



Howard County Council

George Howard Building
3430 Court House Drive
Ellicott City, Maryland 21043-4392

COUNCILMEMBERS

Deb Jung, Chair
District 4

Liz Walsh, Vice Chair
District 1

Opel Jones
District 2

Christiana Rigby
District 3

David Yungmann
District 5

Minutes – Approved

Legislative Work Session
Tuesday, January 23, 2024
Hybrid Meeting (Virtual and In-Person Meeting)
Video Streamed on <https://cc.howardcountymd.gov/watch-us>
9:30 a.m.

Chair Jung opened the meeting at 9:38 a.m.

Members present: Deb Jung, Chair; Liz Walsh, Vice Chair; Christiana Rigby; and David Yungmann.

Staff present: Michelle Harrod; Isaiah Anderson; Trish Hammond; Gary Kuc, County Solicitor; Amanda Mihill; Owen Clark; Lori Buchman; Theo Wimberly; Owen Kahn.

Administration staff: Rafiu Ighile, Department of Finance; Quanita Kareem and Tom Wall, Department of Housing and Community Development; Lynda Eisenberg and Anthony Cataldo, Department of Planning and Zoning.

Agenda:

CB1-2024 - Introduced by The Chairperson at the request of the County Executive
AN ORDINANCE authorizing and empowering the County to issue up to \$17,200,000 of its special obligation refunding bonds at a maximum interest rate not to exceed 6.10% per annum in order to refinance the cost of certain public improvements relating to the development district in Howard County, Maryland known as the “Annapolis Junction Town Center Development District” (the “Development District”) ...; and generally ratifying the levy, imposition, collection and application of such special tax and the issuance of refunding bonds in accordance with the Acts identified herein.

Mr. Ighile gave an overview of CB1, including the Department of Finance’s policy to review issued bonds for the opportunity for 3% savings for the County. Mr. Ighile responded to questions from the Council on the purpose of the bill; how the current interest rates affect the bond market and why the potential for savings is so high; how construction at Annapolis Junction affected the bonds; the tax that the developer is paying; the full cost of construction of the garage at Annapolis Junction and how many parking spaces are in the garage; how the time is calculated when issuing bonds and what the maximum time for a bond is; whether this bill would

extend the time of the bond; if the developer has developed enough tax revenue to service the debt; if the revenue generated from the special tax is only used to service the debt; what happened between 2015 and 2018 to generate revenue and who was paying the debt service before development began generating revenue; what happens when the bond expires; how many people are using the MARC station parking garage; if the 3% savings is calculated from the bond or from the interest payments; who owns what land in Annapolis Junction; and other plans for public improvement in the district and if the bond is exclusively for the parking garage.

Council requested follow up:

- The number of parking spaces built in the Annapolis Junction MARC station.
- On the Columbia TIF special taxing district, a report on the over and above the debt service

CB4-2024 - Introduced by Liz Walsh

AN ACT repealing certain provisions of law that provide optional methods for a developer to provide moderate income housing units under the zoning regulations and that allow a developer to request permission from the Director of Housing to use alternative compliance to certain optional methods; repealing certain provisions of law relating to market-based required alternatives to the moderate income housing unit obligation; repealing certain provisions of law relating to alternatives to moderate income housing unit obligation in certain zones; repealing certain provisions of law relating to the sale of moderate income housing units; repealing certain provisions of law relating to the rental of moderate income housing units; altering certain definitions and certain regulations; and generally relating to the sale of moderate income housing units.

Ms. Walsh gave an overview of the legislation and discussed how fee-in-leu are collected for projects in the County. Ms. Walsh discussed the provisions of the bill, including closing a potential loophole in age restricted affordable housing; incentives for creating low income or disability housing units; the reporting requirements; and what is being eliminated in the legislation. There was a general discussion about what exactly is proposed to be eliminated. The Department of Housing and Community Development discussed how the priority period works and if there is a deficit of qualified applicants. Ms. Walsh discussed reverting to the general public of for sale units. Ms. Walsh proposed cutting the priority periods and age restricted adult housing sections. Ms. Walsh and Ms. Rigby discussed the MXD zoning and overlay. Ms. Walsh discussed active projects that pay fees-in-leu instead of building low income and affordable housing. Ms. Walsh asked what provision of law authorized \$1 million for Morris Place and substituting units. Ms. Jung asked how the Housing Department calculated fee-in-leu numbers and how many actual MIHU units were built by developers. Ms. Kareem discussed how the fees-in-leu are applied to smaller lots. Ms. Jung asked if the program was correctly balancing revenue for housing programs and requirements for increasing the number of affordable units. Ms. Jung discussed the General Plan's proposals for new affordable and workforce housing, including how those new units will interact with MIHU requirements. Ms. Rigby asked how the MIHU requirements are applied in single family homes versus in multifamily projects. Ms. Rigby asked how adoption of the proposed bill would impact the Housing Department's budget and projects.

Ms. Rigby asked about the necessity of the priority period for helping match up a resident to a unit. There was a general discussion about how the programs works during a resale of a home and how that requires the priority period. Ms. Rigby asked Ms. Walsh about the multiplex dwelling unit provisions of the bill. There was a discussion about the merits of the provisions and what should be retained or removed and what happened at previous projects. Ms. Walsh discussed data on the programs and how the money is spent by the Department. Ms. Rigby discussed Dorsey Overlook and what other programs the Department administers with these funds. Ms. Walsh asked what section of the code authorizes those programs. Ms. Jung asked what would happen inf fee-in-leu was removed for age restricted but kept multiplex housing. There was a discussion about how the Council felt about removing certain provisions.

Council requested follow up:

- The actual number of MIHU units built by developers in the County.
- A breakdown of when and why an adult age restricted MIHU is applied.
- The MIHU agreement entered into with Morris Place.

The meeting adjourned at 11:15 a.m.