticipated property taxes not be realized, it will be Howard Hughes, not the taxpayers of Howard County, who will be on the hook.


5. **TIF's Continued Viability.** TIFs continue to be viable in California and in every other state in the United States. Some people are spreading the message that TIFs are no longer viable in California. Not true. Indeed, in 2014, new legislation was adopted in California that would expand the scope and applicability of TIFs in California. According to Government Executive ([www.govexec.com](http://www.govexec.com)) .... "The law, S.B. 628, is expected to revitalize the practice of tax-increment financing in California—a means of generating revenue based on projections of higher property values and taxes arising from long-term property development following in the wake of infrastructure construction. It lowers voter-approval thresholds and expands the range of infrastructure projects eligible for support. If communities embrace the new statute, billions of dollars in new financing will become available." So, contrary to the assertion that TIFs are dead in California, they are alive and better than ever.

The bottom line is that many of the same people who opposed the changes included in the Downtown Columbia Plan are now trying to slow down the development process in any way that they can. That is their right, of course. However, the vast majority of people in Howard County support the vision and goals of the Downtown Columbia Plan and hope only that the creation of the New City can happen during their lifetimes!

If you have any questions, please let me know.

My best wishes!

Michael Davis  
10323 Wilde Lake Terrace  
Columbia, MD 21044  
410.884.6727

 **Consider the environment. Please don't print this e-mail unless you really need to.**

This e-mail and any attached documents are intended only for the addressee names above and may contain confidential information belonging to the sender which is legally privileged and confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying or distribution of the contents of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify us immediately by responding to this e-mail or by telephone.

**Banneker Fire Station Issue**

Tthejoy@aol.com

**Sent:** Monday, July 18, 2016 7:04 AM**To:** CouncilMail**Cc:** tthejoy@aol.com

Council Members,

I am an owner at Wyndham Circle and wish to express my concern about the plans for a high rise building on the corner of Banneker and Little Patuxent Parkway which will include 200 apartments above a fire station. As expressed by a number of my neighbors, this construction would adversely affect our community and we ask you to seriously consider our concerns before a decision is made.

I have lived at Wyndham for 18 years and, over the years, have appreciated our somewhat secluded location which was also a very short distance from the Columbia Mall as well as the Central Library. Our community has become less "secluded" over the past few years in part because of the expanding Exxon station near us, but we still have a relatively quiet neighborhood and many of us prefer to keep it that way.

We do understand the need for a larger fire station as Columbia is growing along with Howard Community College and the hospital, but can't we just have a new and larger fire station without it being a high rise with apartments for more than 200 residents along with their vehicles and all else that goes with more people??

I have been attending the meetings on the Downtown Columbia Plan, having only missed one, but will be unable to attend tonight. I ask you again, please consider what the proposed construction would do to our community of 105 units at Wyndham and 100 units at Banneker.

Thank you for your consideration of my request.

Evelyn Templeman  
5832 Wyndham Circle, #105

## **Developing Columbia**

Dina Boogaard [djboogaard@earthlink.net]

**Sent:** Monday, July 18, 2016 10:24 AM

**To:** CouncilMail

**Cc:** Dina Boogaard [djboogaard@earthlink.net]

As a resident of Howard County, think that Jen Terrassa's approach to development is exactly what we need! We need a strong foundation on which to continue to make Columbia a model place to live.

Therefore, I STRONGLY OPPOSE KITTLEMAN's TIF financing of the DEVELOPERS' DUTY to provide/finance necessary and usual infrastructure in Downtown Columbia. Therefore, I SUPPORT JEN TERRASSA's approach to the problem of providing affordable housing that 1) ASSURES that the affordable housing is actually built and 2) DOES NOT HAVE ANY HOWARD COUNTRY TAXPAYER PUBLIC FINANCING/underwriting TIF Financing underwriting of DEVELOPERS' duties and profits.

Thank you,  
Dina

## **Downtown Columbia**

Lubomyr Onyshkevych [onyshlub@aol.com]

**Sent:** Monday, July 18, 2016 10:58 AM

**To:** CouncilMail

Dear Howard County Council Members,

Re: STOP CONSIDERINIG **BANNEKER** FOR A NEW APARTMENT BUILDING

The general plan for Downtown Columbia has several positive as well as not so positive aspects, but in general, it would not bring harm to the surrounding neighborhood, **except to the Banneker area residents.**

The Banneker Fire Station proposal would be very detrimental to the existing 205 condo and townhouse owners. In fact, it would bring hardship to all of us, in terms of:

- SAFETY CONCERNS IN THE BANNEKER RD AREA during morning and evening rush hour, and especially in case of fire (last October access to Banneker was closed for 2 hours during a 4-alarm fire!).
- driving to and from Banneker Rd in congested traffic
- completely taking up all parking spaces on Banneker (which many of our neighbors need)
- air pollution from gasoline
- noise and other environmental pollution

All these and other factors would also negatively affect *the value of our homes.*

WHY SHOULD OUR RESIDENTS suffer all these negative effects?

If there is such a *desperate need for apartments* – why not use land that is still available elsewhere in Columbia, where no one would be hurt?

*Lubomyr S. Onyshkevych*  
5842 Wyndham Circle, #105  
Columbia, MD 21044

**Fwd: County Bills on Affordable Housing and TIF**

Ramsey Alexander Jr [ramseyalexjr@aol.com]

**Sent:** Monday, July 18, 2016 11:06 AM

**To:** CouncilMail

Greetings All:

The attached testimony is being requested to be read in the record tonight

Sent from my

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Ramsey Alexander Jr <[ramseyalexjr@aol.com](mailto:ramseyalexjr@aol.com)>

**Date:** July 18, 2016, 10:52:30 AM EDT

**To:** "[cball@howardcountymd.gov](mailto:cball@howardcountymd.gov)" <[cball@howardcountymd.gov](mailto:cball@howardcountymd.gov)>

**Subject:** County Bills on Affordable Housing and TIF

I am Ramsey Alexander, Jr., residing at 10101 Governor Warfield Parkway, Columbia, MD 21044-3319. This is my testimony for tonight's (July 18, 2016) hearing. First, as a 42 year resident of Columbia many changes in town center have been orderly until 2005 when planners and others forgot about affordable housing and Jim Rouse's plan to have the workers that work here live here. Transportation has not been well planed or thought out. The Council has also forgot that to have Affordable Housings developers (HHC, builders, and others) must have clauses, conditions, and provisions that can be enforced in their contracts. The contracts have to state must and shall as to the 15% Affordable Housing legislation. I am currently out of town and hope to be available when the Council has its next work session on the above issues. Thanks for the opportunity to have my testimony read into the record.

Sincerely,  
R. Alexander, Jr.

Sent from my iPhone  
443.277.1117



**FW: Housing**

Ball, Calvin B

**Sent:** Monday, July 18, 2016 12:51 PM**To:** Sayers, Margery**Cc:** Pruum, Kimberly; Bailey, Najee; Calvin Ball [philosopherpoet2@yahoo.com]

Please add to the testimony spreadsheet. Thanks.

Trish

---

**From:** Ken Katzen [mailto:kkatzen01@gmail.com]**Sent:** Saturday, July 16, 2016 2:54 PM**To:** Ball, Calvin B**Subject:** Housing

Dear Mr. Ball, We are concerned about Town Center development. We are quoting Liz Bobo below, because she says it better, and with a much more complete knowledge, than we could:

Though[we] are concerned about the lack of preparation for the increased infrastructure that the additional development will require, our main concern is that we not become an exclusive community. We can still say that Jim Rouse conceived Columbia to be “a place where the CEO and the janitor could live in the same community,” and he did just that. Now we are in danger of losing that quality and moving further and further from his values.

Both Lloyd and I have more than a little experience in land use public policy, and we are deeply troubled by what is currently before the County Council, with the exception of one bill.

