

Sayers, Margery

From: Ben Fabina <bfabina@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, July 10, 2017 2:25 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: Opposition to CB60 Without Major Amendments

County Council,

We are very concerned with CB60 which will allow for industrial mulching and composting on ag preserve farmland and on all of RR/RC throughout Howard County. The current zoning language contained in CB60 is unacceptable and not only puts the rural communities at risk for well-documented safety and health concerns from industrial mulching, but now also makes this a countywide issue.

As it currently reads, there are clear loopholes that will allow those posing as tree farmers to conduct industrial mulching activities from 2 acres up to 5 acres, depending on whether on Howard County ag (ALPP), RR or RC parcels. This will result in unacceptable risks to ensuring the well-being of children, families and all individuals living in affected areas. Furthermore, DPZ has demonstrated a clear inability to enforce clear violators of CB20. We now ask, how can DPZ protect our families when loopholes in CB60 will allow for industrial mulching to occur, making enforcement even more challenging?

County Executive Kittleman, through CB60 introduced on his behalf, has simply not keep to his campaign promise to ensure that there is no possibility of industrial mulching on both Howard County and State of MD ag preserve parcels, despite his recent claims to the contrary. There is no separate section in CB60 that deals with State of MD ag (MALPF) restrictions (only Howard County ag). We worked hard to get State of MD ag restrictions included in the current zoning language for CB20 and are disappointed that it has been omitted from CB60.

We do not want up to 50 large semi and commercial trucks on our rural roads per day. We do not want to jeopardize the safety of our school children, runners, cyclists. We do not want groundwater and air contamination threatening our family's health.

There are many other key amendments needed in CB60 to make it acceptable to the health and well-being of thousands of families throughout Howard County. We are counting on the County Council to course correct with amendments added to CB60 to clearly prevent any chance of industrial mulch facilities from operating throughout farmland in Howard County, other than in M1/M2 commercially zoned land. This is the only way our Councilmembers will ensure everyone in potentially affected areas continues to be protected by current zoning regulations defined in CB20. Please take this matter seriously and add needed amendments to CB60 that we feel is unacceptable as it now stands.

Thank you.

Ben Fabina, PE
443-538-4682

Sayers, Margery

From: Kathy Burns <klynburns@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 10, 2017 1:19 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: Opposition to CB60 Without Major Amendments

County Council,

I am very concerned with CB60 which will allow for industrial mulching and composting on ag preserve farmland and on all of RR/RC throughout Howard County. The current zoning language contained in CB60 is unacceptable and, not only puts the rural communities at risk for well-documented safety and health concerns from industrial mulching, but now also makes this a countywide issue.

As it currently reads, there are clear loopholes that will allow those posing as tree farmers to conduct industrial mulching activities from 2 acres up to 5 acres, depending on whether on Howard County ag (ALPP), RR or RC parcels. This will result in unacceptable risks to the well-being of children, families and all individuals living in affected areas. Furthermore, DPZ has demonstrated a clear inability to enforce sanctions against clear violators of CB20. We now ask, how can DPZ protect our families when loopholes in CB60 will allow for industrial mulching to occur, making enforcement even more challenging?

County Executive Kittleman, through CB60 introduced on his behalf, has simply not keep to his campaign promise to ensure that there is no possibility of industrial mulching on both Howard County and State of MD ag preserve parcels, despite his recent claims to the contrary. There is no separate section in CB60 that deals with State of MD ag (MALPF) restrictions (only Howard County ag). We worked hard to get State of MD ag restrictions included in the current zoning language for CB20 and are disappointed that it has been omitted from CB60.

There are many other key amendments needed in CB60 to make it acceptable for the health and well-being of thousands of families throughout Howard County. We are counting on the County Council to course correct with amendments added to CB60 to clearly prevent any chance of industrial mulch facilities from operating throughout farmland in Howard County, other than in M1/M2 commercially zoned land. This is the only way our Council members will ensure everyone in potentially affected areas continues to be protected by current zoning regulations defined in CB20.

Please take this matter seriously and add needed amendments to CB60 that we feel is unacceptable as it now stands.