*We support Councilmember Jen Terrasa’s bill which would require Howard Hughes (the successor to The Rouse Company and General Growth Properties) to provide that 15% of all new housing in Town Center be moderately priced. This is currently required of developers in all other areas of Howard County. We would like to see this bill be made even stronger in the mix of “affordable” housing it would require.*

*We oppose the other six bills currently before the County Council, particularly the one granting a TIF (Tax Increment Financing) to the developer, Howard Hughes, which is strongly promoting this legislation. Passage of this legislation would bequeath to that developer a huge (roughly \$90 million) gift at the expense of the taxpayers.*

This issue is often described as “very complicated”. It is not. For 35 years or more the Rouse Company paid for all of the infrastructure costs as a matter of doing business. Who should now pay for the roads, parking structures, roads, sewers, etc. demanded by the great amount of additional development in Downtown Columbia? My answer is the current developer, Howard Hughes, who will reap the profit, not the county taxpayers.

TIF’s, which have now been prohibited in California, the state in which they originated, were initiated for use in economically distressed communities. I don’t believe Downtown Columbia qualifies.

Currently we are observing the tragic consequences of economic injustice all over the globe.... We do not want increased economic discrimination in our own county.

We could not agree more.

Ken & Harriett Katzen

**FW: Legislation regarding Downtown Columbia development**

Ball, Calvin B

**Sent:** Monday, July 18, 2016 1:18 PM

**To:** Sayers, Margery

**Cc:** Pruim, Kimberly; Bailey, Najee; Calvin Ball [philosopherpoet2@yahoo.com]

Margery,

Please add to testimony spreadsheet. Thanks

Trish

-----Original Message-----

From: joan oliver [<mailto:joanfoliver@gmail.com>]

Sent: Wednesday, July 06, 2016 5:20 PM

To: Ball, Calvin B

Subject: Legislation regarding Downtown Columbia development

County Council Member Ball,

Please consider rescheduling the upcoming legislative hearing regarding the Development of Downtown Columbia to later in the year. This is important legislation and should have the full input from the citizenry. Thank you.

Joan Oliver

Charles Schwenz

**CB52,53,54,55,56. CR103,104,105**

Paul Verchinski [verchinski@yahoo.com]

**Sent:** Monday, July 18, 2016 1:22 PM**To:** CouncilMail**Cc:** Paul Verchinski [verchinski@yahoo.com]

I am hopeful that you will vote AGAINST these Bills and Resolutions. I would have come personally to testify last Thursday and tonite except that last week I was out of state and tonite I host my brother who is an At Large Delegate for Bernie Sanders from New Mexico to the Democratic National Convention.,

Especially rankling is providing under CB56, a TIF, to Howard Hughes Corp (HHC) . HHC is valued at \$4.63 Billion and does not need a handout. When Rouse/HRD built Columbia, roads, school sites, and other infrastructure where paid by them. Now it seems that a \$4.63 Billion corporation needs a TIF subsidy of \$90 Million. TIFs are meant for rehabbing, razing, and redoing older areas like Long Reach, Oakland Mills, and Owen Brown. We need TIFs for those areas and not for unbuilt greenspace.

If you must do a TIF, I would suggest you include funding for \$20 million for a new pedestrian, bicycle, and transit bridge over US29. After all, HHC has stated over and over again that this highly dense Creascent (as dense as Manhattan) will only work if residents walk, bike, and use transit.

Regarding the 40 year hold harmless agreement for HHC, this is a really bad deal for Howard County taxpayers. Times do change and binding HoCo for 40 years does not allow for any changes.

Paul Verchinski 5475 Sleeping Dog Lane Columbia, MD 21045 410.997-3879

**CB43, 44, and 45**

Paul Verchinski [verchinski@yahoo.com]

**Sent:** Monday, July 18, 2016 1:36 PM**To:** CouncilMail**Cc:** Paul Verchinski [verchinski@yahoo.com]

I would like you to vote FOR these bills.

Councilwoman Jen Terrasa's bills are easily understood and do not bind HoCo to increase down town density from 5500 units to over 6500 units. This is the way affordable housing should be done. Spread out in market rate housing and not concentrated on land owned by HoCo. This 'affordable housing' proposed by Kittleman will in all likelihood not be included on the property tax rolls as I understand is the case for other existing Housing Commission projects in HoCo. This should be a major consideration for you since almost 90% of HoCo's revenues are from property taxes and the piggyback county income tax.

Paul Verchinski 5475 Sleeping Dog Lane Columbia, MD 21045 410.997-3879

## **Upcoming Legislation**

Steve Greif [sgreif@comcast.net]

**Sent:** Monday, July 18, 2016 5:48 PM

**To:** CouncilMail

I strongly urge you to support Jen Terrasa's bill requiring Howard Hughes to provide that 15% of all new housing in Town Center be moderately priced. This is currently required of developers in all other areas of Howard County, and is certainly in line with Jim Rouse's vision in the founding of Columbia.

I also feel that granting Hughes a \$90 million TIF is excessive, in that they would reap all the profits from the new development, and there is no reason the taxpayers of Howard County should have to pay for all of the required infrastructure for this development. Perhaps some amount considerably less than that might be appropriate.

Sincerely,

Stephen Greif  
11385 Heathertoe Lane  
Columbia, MD 21044

## **Our written testimony in opposition to the Administration/Howard Hughes Corp. proposed legislation**

Ellis F. [greenjeep06@gmail.com]

**Sent:** Monday, July 18, 2016 5:56 PM

**To:** CouncilMail

To the Howard County Council:

We oppose the proposed legislation regarding the Howard Hughes Corp. Crescent property development, because it uses our tax money (Tax Increment Financing), which is supposed to be used for public infrastructure projects, to benefit a private developer, Howard Hughes Corp.

The Corporation plan will overwhelm our local schools. We understand there is no provision by Howard Hughes Corp. to pay for the additional school construction which would be required to accommodate the additional students.

We also oppose the plan because it will greatly increase traffic density along Broken Land parkway. Has an engineering study of traffic feasibility been performed?

Additionally, a 40-year freeze on legislation affecting the development seems unreasonable.

We support the alternative plan of Ms. J. Terrasa, which does not use our tax money to benefit a private developer, and which represents a reasonable, feasible new apartment density consistent with the planned community in which we have lived for the past 18 years.

Sincerely,

Mr. Ellis and Dr. Harriet Feldman  
10337 Whitewasher Way  
Columbia, MD 21044



## Written testimony on Downtown Columbia legislation

Liz Bobo [lizbobo1@gmail.com]

Sent: Monday, July 18, 2016 6:39 PM

To: CouncilMail

Dear Councilmembers,

I attended your public hearing last week and was encouraged by the respectful tone given such very strong feelings on every side of the issues of the Downtown Columbia bills before you for consideration.

I had intended to return this evening and testify in person. I have just learned that I cannot, so I am sending this message for the legislative record.

Below is a message I sent out last week to some of my contacts in our county. I realize that it is not in the most common form for public testimony on a serious legislative matter. Yet when I reread it I was aware that it captures as clearly as possible my thoughts and deeply held beliefs on these most important economic justice bills. So I am sending it just as I sent it out to those contacts in our county

I know you realize just how important the issues before you are from a social and economic justice perspective. I ask that you reach deep into your souls and vote accordingly.

If there is any way in which I can be of help, please let me know.

Thank you for your service to our county, I know that it is not always easy.

Liz Bobo

**Liz Bobo**

## Reflection and Action for Columbia

*The accelerated legislative agenda of our Howard County Council regarding further development in Town Center prompted me to send this one mid-month action item.*

*This is the first local public policy issue on which I have spoken out since leaving public elected office a year and a half ago after more than thirty years in public service. I hope you share my deep concern and that you contact the County Council at [councilmail@howardcountymd.gov](mailto:councilmail@howardcountymd.gov).*

Unusual for me, my heart is heavy as I sit at my laptop. I have been calling on all of my stalwarts – Thich Nhat Hanh, the Dalai Lama, Zach, Thomas Merton, Pema Chodron, Pope Francis, and more recently Elie Wiesel – to help me pull myself back from deep sadness in observing what is happening on our planet, in our nation and state, and right here in in Jim Rouse's beloved New Town of Columbia. The international and even the national problems often appear as beyond our control, and to a large extent that is accurate since it will take our whole nation and international solutions. Our local Columbia concerns, in contrast, are wholly within our own control.

Opening Thich Nhat Hahn's "Being Peace" for my early morning reading today, my eyes fell upon this gem: "Life is filled with suffering, but it is also filled with many wonders, such as the blue sky, the sunshine, the eyes of a baby. To suffer is not enough." Then just a couple pages beyond, "...we must be able to smile in our sorrow because we are more than our sorrow." I closed my book and recalled another favorite, "Pain is unavoidable. Suffering is optional", and then

proceeded to type this message.

I have attended several community meetings in the past few weeks about the upcoming legislation regarding further development in Town Center. Though Lloyd and I are concerned about the lack of preparation for the increased infrastructure that the additional development will require, our main concern is that we not become an exclusive community. We can still say that Jim Rouse conceived Columbia to be "a place where the CEO and the janitor could live in the same community," and he did just that. Now we are in danger of losing that quality and moving further and further from his values.

Both Lloyd and I have more than a little experience in land use public policy, and we are deeply troubled by what is currently before the County Council, with the exception of one bill.

We support Councilmember Jen Terrasa's bill which would require Howard Hughes (the successor to The Rouse Company and General Growth Properties) to provide that 15% of all new housing in Town Center be moderately priced. This is currently required of developers in all other areas of Howard County. We would like to see this bill be made even stronger in the mix of "affordable" housing it would require. We oppose the other six bills currently before the County Council, particularly the one granting a TIF (Tax Increment Financing) to the developer, Howard Hughes, which is strongly promoting this legislation. Passage of this legislation would bequeath to that developer a huge (roughly \$90 million) gift at the expense of the taxpayers.

This issue is often described as "very complicated". It is not. For 35 years or more the Rouse Company paid for all of the infrastructure costs as a matter of doing business. Who should now pay for the roads, parking structures, roads, sewers, etc. demanded by the great amount of additional development in Downtown Columbia? My answer is the current developer, Howard Hughes, who will reap the profit, not the county taxpayers.

TIF's, which have now been prohibited in California, the state in which they originated, were initiated for use in economically distressed communities. I don't believe Downtown Columbia qualifies.

Currently we are observing the tragic consequences of economic injustice all over the globe. Please let your Councilmembers know that we do not want increased economic discrimination in our own county. If you agree please let your County Councilmember know.



## Downtown Columbia Redevelopment Testimony

Stuart Keitz [uscanfam@verizon.net]

Sent: Monday, July 18, 2016 8:49 PM

To: CouncilMail

July 18, 2016

I registered to testify at the July 14 hearing. I apologize that I could not stay until I was called to the podium. Please accept this message as my testimony.

I am Stuart Keitz of 6242 Cricket Pass, Columbia. I am in my 40th year of residency at this address. I have registered to testify, because, in discussions with my neighbors, both long-term and recent residents, all have expressed alarm at the current trend of development in Columbia. We all came to Columbia from big cities and other suburban communities, drawn by Columbia's reputation as a planned city of good schools, excellent amenities, and the infrastructure to support them. Key here is the term "planned". As a result, Columbia has been a place of relative safety and has provided our children with the environment and opportunities to become responsible and productive adults.

At Thursday's hearing, I heard enthusiastic testimony that the redevelopment plan will carry out Jim Rouse's vision for Town Center. I'm not familiar with the specifics of how the current plan comports with the original plan, however, I do know Mr. Rouse's vision was that of a "planned city". That term implies that Columbia would not suffer from the chaos and blight of so many older cities, where developers pursued their projects without regard to their effect on infrastructure and quality of life. Mr. Rouse's vision can only be achieved when development of residences, schools, medical facilities, commercial development, and necessary infrastructure of Town Center and surrounding villages progress in harmony. That is not what is contemplated here. Indeed, there was testimony that the rapid construction of commercial buildings and high-density housing at Town Center would have a grave impact on the quality of life in Columbia, but it was considered only in isolation. It failed to focus on the big picture, i.e., the simultaneous addition of high-density housing in the villages which will amplify that impact.

There is one other comment I would like to make with regard to the testimony I heard Thursday. There were many references made to "affordable housing", but it was not fully described as it relates to the development of high-density housing in Columbia. Some pointed to the need for housing for those who work in Columbia at a certain level of income. None of the testimony discussed another type of "affordable housing", that provides for residents with no earned income. I grew up in a New York City housing project which concentrated, in one area, large numbers of those with no income and those with low incomes. Many were moved from areas where filth and crime were part of everyday life and they brought those qualities with them. Some the testimony did include negative comments on proposals to concentrate "affordable housing" in specific locations instead of distributing it. I urge you, as someone who experienced first-hand the crime and degradation in that kind housing, not to make the same mistake here. I recall a speech Eleanor Roosevelt made in a late-1950's visit to a New York City slum, in which she stated "buildings don't make slums, people do".

## **HCLS Visibility of New Facilities**

joelhurewitzaug2010@gmail.com on behalf of Joel Hurewitz [joelhurewitz@gmail.com]

**Sent:** Tuesday, July 19, 2016 12:35 AM

**To:** CouncilMail

**Attachments:** HCLS Facilities Executive ~1.pdf (1 MB) ; HCLS Facility-Recommendations.pdf (3 MB)

Dear Council Members,

As requested during my testimony on July 18, attached please find the HCLS "Facility Recommendations" and the "Howard County Facilities Assessment and Master Plan 2004-2030" adopted October 26, 2004 by the Library Board of Trustees.

Thank you for considering a better location for the new Central Library.

Joel Hurewitz

**HOWARD COUNTY**  
**FACILITIES ASSESSMENT AND MASTER PLAN**  
**2004 – 2030**

*Adopted October 26, 2004 by the Howard County Library Board of Trustees*

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The Howard County Library (to be known hereon as HCL) continues to experience significant growth in the community's use of all library services. It outperforms peer libraries in almost all areas of standard accepted performance measures. To plan for the future delivery of library service in this growing jurisdiction the County, working together with the Library, issued a request for consultant services to create a twenty-five year Library Facilities Assessment and Master Plan for Howard County. The goal of both the County and the Library was to be able to provide for library facilities that would not only be responsive to changing service needs, but would also anticipate the service needs and expectations of county residents. One particular area of focus was to address those County's Planned Service Areas which are under-served by existing library facilities. The County selected PROVIDENCE *Associates Inc* for the project and charged the firm with:

- Assessing current library services and identify future services
- Studying the physical condition of existing library facilities and determine the adequacy of those facilities to serve the current county population and the projected population through the year 2030
- Devising standards
- Making recommendations for all aspects of a library capital program
- Developing a program of requirements for a proposed Ellicott City Branch Library.

PROVIDENCE began its work with the Library's Administration, Project Team and Leadership Team in March, 2004.

To date PROVIDENCE *Associates* has:

- Identified both current and projected library usage patterns
- Created a county demographic profile
- Conducted a peer comparison of library output measures that compare HCL with six other Maryland library systems whose boundaries are contiguous to the County, and with four other comparable public libraries in the United States
- Gathered stakeholder input to determine satisfaction levels with current services and to identify changes in the way library services need to be provided in the future
- Assessed the physical infrastructure of all existing library facilities,
- Established library facility service areas for Howard County that will serve for at least the next twenty-five years,
- Focused on the issues related to the current Miller Branch Library facility and service area

## **LIBRARY FACILITIES ASSESSMENT**

The appropriate sizing of public library facilities is determined by the complement of services to be offered in response to community need and expectation and the population of the service area.

### **Size of Library Facilities**

All Howard County libraries at this time, with the exception of Glenwood, are too small for providing the current array of service offerings and collections to the number of residents being served. With the County's population expected to increase by approximately 28% over the next 25 years and with new services and additional technology resources that will need to be provided, the existing library facilities are also too small to provide future service to a growing customer base throughout the County.

Nationally established best practices for adequately sizing library facilities recommend one square foot (1 SF) of library space per capita. Currently Howard County is providing .62 SF of library space per capita, or 178,000 SF for a population of 273,400. Hence, the library system is under-sized for served its current population base. It requires 35% percent more space than it currently has.