Thank you,

Kathy Burns

Sayers, Margery

From: Stacey Bozman <bozmanstacey@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 10, 2017 12:56 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: CB60-2017

To all Howard County Council members,

Last fall my family relocated from Weston, Florida to Dayton, Maryland. My husband accepted a job as General Manager of Tennis for Columbia Association. We looked at dozens of homes in Columbia, Ellicott City, Clarksville and Dayton. We chose to live in Dayton because of its tranquil rural setting. We wanted our children to be able to breathe clean air and enjoy the nature around them. To now learn that industrial mulching is being proposed is extremely upsetting. I do not want my children's future and the future of Dayton and other rural communities to be jeopardized by big business trying to make a bigger profit. Please consider the damage that will be done if this bill is allowed to pass. I am not an activist but all of my neighbors and I are willing to do whatever we have to do to keep Dayton safe, clean and beautiful.

Sincerely,

Stacey Bozman
14170 Twisting Lane
Dayton, MD

Sent from my iPhone

Sayers, Margery

From: Michael Burns <mp_burns@live.com>
Sent: Monday, July 10, 2017 11:36 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: CB60 IS UNACCEPTABLE WITHOUT MAJOR REVISIONS

I'm a tax-paying property owner in Dayton, Maryland. Howard county officials are considering severely infringing on my family and friends right to living in a safe and healthy environment.

Industrial mulch presents unacceptable health and safety risks to nearby residents. THESE ARE KNOWN FACTS:

- The wood dust and fine particles are carcinogenic that can be in our air over long distances affecting residents. Cases of suspicious cancer have been found in areas close to unsafe mulch sites.
- The massive trucks that carry industrial mulch cannot properly maneuver or stop on our narrow country roads creating major safety concerns for children, joggers, cyclists, residential traffic. Deaths have already resulted from this problem elsewhere. If allowed in Howard county, it would be only a matter time before deaths occurs here.
- There is an unacceptable increase in traffic and road damage caused by up to 50 heavy trucks a day and up to 100 employees entering and leaving these sites
- There is an unacceptable noise levels nearby the facilities from large grinding machines
- There is well and water contamination creating likely health risks to the residents along with potential massive cleanup and legal costs
- Mulch Fires are all too common and have occurred with homes and wooded areas nearby

Because of these FACTS, industrial mulching has no place in rural Dayton or other rural communities in this county. Industrial mulch is not farming. Bill CB 60-2017 as it exists today would allow unscrupulous business owners to convert farms into "tree farms" for the real purpose of operating an industrial mulching business. The only way that CB 60-2017 would be acceptable is with the following amendments:

- Compost/Mulch on RR/RC/All Ag
- Limit shipment to that required for the farming product produced, i.e. shipment with trees, shrubs, plants
- Limit truck size to small trucks (include definition) that must contain product from the farm
- Restrict Industrial Shipment to M1/M2
- Add restrictions on M1/M2 (covered facilities)
- Add State Ag to County Ag – same rules
- Ban these uses on cluster subdivision parcels
- Stricter enforcement, larger fines that escalate as violations continue, and more aggressive enforcement for violation
- Further define "Emergency NWWR"

You need to do the right thing for the rural residents of this great county. If not, this will not stop here. We're will fight this until harmful industrial mulching is stopped and there is a significant turnover in the county composition to one that understands the importance of resident health and safety.

Michael Burns
14044 Big Branchy Dr
Dayton, MD 21036

Sayers, Margery

From: Pioneer Painting <pioneerpainting@verizon.net>
Sent: Monday, July 10, 2017 10:22 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: CB-60-2017/OPPOSED: Timothy & Pamela Burgess 5071 Green Bridge Road, Dayton, MD 21036

To: Howard County Council – All Members:

In Re: CB-60-2017

Timothy & Pamela Burgess 5071 Green Bridge Road, Dayton, MD 21036 – OPPOSED

Margaret Burgess 4941 Ten Oaks Road, Dayton, MD 21036 – OPPOSED

We are residents of Dayton since 1987. Before that, my parents moved to Dayton in 1964 and I grew up living here.

This is a BAD LAW and should not pass without major amendments.

We do not believe that Bobby Orndorf is a bad person or unscrupulous in any way. He is a businessman and, as such, he will work within the framework of the law to maximize his profits. More power to him.

The problem is YOU GUYS have drafted BAD LAWS that contain loopholes that can be exploited by businessmen.

AMEND THE BILL TO CLOSE THE LOOPHOLES BEFORE YOU PASS IT

Land Use: Two trends are of intense concern: the loss of productive agricultural land to urban, industrial, and mining development and the conversion of marginal lands and underdeveloped areas to agricultural use.