The need to increase the library space for Howard County is especially significant given the extraordinarily high proportion of residents who use their libraries regularly, which at 95%, is among the highest in the nation. By the year 2030 the County's population is projected to grow to 320,000. At that point the Library will need a total of 320,000 SF of library space to adequately serve County residents. Therefore, HCL needs to add at an additional 142,000 SF of space over the next 25 years.

As libraries engage in adding space through both the expansion of existing facilities (where possible) and the construction of new facilities, it is imperative that the design of these spaces include maximum adaptability to accommodate not only what we know is needed today, but also to accommodate what we do not yet know will be needed in the future. As the core of the communities they serve, all libraries should include spaces that welcome users and that provide for a variety of community activities and gatherings.

Any new and replacement facilities need to be located in highly visible, frequently traveled, accessible areas of the communities they serve. Ample parking is an essential requirement.

## **V. FACILITY RECOMMENDATIONS**

In this section of the report the consultant team presents its recommendations with regard to the library facilities that Howard County will need to provide its residents over the next 25 years.

The consultant team presents first two general recommendations designed to guide the HCL over the next several years, followed by detailed recommendations and then recommendations that address standards for information technology. This section concludes with recommendations that address signage issues as a way of bringing increased uniformity for customer satisfactions and more user-friendly facilities.

### **BUILDING SIZE AND LOCATION**

All Howard County libraries at this time, with the exception of Glenwood, are too small for providing the current array of service offerings and collections to existing residents. (Glenwood will soon be too small unless our collection weeding recommendations are instituted).

Knowing that the County's population will increase by approximately 28 percent (28%) over the next 25 years and new services and additional technology resources must be provided, the existing library facilities are too small to meet the needs of current and future customers throughout Howard County.

Nationally established best practices for adequately sizing library facilities is one sq. ft. (1 SF) of space per capita. Currently Howard County is providing 178,000 SF of library space for a population of 273,400. By the year 2030, the county population is projected to be 320,000 and the library will need a total of 320,000 SF of library space to adequately serve County residents. The HCL needs to add at least 142,000 SF of space over the next 25 years.

All new library buildings and renovations must be designed to maximize the adaptability of space in order to be able to easily respond to new formats, technologies, and services that have not yet been identified. As the core of the communities they serve, all libraries should include spaces that welcome and provide for a variety of community activities and gatherings. This translates into multiple meeting rooms, quiet study areas for individuals and groups, auditoriums, computer training labs, teen spaces that stimulate socializing and self-learning, teen areas that provide this unique group a "fun" place to gather and opportunities to participate in creative activities, engaging children's areas that include programming and story-hour spaces and promote interaction between parents/caregivers and children.

New facilities need to be located in highly visible, well trafficked, accessible areas of the communities they serve. Ample parking is required. For libraries of 20,000 SF a site of four acres is required, libraries of 35,000 SF require a six to seven acre site, and libraries of 80,000 SF will require an eight to ten acre site.

## GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on population projections to the year 2030, the consultant recommended Program of Service and on site observations, and the physical assessment of all existing facilities, the consultants recommended

- Addressing immediate critical infrastructure repair and replacement needs of current facilities
- Increasing Library space by approximately 142,000 SF by 2030 (based on national guidelines of providing 1 SF per capita of library space).

## DETAILED RECOMMENDATIONS

Detailed recommendations for increasing Library space by 142,000 SF by the year 2030 were presented to the Library Board of Trustees on October 26, 2004. The Library Board voted unanimously to adopt the recommendations in priority order as listed below.

- Construct a brand new 82,500 SF Ellicott City Library. Estimated Cost: \$26,000,000 excluding site acquisition. (Estimated to 4<sup>th</sup> quarter 2006) (See Director's office for Detailed Program of Requirements)

Relocate Administrative Offices/Back-of-House operations from Central Library to the 23,500 SF Miller facility renovated for office space. Central Library gains 7,000 SF and East Columbia Library gains 9,000 SF. Central gains 30 public parking spaces

(previously staff parking spaces).  
Estimated Cost: \$1,000,000

- Renovate both the Central and East Columbia libraries to incorporate the vacated administrative space as public service space. Estimated Cost: \$1,164,300
- Pending an analysis of the existing site, replace the current ElkrIDGE Library with a new 35,000 SF facility. Estimated Cost: \$11,000,000 (includes demolition of existing building)\*
- Pending an analysis of the existing site, replace the current Savage Library with a new 35,000 SF facility. Estimated Cost: \$11,000,000 (includes demolition of existing building)\*
- Construct a new 25,000 SF library (likely in the Maple Lawn Farms or Waverly Woods areas) depending on the ultimate location of the Ellicott City facility. Estimated Cost: \$7,500,000.

\*Site Analysis is recommended to determine amount of space and parking that can be constructed on the existing site per County planning guidelines.

In addition, the Howard County Library Board of Trustees also adopted the standard of one square foot (SF) of library space per person for Howard County libraries.

Total estimated project cost for implementing these recommendations is approximately \$57,700,000 in 2004

dollars (with exception of new Ellicott City Library estimated to 4<sup>th</sup> quarter 2006). For cost estimation beyond 2004 a 3.5 annual inflation rate should be applied. Detailed space planning spreadsheets for each facility can be found in Appendix F.

Currently library space per capita in Howard County is at .62 SF per person. With the county population projected to increase by 28% by the year 2030, per capita library space must increase by .38 SF per person. Meeting or exceeding the 1 SF per capita standard is vital for the library to be able to accommodate continued high use by county residents.

There are a number of libraries in the United States that currently meet or exceed the 1 SF of space per capita standard. Below is a representative sample.

**Libraries with 1 SF of Library Space per Person – and More**

<i>Library</i>	<i>Population</i>	<i>SF Per Capita</i>
Berkeley, CA	104,000	2.8
Skokie, IL	63,000	2.1
Cleveland, OH	478,000	1.7
Cerritos, CA	54,000	1.6
Schaumburg, IL	182,000	1.6
Salt Lake City, UT	182,000	1.6
Birmingham, AL	243,000	1.5
Seattle, WA	572,000	1.5

**FACILITY STANDARDS FOR INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY**

In addition to the facility recommendations above, PROVIDENCE has provided Facility Standards for Information Technology

that need to be considered during the programming and design of any new library. These standards address the following:

- Network Infrastructure
- RFID
- Theft Detection Systems
- Materials Handling System
- Staff Computing
- Public Computing
- Self Service
- Communications Systems.

**Network Infrastructure**

The infrastructure for the network includes both the wired and wireless systems. A system that utilizes both is recommended for new construction, renovations, and existing facilities.

The design and installation of, and the materials for, the wired and wireless systems should comply with industry standards. The Electronics Industry Association (EIA) and the Telecommunications Industry Association (TIA) are large industry trade groups that promulgate and update wiring standards on an ongoing basis. Standards must be checked to verify the most recent edition before the start of any project.

The library's voice and data infrastructures should be designed at the same time and in an integrated fashion. Increasingly, telephone, computer, and video technologies are merging as all standardize on digital transmission.

Category 6 cabling is recommended. Fiber should be used for the network backbone.

A wireless local area network should be considered as an extension or supplement to the library's wired LAN. Wireless Access Points should be located throughout the library. While developments in wireless systems continue, at this time, wireless systems are recommended for consideration for the following primary uses:

- Public laptops
- Staff mobile computers
- Training and computer labs
- Staff mobile ip phones
- Security cameras
- Extension of existing wired systems when wiring is too expensive or not feasible in renovations or existing facilities.

Network and computer equipment being purchased should support a 10 Gbps backbone and 1 Gbps to the desktop in a managed switch installation. Equipment must be installed in secure spaces which were designed for this purpose with adequate room for efficient management and future growth. Storage space must accommodate space for IT supplies, storage of critical boxes, and secure storage for critical materials and documents. Work space for IT staff must be provided in each building regardless of whether permanent staff member are assigned to that location. Space must be sufficient to allow equipment to be repaired.

## RFID

New building designs must accommodate Radio Frequency Identification (RFID) technology for use now or in the future. Libraries are increasingly adopting and implementing RFID to improve efficiency and integrate functions. RFID can be used by the

library to manage the charging and discharging (circulation) of library materials and may also be used by the Theft Detection System.