- In general, land should not be converted from those agricultural uses which protect long-term resource productivity.
- In areas not now in agricultural use, land-use classifications and policies should be developed and implemented before conversion is permitted.
- Those seeking to convert land to other uses should bear the burden of proving that the proposed new use is more important to current and future public welfare and that there is no other feasible location for the proposed use.
- Comprehensive land-use planning is necessary to ensure a balance of lands for all purposes. It is important that there be wide public and professional participation in the planning process and that farmers, ranchers, and other agricultural professionals participate in land-use decisions.
- Zoning and land-division policy and practice should be restructured to serve as a substantive control over conversion of agricultural lands.
- Tax policy, to the extent that it encourages conversion of agricultural land, must be reformed. Examples include adoption of differential assessment and tax deferral techniques, restructuring of estate and inheritance taxes to promote continuity of family farming, and elimination of tax shelters.
- The concept that "highest and best use" of land and water resources is that which can pay the highest immediate price must be modified to reflect the long-term goal of preserving agricultural productivity and natural resources.

- Soil erosion control should be focused on prevention of the problem at its source. Special attention should be given to restoration of formerly productive eroded lands.
- In general, smaller, more diverse production units such as family farms, to the degree that they result in increased environmental responsibility, are preferable to the extensive monoculture characteristics of larger units.

Sincerely,

Tim, Pam, & Margaret Burgess

Sayers, Margery

From: Trip Kloser <tripkloser@verizon.net>
Sent: Monday, July 10, 2017 10:03 AM
To: CouncilMail
Cc: karenkloser@verizon.net
Subject: The Kloser's Opposition to CB60 Without Major Amendments
Attachments: The Kloser's Opposition to CB60_Council Mail_Call for Amendments_V3 (1).docx
Importance: High

Dear County Council,

Do the right thing for the 20136 community! Opposite CB60 Without Major Amendments. It's for safety and health reasons you need to do this.

Thanks,

Trip Kloser

14113 Big Branch Drive

Dayton, MD 21036

IMPORTANT

Subject: Opposition to CB60 Without Major Amendments

County Council,

Our family (The Klosers at 14113 Big Branch Drive) are very concerned with CB60 which will allow for industrial mulching and composting on ag preserve farmland and on all of RR/RC throughout Howard County. The current zoning language contained in CB60 is unacceptable and not only puts the rural communities at risk for well-documented safety and health concerns from industrial mulching, but now also makes this a countywide issue.

As it currently reads, there are clear loopholes that will allow those posing as tree farmers to conduct industrial mulching activities from 2 acres up to 5 acres, depending on whether on Howard County ag (ALPP), RR or RC parcels. This will result in unacceptable risks to ensuring the well-being of children, families and all individuals living in affected areas. Furthermore, DPZ has demonstrated a clear inability to enforce clear violators of CB20. We now ask, how can DPZ protect our families when loopholes in CB60 will allow for industrial mulching to occur, making enforcement even more challenging?

County Executive Kittleman, through CB60 introduced on his behalf, has simply not keep to his campaign promise to ensure that there is no possibility of industrial mulching on both Howard County and State of MD ag preserve parcels, despite his recent claims to the contrary. There is no separate section in CB60 that deals with State of MD ag (MALPF) restrictions (only Howard County ag). We worked hard to get State of MD ag restrictions included in the current zoning language for CB20 and are disappointed that it has been omitted from CB60.

There are many other key amendments needed in CB60 to make it acceptable to the health and well-being of thousands of families throughout Howard County. We are counting on the County Council to course correct with amendments added to CB60 to clearly prevent any chance of industrial mulch facilities from operating throughout farmland in Howard County, other than in M1/M2 commercially zoned land. This is the only way our Councilmembers will ensure everyone in potentially affected areas continues to be protected by current zoning regulations defined in CB20. Please take this matter seriously and add needed amendments to CB60 that we feel is unacceptable as it now stands.

Thank you.

Trip Kloser

PS I hope you and Mr. Kittleman do the right thing and permanently make it impossible for Industrial (and that is anything where outside materials are brought in for processing) to ever be permitted on any Maryland or Howard County Ag preserve.

PPSS. I only have 1 vote but all of us in the greater 20136 zip code have many votes that will be cast at next election.