When used to manage the charging and discharging of library materials, the RFID system is integrated with the library's Integrated Library System. Specific components that must be designed to accommodate RFID include:

- Circulation desk charging and discharging stations
- Circulation workroom charging and discharging stations
- Book and materials return windows or drop points
- Self-service stations
- Technical services tagging or processing stations.

When used to manage a Theft Detection System, the RFID system is integrated with the Theft Detection System. When a Materials Handling System is in use, the RFID system is integrated with it.

## Theft Detection System

New building designs must provide for the installation of a Theft Detection System to control the loss of library materials. The system must be installed at all public exits.

## Materials Handling System

Plans for new buildings of 50,000 SF or more should be reviewed for the inclusion of a Materials Handling System. Systems of varying complexity and scope are available. Even a simple system, which sorts materials returned through a book return into just a few



bins by category, such as this building vs. other buildings, or adult collections vs. children's collections, could save staff time and decrease the time to return materials to the shelves.

### **Staff Computing**

IT components for library staff may include computer, flat monitor, speakers, and a variety of peripherals which may include: PDA dock, barcode scanner/RFID reader, and multifunction device (fax, scanner, and printer). Laptops, rather than desktops, should be provided for staff who move from building to building or lack a permanent office. Offices should be configured with voice and data jacks, and power outlets on at least two different walls within an office, ideally on each wall as the budget allows. Jack and power outlet placement should take into account the furniture design and placement to avoid having data jacks and power outlets inaccessible behind desk modesty panels, bookcases or credenzas.

### **Public Computing**

Both the use of library-provided equipment and library customer-provided equipment must be supported. Wired and wireless network access should be provided, although the library may wish to limit access to only wireless. Power should be provided for at least some customer equipment. Increasing use of library customer equipment should be anticipated. Furniture should make it easy for library staff to monitor and for library customers to find available equipment. The arrangement of library equipment in an information commons design can achieve this objective.

A variety of spaces should be designed in new facilities for public computing, including quiet areas where individuals or small groups can use personal computers. Space for public printers, print release stations, and reservation stations to reserve public computers should be provided consistent with the time and print management system which the library selects.

### **Self Service**

Self-service should be supported in all facilities. Minimal services include copying and printing. Self-check should also be provided in all facilities except in existing facilities which cannot accommodate the addition of the equipment and renovation is not possible. New facilities should provide sufficient space for the addition of self-check units. The number of units is based on the library's goal for the percent of check-outs to be handled by the self-check units.

### **Communications Systems**

Communications systems include:

- Telephone
- Public address
- Satellite
- Cable television
- Dynamic digital signage.

New buildings and renovations must include a telecommunications infrastructure that supports digital communications systems. Voice over IP (VoIP) phone systems should be implemented when new phone systems are selected or existing phone systems are upgraded or replaced.

Dynamic digital signage systems should be included in new building designs and considered for renovations. The ability to quickly deliver information to library customers and to update it can easily be achieved with the use of such a system.

## **BUILDING SIGNAGE**

A uniform signage system is needed for all existing and new HCL facilities. The signage system should encompass these features:

- Select a font type and size that is appropriate for the space, whether exterior or interior
- Select a material that can be changed by staff without damage to the building
- Provide exterior signs that provide the name of the facility, state its hours of operation on a weekly basis, and facilitate the promotion of "today's events" and/or forthcoming events
- Locate all exterior yard signs perpendicular to the street(s)
- Use terms that the lay public is generally familiar with, e.g. "Ask for Assistance Here" and not "Reference Desk."

The consultants further recommend that a Request for Proposal (RFP) be developed in order to obtain the services of a signage consultant.

**FW: Vote Yes for CB 43,44,45 Vote No to TIF**

Sigaty, Mary Kay

**Sent:** Tuesday, July 19, 2016 12:31 PM

**To:** Feldmark, Jessica; Sayers, Margery

For legislative file.

—  
Mary Kay Sigaty  
Howard County Council, District 4

3430 Court House Drive  
Ellicott City, MD 21043  
(410) 313-2001

---

**From:** Ellron [mailto:ellron2@verizon.net]

**Sent:** Monday, July 18, 2016 5:54 PM

**To:** Sigaty, Mary Kay; Ball, Calvin B; Fox, Greg; Weinstein, Jon; Wilson, B Diane; Terrasa, Jen; Kittleman, Allan

**Subject:** Vote Yes for CB 43,44,45 Vote No to TIF

Dear Members of the Howard County Council:

It was interesting to be at the Council meeting last Thursday when so many citizens from so many distinguished organizations came to testify against the shenanigans of the Howard Hughes Corporation: the HCCA, the HC League of Women Voters, the Hickory Ridge Village Board, the Town Center Village Board, the African American Coalition, the Wilde Lake Middle School PTSA, the Association of Community Services, PATH, the Full Spectrum Housing Coalition, the HC Educators Association, and individual citizens of Howard County.

I would like to lend my voice to the above and ask the Council to vote in favor of Jen Terrasa's alternate plan. Vote for CB 43, 44, and 46-2016.

Please vote against TIF. Certainly, the Howard County tax payers are not interested in paying for anything that Howard Hughes Corporation thinks it deserves. Why should folks pay for new restaurants, parking, and the MPP? Those efforts are certainly not helping those of us who live in Savage. How about a little TIF for us? We could use some POSITIVE attention down here. We are sick of the Route One Corridor being the "dumping ground" for Howard County. Let's let the Columbia developers pay for their own mess and not involve us!

Jen, thank you for being on our side! I hope the others will listen to citizens as you have.

Sincerely,  
Ellen Long  
8800 Baltimore Street

Savage MD 20763

**Re: [HOWARD-CITIZEN] new Sun article and video about the TIF**

Barbara Russell [babsrussell@comcast.net]

**Sent:** Tuesday, July 19, 2016 4:34 PM

**To:** HOWARD-CITIZEN@yahoogroups.com

**Cc:** CouncilMail; Kittleman, Allan

To Lisa and all,

I don't understand why you and others who make such a good case against the "sweet deal" that the county is proposing to make with HH then say you are in favor of the TIF.

As I've said before, I'm not a lawyer but my common sense and looking at how the county has required other developers to provide a certain percentage of affordable housing in their projects and infrastructure such as roads necessitated by their development, I don't see why the county is willing to throw out those requirements for this out-of-state developer.

Just because the county passed bad legislation in 2010, over the objections of hundreds of people like myself who attended many hearings and wrote much testimony opposing that give-away, doesn't mean that there is nothing that can be done now or in the future to require that HH meet certain requirements THAT WERE NOT SPECIFICALLY EXCLUDED in the 2010 legislation. I believe that is the reason that HH is now proposing the "cannot change for 40 years" legislation they are also proposing -- to cover anything the county might impose at this time or in future legislation.

I agree with those who have said, if this corporation continues to twist the county's arm by saying it cannot afford to develop unless the county picks up the tab for their infrastructure, etc. development costs, fine let HH sell their property to another developer. I'm sure there are major developers who know they can make a decent profit developing downtown Columbia without holding the county hostage and making unreasonable demands.

I get the feeling that HH is using the, what I think is unreasonable, profit they want to make on the Columbia project to balance out losses they may have on other projects (maybe Las Vegas, if HH is still invested there). I think this would be worth looking into by someone who understands this kind of accounting. Remember, HH's mother corporation General Growth Properties went bankrupt but retained their successful mall businesses across the country while splitting off the community developments like Columbia to HH. Howard County tax payers should not be paying for the the results of bad business decisions made by either GGP or HH.

Barbara

On Jul 19, 2016, at 12:46 PM, [lmarkovitz@comcast.net](mailto:lmarkovitz@comcast.net) [HOWARD-CITIZEN] wrote:

Thanks for those figures Chris,

There is a clause some folks are referencing that there is a "reasonable" profit limit over which HHC shares the profit with the County. I haven't yet seen what "reasonable" is supposed to be in this deal, nor what the sharing ratio is that is proposed. Those will be interesting numbers to review.



I too am in favor of the TIF because I believe it is the only way we will get the infrastructure needed to accommodate the large influx of density. I believe the developer should be paying what others are made to pay for that infrastructure and I don't like that they are getting such a sweet deal with so much on their side, and not enough on "our" side. I find it odd to take the approach on this deal that we are begging for this development to happen and it needs such incentive to occur. I cannot believe that developing Downtown Columbia isn't something that is desired to be done by HHC, and all the assistance to do so is icing. They are basically being allowed to only provide 5% affordable housing (on their own property), are given the TIF assistance with paying less for public works on their own, and reduced parking requirements (so the max density will fit) and the cherry on top of a moratorium on changing any regulations applying to their projects for 40 years.

Lisa Markovitz

---

**From:** "Chris Alleva [jens151@yahoo.com](mailto:jens151@yahoo.com) [HOWARD-CITIZEN]" <[HOWARD-CITIZEN@yahoogroups.com](mailto:HOWARD-CITIZEN@yahoogroups.com)>  
**To:** [HOWARD-CITIZEN@yahoogroups.com](mailto:HOWARD-CITIZEN@yahoogroups.com)  
**Sent:** Monday, July 18, 2016 8:35:20 PM  
**Subject:** RE: [HOWARD-CITIZEN] new Sun article and video about the TIF

I'm in favor of the TIF, but I would like to set the record straight on the developer's investment returns on the Metropolitan.

Using the land basis before the 2009 writedown of \$1 million per acre HHC earned a 400% year 1 return. Their 50% share of net operating income is \$3.5 million annually or 22.29%.

HHC's 5 year cash on cash return is 642%. Six hundred forty two percent. The historical average for the S&P 500 is around 10%.

This information is from HHC's SEC reports.

HHC can do this privately it will just be more complex.

Chris Alleva

---

**From:** 'Alan Klein' [Alan@Klein.Net](mailto:Alan@Klein.Net) [HOWARD-CITIZEN]  
**Sent:** 7/18/2016 2:37 PM  
**To:** [HOWARD-CITIZEN@yahoogroups.com](mailto:HOWARD-CITIZEN@yahoogroups.com)  
**Subject:** RE: [HOWARD-CITIZEN] new Sun article and video about the TIF

And here is the key statement from that article, said by Stan Milesky, the county's finance department director: "[Howard Hughes] could not be expected to do all the things we have here and earn less than market rate return on their investment. That's what it comes down to."



Columbia is a planned community - based on a set of social values, not just market forces or physical characteristics. Jim Rouse could have earned a higher rate of return if he had not insisted that 36% of the land he purchased be, essentially, given to the public through CA. Jim Rouse could have earned a higher rate of return if he had not insisted that affordable housing be built - by him. Development in Columbia has always insisted on recognizing the cost of investing in social values.

If Howard Hughes is not willing to accept the social values investments necessary to develop in Columbia, perhaps it's time we insisted on another "Master Developer".

~Alan Klein

---

**From:** [HOWARD-CITIZEN@yahoogroups.com](mailto:HOWARD-CITIZEN@yahoogroups.com) [<mailto:HOWARD-CITIZEN@yahoogroups.com>]  
**Sent:** Monday, July 18, 2016 8:35 AM  
**To:** [HOWARD-CITIZEN@yahoogroups.com](mailto:HOWARD-CITIZEN@yahoogroups.com)  
**Subject:** [HOWARD-CITIZEN] new Sun article and video about the TIF

Article in the Baltimore Sun about the TIF, with an interesting little video explanation at the top, paid for by Howard Hughes:

<http://www.baltimoresun.com/news/maryland/howard/columbia/ph-ho-cf-downtown-tif-introduction-0721-20160714-story.html>

HH is now openly talking about \$127 million in regard to the TIF, rather than just the initial \$90 million.

If you have not yet testified, please come testify at tonight's hearing!

Lada

On 07/18/16, Barbara Russell [babsrussell@comcast.net](mailto:babsrussell@comcast.net) [HOWARD-CITIZEN]<[HOWARD-CITIZEN@yahoogroups.com](mailto:HOWARD-CITIZEN@yahoogroups.com)> wrote:

To Chao and all,

Thank you for forwarding the message from Howard Hughes.

You may be interested in knowing that (I believe it was) during the brief couple of weeks between the meeting in which the Columbia Association Board introduced the motion to give IAT control of Symphony Woods and the subsequent vote, a citizen who was a former high ranking administrator in the Ulman administration circulated an email petition in support of the IAT proposal, that CA claimed resulted in many signatures. The Columbia Association subsequently gave control of Symphony Woods to IAT and cited the email petition as being a strong factor indicating the will of the majority of those testifying.

Because the vast majority of people who testified publicly actually opposed the IAT proposal, I asked for a copy of the email list of names. The CA president and board refused to release the list so that we had no idea who the people on the list were -- or if they were CA Annual Charge Payers, or even Howard County residents or business owners or how they might have profited from the deal.

Look at things as they now stand with regard to the Symphony Woods property. Almost no development now or in the foreseeable future (with the exception of one feature basically paid for by the county), almost all of the money CA gave to IAT gone, Mr. McCall receiving approximately a couple of hundred thousand dollars and now saying he is planning to leave IAT.

Beware of the numbers game! And, also look at who is supporting the HH proposal as a result of HH's request for support and what those people might have to gain if the legislation is passed.

Barbara

On Jul 14, 2016, at 12:43 PM, Chao Wu [chaowu2016@gmail.com](mailto:chaowu2016@gmail.com) [HOWARD-CITIZEN] wrote:

FYI.

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

From: **Howard Hughes** <[community@downtowncolumbia.com](mailto:community@downtowncolumbia.com)>

Date: Thu, Jul 14, 2016 at 12:10 PM

Subject: Act Now to Pass the Legislative Package for Downtown Columbia

[View this email in your browser](#)

[The entire original message is not included.]

Good Afternoon -

Thank you for your efforts in supporting the Downtown Columbia Plan.

Your work thus far has helped bring improvements to our Downtown like Whole Foods, The Metropolitan and the Merriweather Post Pavilion renovation.

---

---

Posted by: [lmarkovitz@comcast.net](mailto:lmarkovitz@comcast.net)

---

NOTE 1: When you choose REPLY, it will go to the entire group.  
To send to one member, enter that address in the TO window.

NOTE 2: HCCA does not take responsibility for the content of messages posted on  
the listserve; assertions should be verified before placing reliance on them.

▪

**VISIT YOUR GROUP**

[Privacy](#) • [Unsubscribe](#) • [Terms of Use](#)

---

**FW: Downtown Columbia Housing**

Ball, Calvin B

**Sent:** Wednesday, July 20, 2016 10:04 AM

**To:** Sayers, Margery

**Cc:** Pruiam, Kimberly; Bailey, Najee; Calvin Ball [philosopherpoet2@yahoo.com]

Margery,

Please add to testimony spreadsheet. Thanks

Trish

**From:** Jennifer Germuth [mailto:jcgermuth@gmail.com]

**Sent:** Monday, July 18, 2016 7:48 PM

**To:** Ball, Calvin B

**Subject:** Downtown Columbia Housing

Please postpone these meetings until the fall, as that will give more time for me and everyone else within this community to read and understand these bills.

**FW: TIF - please do not pass legislation as-is; please take more time to listen and please come up with a better deal for Columbia!**

Sigaty, Mary Kay

Sent: Wednesday, July 20, 2016 10:46 AM

To: Sayers, Margery

---

From: Christine Piatko [christine.piatko@gmail.com]

Sent: Sunday, July 17, 2016 11:21 PM

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

Cc: Kittleman, Allan

Subject: TIF - please do not pass legislation as-is; please take more time to listen and please come up with a better deal for Columbia!

July 17 2016

I respectfully request that you take more time on deciding this issue, and not rush into committing 40 years of one slice of our county's potential tax future in haste over this summer. Especially after reading that the Baltimore Sun has called this proposed TIF "the largest in the county's history"

<http://www.baltimoresun.com/news/maryland/howard/columbia/ph-ho-cf-downtown-tif-introduction-0721-20160714-story.html>

Last Thursday night was the first time in all the years I've lived in Columbia (24 years) that I ever attended a county council meeting. I did not testify, though friends asked me to, as I was trying to understand more about the complexity of what is proposed for downtown and what fellow citizens think about it. The meeting was long, and seemed like nothing was decided. And very hard to understand how the different testimony will be affecting the Council's vote. (And unclear to me if the vote is now or October?)