Sayers, Margery

From: Strickland, Brent C. <bstrickland@wtplaw.com>
Sent: Monday, July 10, 2017 9:45 AM
To: CouncilMail

County Council,

I am very concerned with CB60 which will allow for industrial mulching and composting on ag preserve farmland in Howard County. The current zoning language contained in CB60 is unacceptable and not only puts the rural communities at risk for well-documented safety and health concerns from industrial mulching, but now also makes this a countywide issue. As currently worded, loopholes will allow those posing as tree farmers to conduct industrial mulching activities from 2 acres up to 5 acres, depending on whether on Howard County ag (ALPP), RR or RC parcels. This will result in unacceptable risks to ensuring the well-being of children, families and all individuals living in affected areas. Furthermore, DPZ has demonstrated a clear inability to enforce clear violators of CB20. We now ask, how can DPZ protect our families when loopholes in CB60 will allow for industrial mulching to occur, making enforcement even more challenging?

County Executive Kittleman, through CB60 introduced on his behalf, has simply not keep to his campaign promise to ensure that there is no possibility of industrial mulching on both Howard County and State of MD ag preserve parcels, despite his recent claims to the contrary. There is no separate section in CB60 that deals with State of MD ag (MALPF) restrictions (only Howard County ag). We worked hard to get State of MD ag restrictions included in the current zoning language for CB20 and are disappointed that it has been omitted from CB60.

We are counting on the County Council to course correct with amendments added to CB60 to clearly prevent any chance of industrial mulch facilities from operating throughout farmland in Howard County, other than in M1/M2 commercially zoned land. This is the only way our Councilmembers will ensure everyone in potentially affected areas continues to be protected by current zoning regulations defined in CB20. Please take this matter seriously and add needed amendments to CB60 that we feel is unacceptable as it now stands.

Thank you.

Brent C. Strickland
Dayton, MD

This transmission contains information from the law firm of Whiteford, Taylor & Preston LLP which may be confidential and/or privileged. The information is intended to be for the exclusive use of the planned recipient. If you are not the intended recipient, be advised that any disclosure, copying, distribution or other use of this information is strictly prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error, please notify the sender immediately.

Sayers, Margery

From: Valerie C. Conn <valerie.conn@grayrockalliance.com>
Sent: Monday, July 10, 2017 9:20 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: CB60 NO!

To whom it may concern,

CB60 makes no sense! Allowing industrial mulching in a rural residential area is plainly idiotic.

This type of industry belongs in an industrial area(B1, M2) such as various parcels along Rt 1 in Jessup or North Laurel.

Ruining a rural residential area is wrong.

Do the right thing. Do your job. Do not allow industrial mulching on Ag preserve land in Howard County. It is a dangerous industrial process that does not belong near homes, especially those on wells which we all have here in Western Howard County.

These back country roads can't handle anymore large trucks. If you haven't already done so, drive down Ten Oaks Rd and through the intersection at Green Bridge(right in front of RLO) on a school day morning. See the back up on Ten Oaks Rd and the buses trying to get into Dayton Oaks Elementary School. We already deal with RLO smaller trucks and the local buses from Eyre Bus Company competing with school buses. Drive through the four corners intersection at 8:45 AM after Sept 5th. You will plainly see that there is already safety issues and a congestion problem. Are you really going to add to that problem?

That is just one of the major issues with allowing industrial mulching in Dayton. We have already had a school bus accident on Triadelphia Road when the bus went over the yellow line hitting a high schooler on her way to Glenelg HS. There were injuries and the bus nearly went over the guard rail into a ravine at the reservoir with five elementary school children on board. Had they hit a larger vehicle such as a heavy truck, the bus would have rolled over down the fire road at the reservoir. It was up on two wheels on its side briefly during the accident. These narrow, curvy, double yellow lines can't handle the traffic we have now. Adding large mulching trucks will certainly end in disaster.

Please protect our children, the environment and the rural residential way of life in Western Howard County. Industrial mulching is not truly farming and doesn't belong here.

Thank you for addressing this very serious issue.

Valerie Conn

(Dayton resident, mother of three school age children)

Sent from my iPhone

Sayers, Margery

From: Jeffrey Hensel <jthensel61@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 10, 2017 8:03 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: Opposition to CB60 Without Major Amendments - Very Frustrated

Subject: Opposition to CB60 Without Major Amendments

County Council,

We are very concerned with CB60 which will allow for industrial mulching and composting on ag preserve farmland and on all of RR/RC throughout Howard County. The current zoning language contained in CB60 is unacceptable and not only puts the rural communities at risk for well-documented safety and health concerns from industrial mulching, but now also makes this a countywide issue.