It did feel historic - Columbia at 50, a small subset talking through some of their hopes and fears of what Columbia might become over the next 40 years. Some (like me) who chose Columbia for its mix of great schools and quiet tree-lined neighborhoods - others seeing Columbia fulfilling what they see as its ultimate destiny, as a city, with a real downtown. Folks testifying in suits and dresses - others testifying in shorts. Some well prepared and well spoken - others rambling away. Concerns expressed about schools, about jobs, about the arts, about our children's future, about... parking.

You, as our elected officials will need to continue integrate over all these different points of view. Through these, and other upcoming choices, you are threading a path for the future of Columbia.

(I would like to pause here to thank Calvin Ball for presiding very efficiently and yet respectfully over the whole proceeding, no matter the particular speaker.)

What I heard overall Thurs. did not sound like a fair deal for Columbia in the long term.

The proposed TIF and locking in for 40 years with the DRRRA (except for health and safety issues) did not sound worth it.

The parking garage deal did not sound like it would really solve the parking problems, the guarantees were very unclear of how it really would be "shared". (And confused who owns Merriweather right now - if Howard Hughes does, could it resolve the problem first itself before transferring the pavilion to the arts council?)



It seems very wasteful to need to pay to move the Central library we just paid to renovate. Relocating a fire station sounds expensive- and it was not clear what land that would be built on (or is it staying where it is with the low income housing above it?).

Testimony against concentrated low income housing, and some of the known problems it can lead to, made me concerned about this legislation's approach to concentrate housing. (Also, housing for 80% median income sounds like market rate housing, not aiding affordable housing.)

As someone whose children go to schools like Wilde Lake HS, concerned more thought is not being given to downtown school overcrowding issues up front, including potential new school locations.

Stating this is not a tax burden seems incorrect (e.g. Per Kittleman "Using only the increased tax revenue from the new development will ensure that taxpayers are not burdened with these costs.") - it may not be taking away current actual \$ - but it will take away those tax \$ decisions from future generations.

I was very influenced by LaTonya Peters' personal testimony. It reminded me that I too came to Columbia and bought my home here because of its excellent schools (six years before having kids), its quiet suburban feel, its tree lined streets. I grew up in NYC - and did not want to live in a city to raise my family, nor in suburban cities like Silver Spring or Montgomery County or Northern Virginia.

In sum, based on the testimony presented Thurs., I feel this "deal" for downtown does not seem like a good enough deal for Columbians.

My personal request is that you do not pass this proposed legislation as is. At the very least please consider Jen Terrassa's alternate legislation.

And, please keep looking to hammer out a better deal for Columbia.

I believe we can do better. That YOU can do better.

If we were still in a recession that would be one thing - but we don't seem to be. This "deal" is tipped far too in favor of the developer.

(Finally - Please also consider ways of advertising additional hearings more widely. I am not sure how they could show up on Facebook more easily for example - perhaps on the Howard County Government page.)

Sincerely,  
Christine Piatko  
11894 Blue February Way  
Columbia, MD 21044

**FW: downtown columbia legislation**

Sigaty, Mary Kay

**Sent:** Wednesday, July 20, 2016 10:46 AM**To:** Sayers, Margery

---

**From:** elizabeth moss [eliz.moss@gmail.com]**Sent:** Saturday, July 16, 2016 3:27 PM**To:** Sigaty, Mary Kay**Subject:** downtown columbia legislation

i am writing to ask you to support Jen Terrasa's legislation for downtown columbia and to oppose the administration's legislation. As a resident of swansfield, i am well aware of the problems of concentrated affordable housing and i do not believe that an increase in this problem would benefit our community. the vision of jim rouse was to integrate all aspects of our society. unfortunately, we currently have street pockets of housing problems. the schools in the area are dominated by low income housing residents and incoming families move to wealthy district. additionally, we need more parking and infrastructure in that area, not less. it is impossible to drive through town center or to get from this side of columbia to the other side. and as a resident of the area, i want to know that i can park if i want to enjoy the amenities that come with increased traffic. howard hughes has already received more handouts than they should and enabling their ability to shift infrastructure costs to tax payers is not in this area's interest. and why would the government give up the ability to change the law in the next 40 years. the inability to predict that far into the future is evident by all of the problems that columbia is struggling with. please vote in favor of jen's bill which protects the interest of this county and columbia, and most especially this district and community.

**FW: Deep Disappointment with Developer's Plan**

Sigaty, Mary Kay

**Sent:** Wednesday, July 20, 2016 10:47 AM

**To:** Sayers, Margery

---

From: marcia gorrie [marciagorrie@comcast.net]

Sent: Saturday, July 16, 2016 12:12 PM

To: Sigaty, Mary Kay

Subject: Deep Disappointment with Developer's Plan

I have supported you in the past, Mary Kay, and admired your teaching, your work with the craft show, as well as the political positions we hold in common such as environmental concerns. But now I will be very disappointed if you support the developer's position negating the agreed upon 15% of affordable housing that was the zoning board's 2010 requirement. This group does not seem committed to make Columbia better, but rather they seem to be committed to making money. These are not the ideals with which James Rouse began Columbia. I support Jennifer Teresa's bill. I hope you will too.

Sincerely,  
Marcia Gorrie

**FW: Support the County Administration's Legislative Package for Downtown Columbia**

Sigaty, Mary Kay

**Sent:** Wednesday, July 20, 2016 10:47 AM

**To:** Sayers, Margery

---

**From:** Stephen Cherry [user@votervoicenet]  
**Sent:** Friday, July 15, 2016 8:03 PM  
**To:** Sigaty, Mary Kay  
**Subject:** Support the County Administration's Legislative Package for Downtown Columbia

Dear Councilmember Sigaty,

As a resident of Howard County, I ask that you support the County Administration's legislative package for Downtown Columbia, including the Joint Recommendations on affordable housing and the TIF proposal.

Unanimously approved in 2010 by the Council after significant community input and support, the time has come to realize the vision of the Downtown Columbia Plan.

We finally have the opportunity to establish a diverse Downtown where those that serve the community can also live in the community, where public infrastructure and amenities benefit the entire county, and where hundreds of thousands flock to hear world-class music.

Please pass the Joint Recommendations on affordable housing and the TIF proposal - for the benefit of Downtown Columbia and all of Howard County.

Sincerely,

Stephen Cherry  
5009 Orchard Dr  
Ellicott City, MD 21043  
campers@yahoo.com

**FW: Anne Arundel County TIF Activity**

Meyers, Jeff

**Sent:** Wednesday, July 20, 2016 3:21 PM  
**To:** Sayers, Margery  
**Attachments:** Anne Arundel County TIF A~1.docx (15 KB)

For inclusion in the downtown Columbia bill files – CB56 and CR105

---

**From:** Richard Story [mailto:rstory@howardbank.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 20, 2016 3:18 PM  
**To:** Meyers, Jeff  
**Subject:** FW: Anne Arundel County TIF Activity

Jeff:

It was great seeing you Monday evening. Glad to see you are gainfully employed by Howard County.

I just sent Jessica an email and got her “out of the office” auto response.

Sending you this FYI.

Dick

**Richard W. Story**

Senior Vice President  
Director of Community Relations and Government Affairs  
and Business Development Liaison  
6011 University Boulevard, Suite 370  
Ellicott City, MD 21043  
Direct Dial: 410 988-1759  
Mobile: 410 236-2782

Please visit us: [www.howardbank.com](http://www.howardbank.com)



---

**From:** Richard Story  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 20, 2016 3:13 PM  
**To:** Calvin Ball <cball@howardcountymd.gov>; Mary Kay Sigaty <mksigaty@howardcountymd.gov>; Jennifer Terrasa <jterrasa@howardcountymd.gov>; Greg Fox <gfox@howardcountymd.gov>; Jonathan Weinstein <jweinstein@howardcountymd.gov>  
**Cc:** Jessica Feldmark <jfeldmark@howardcountymd.gov>; Allan Kittleman <akittleman@howardcountymd.gov>; Larry Twele <ltwele@hceda.org>  
**Subject:** Anne Arundel County TIF Activity

To the Howard County Council:

Pursuant to our conversation during the Council’s public hearing Monday evening, I have talked with Anne Arundel County Budget Director John Hammond, who has provided additional detail on the major

TIF financings our neighboring county has authorized. You will find that data on the attached Word document.

Mr. Hammond also made the following statements:

- ALL tax-increment financings in Anne Arundel County that were “developer driven”, are back-stopped by agreement with the developer and all involve a special taxing district.
- The 6 transactions all are performing/performed in accordance within expectations established at the outset
  - One did not “break even” immediately as anticipated. It is performing now.
  - 2 of the 8 projects listed have been created, but have not yet been funded. (#7 and #8 on the attachment)
  - Over the years, most have been refunded (refinanced) to take advantage of more favorable interest rates.
- Correcting one statement I made during my testimony: the FY 2016 Budget for Anne Arundel County was enriched by \$31 Million from active TIF’s **AFTER DEBT SERVICE**. This is the “profit” Anne Arundel County is reaping.
  - This amount is expect to grow each year.
  - Once retired and debt service is satisfied, all commercial tax revenue within the TIF district goes to the General Fund.

I will be attending you Work Session on Monday, July 25 and will be prepared to further elaborate on these projects.

If the period for testimony is still open, I would add to my written comments:

There are two strong arguments for proceeding with TIF financing now:

1. Immediate tax base to service debt – as you know, there are a number of construction projects relating to the evolution of the Downtown Columbia Plan including two major Class-A office buildings. Creating the district now captures the commercial property taxes to be paid by the two developers involved. Once the MD Department of Assessment and Taxation assesses these structures, they are on the tax rolls of Howard County. That tax revenue will go to the County’s General Fund, but by creating the district before that taxable milestone guarantees a significant debt service component early in the life of the bonds.
2. The competitive environment should also be considered – the close-in competition for job creation and growth in the commercial tax base is basically the Baltimore/Washington Corridor, comprised mostly by Howard and Anne Arundel County (and small portions of Baltimore and Prince Georges Counties). Anne Arundel County is our most formidable rival in the increasingly keen competition for new jobs. Good, family-supporting jobs. The primary economic engines of this corridor are BWI Airport and Fort Meade/NSA. Today, TIF financing at National Business Park and Arundel Mills is helping developers build up their ready inventories of Class-A office space. We are playing catch-up already.

If we want to “win” the next Harkins Builders and MedStar health opportunities in Columbia, we need to have product on the shelf. If a prospect cannot see a building, either existing or under construction, it doesn’t exist.

That’s my additional testimony. If however, the period for input is closed please disregard the above



paragraphs, but please do consider the attachment as a description of the battlefield.

Looking forward to seeing you next week.

Dick

**Richard W. Story**

Senior Vice President  
Director of Community Relations and Government Affairs  
and Business Development Liaison  
6011 University Boulevard, Suite 370  
Ellicott City, MD 21043  
Direct Dial: 410 988-1759  
Mobile: 410 236-2782

Please visit us: [www.howardbank.com](http://www.howardbank.com)



---

"This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. This communication represents the originator's personal views and opinions, which do not necessarily reflect those of Howard Bank. If you are not the original recipient or the person responsible for delivering the email to the intended recipient, be advised that you have received this email in error, and that any use, dissemination, forwarding, printing, or copying of this email is strictly prohibited. If you received this email in error, please immediately notify [postmaster@howardbank.com](mailto:postmaster@howardbank.com)"

## Recent Tax Increment Financing in Anne Arundel County

1. **National Business Park**: two separate TIF events each in support of public utilities and roads.
  - Two separate TIF projects: 1999 and 2010
  - Most recent = \$25 Million, opening up an additional +/- 250 acres for development, primarily office buildings with a few amenities
2. **Arundel Mills**: TIF funded significant road improvements connecting project area (800-1000 acres) to Md. Rt. 100
  - 1999
  - Primarily road improvements supporting the development of the Arundel Mills Mall
3. **Park Place**: TIF funded public parking within the four level underground parking structure (two levels are public, two levels private).
  - 2005
  - Refunded in 2013
  - \$25 Million financing
4. **Airport Square/BWI Tech**: TIF funded interchange improvements at West Nursery Rd and 295 and environmental mitigation at BWI Tech Bus Park.
  - Initially created in Mid-1980's
  - Primarily Transportation Bonds within the TIF district, debt service payment from Highway user revenues
5. **Waugh Chapel**: TIF funded public roads, utilities and environmental mitigation (seal over fly ash dump).
  - No additional details

6. **Parole Town Center**: TIF funded road improvements – underpass and interchange at MD Rt. 50 and Solomons Island Rd. This road improvement primarily benefitted Anne Arundel Medical Center when it moved from Annapolis City to current site just off Rt. 50. (Separately the Greenberg-Gibbons redevelopment benefitted from a Brownfields Tax Credit, BRIP, based on environmental mitigation.

- Not developer initiated
- \$10 Million from AA County, \$10 Million from MDOT
- Viewed as very successful
- Now paid off

**Pending, but not Active:**

7. **Maryland Live Hotel and Conference Center**: *project now under construction; TIF funded road, utilities and structured public parking in support hotel and conference center; County will benefit from use of Conference Center for public meetings and Anne Arundel High School graduations.*

- \$22.5 Million
- *Approved by the AA County Council*
- *Still in formative stage. No bonds issued to date*
- *Waiting for developer (Cordish Co.) decision. (may go forward without TIF assistance.*

8. **Odenton TOD TIF**: *TIF District was established in 2014 but not yet implemented; future funds will be blended with MDOT funds for structured parking and utilities.*

- *To benefit MARC Station in Odenton*
- *Would be blended with Transit Oriented Development funding*

Sources:

Anne Arundel County Economic Development Corporation CEO Robert Hannon – July 18, 2016

Anne Arundel County Budget Officer John Hammond – July 20, 2016

**Affordable Housing bills**

Helen Ruther [heruther@hotmail.com]

**Sent:** Wednesday, July 20, 2016 3:34 PM**To:** CouncilMail

I'm very disappointed in what appears to be your support of the administration's bills on affordable housing. Why are you abandoning the 2010 zoning bill's requirement for 15% of all newly built housing in downtown to be affordable? Why let Howard Hughes out of their obligation to provide affordable housing on their own property not on County owned property? These bills provide a big give away to the developer as well as adding 900 more units to the 5500 already planned for. Using TIF is another big give away. It's my understanding that TIF is designed for deteriorating neighborhoods which Downtown Columbia definitely is not. Why are you letting Howard Hughes avoid their obligation to provide infrastructure for their development. The Rouse Company always did. I strongly support Jen Terassa's bill which is consistent with the original 2010 zoning. I hope you all do the right thing. I'll be watching closely.

Helen Ruther

## **Affordable housing in Columbia Town Center**

Eileen Clegg [eileensclegg@gmail.com]

**Sent:** Wednesday, July 20, 2016 5:01 PM

**To:** CouncilMail

Please support Jan Terrasa's Bill to require The Howard Hughes Corporation to provide 15% of all new housing in The Town Center of Columbia to be moderately priced. Please support economic justice and equity for all income levels. I want to live in a town with housing opportunities for all income levels. Thank you. Eileen Clegg, 6007 Flywheel Court, Columbia MD 21044. A resident of Columbia for 41 years.

**Howard Hughes**

Jean Israel [jbw3013@yahoo.com]

**Sent:** Wednesday, July 20, 2016 5:02 PM

**To:** CouncilMail

I strongly support Jen Terressa's motion. Howard Hughes has taken advantage of the Howard county tax payer for sometime. It's about time somebody takes a stand. Our County Executive has let us down.

Jean Israel  
5353 smooth Meadow way  
Columbia,MD

Sent from my iPad