As it currently reads, there are clear loopholes that will allow those posing as tree farmers to conduct industrial mulching activities from 2 acres up to 5 acres, depending on whether on Howard County ag (ALPP), RR or RC parcels. This will result in unacceptable risks to ensuring the well-being of children, families and all individuals living in affected areas. Furthermore, DPZ has demonstrated a clear inability to enforce clear violators of CB20. We now ask, how can DPZ protect our families when loopholes in CB60 will allow for industrial mulching to occur, making enforcement even more challenging?

County Executive Kittleman, through CB60 introduced on his behalf, has simply not keep to his campaign promise to ensure that there is no possibility of industrial mulching on both Howard County and State of MD ag preserve parcels, despite his recent claims to the contrary. There is no separate section in CB60 that deals with State of MD ag (MALPF) restrictions (only Howard County ag). We worked hard to get State of MD ag restrictions included in the current zoning language for CB20 and are disappointed that it has been omitted from CB60.

There are many other key amendments needed in CB60 to make it acceptable to the health and well-being of thousands of families throughout Howard County. We are counting on the County Council to course correct with amendments added to CB60 to clearly prevent any chance of industrial mulch facilities from operating throughout farmland in Howard County, other than in M1/M2 commercially zoned land. This is the only way our Councilmembers will ensure everyone in potentially affected areas continues to be protected by current zoning regulations defined in CB20. Please take this matter seriously and add needed amendments to CB60 that we feel is unacceptable as it now stands.

Thank you.

Jeffrey Hensel

14088 Big Branch Drive

Dayton, MD 21036

Sayers, Margery

From: Williams <rawmlw@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, July 09, 2017 6:59 PM
To: Kittleman, Allan
Cc: Fox, Greg; Ball, Calvin B; Weinstein, Jon; Terrasa, Jen; Sigaty, Mary Kay; CouncilMail
Subject: CB 60-2017

Importance: High

County Executive Kittleman,

We are writing to express our disappointment with the referenced bill which, as currently written, is very vague and does not even prohibit this process on the Maryland Ag properties in Howard County. It once again opens the door for industrial business owners who have recently purchased farmland to use for their industrial mulch processing, storing and composting. Essentially, everything we fought for in 2014 is being undone with this new bill. This new industrial mulch/composting legislation does NOT include any restrictions **on State of MD (MALPF) ag preserve farmland**. Essentially half of Howard County is State of MD ag, with the other half Howard County ag (ALPP). The county council introduced Amendment 5 to CB-20 which prohibits industrial mulching on MD ag farmland. We argued then, and again now, that not addressing **both** Maryland **AND** Howard County agricultural farmland is tantamount to fencing only half of your yard and expecting that to prevent things from wandering in.

Beyond this huge oversight, which is intentional negligence in our opinion, there are loopholes in the current CB-60 that will allow industrial mulching and industrial composting to occur. Industrial operators playing farmer in disguise will be able to purchase ag preserve on the cheap, only to move their industrial processes onto the farmland and into our communities, presenting risks to families that we simply will NOT accept. Your dismissal of the final report from the Suffolk County Department of Health that investigated the effects of wood waste and compost sites in their county is irresponsible and unethical. Clear and convincing evidence has been presented confirming that such operations contaminate the water. One sample when tested for manganese contamination measured **49,300 ppb** [parts per billion] and the safe ground water/drinking standard for manganese is **300 ppb.**, **164 times greater** than the **safe ground water/drinking standard for manganese**.

CB-60 is unacceptable **without major amendments**. For our safety, our health, and the protection of our environment, these operations must **remain on industrially-zoned land**, which the Dayton location is **NOT**. It is ludicrous to allow otherwise, putting rural residents at verified risk of well water contamination, serious health threats from airborne wood particles and fungal spores which increase the risks of cancer and respiratory diseases, as well as mulch fires, site noise generated by trucks and heavy machinery, truck traffic on rural roads affecting the condition of the roads, and danger to children at bus stops, runners, and cyclists.

In summary, we are therefore **calling for amendments** to protect the rural communities it will put at risk as it currently stands.

Monica and Rich Williams
Dayton

Sayers, Margery

From: BillBird <bill@oldbirds.net>
Sent: Saturday, July 08, 2017 1:26 PM
To: CouncilMail
Cc: Kittleman, Allan; Fox, Greg; Sigaty, Mary Kay; Terrasa, Jen; Ball, Calvin B; Weinstein, Jon
Subject: Council Bill 60 - 2017 (ZRA 180)

I am opposed to this bill!

- 1. We paid land owners to put their properties into Agricultural Preservation with defined restrictions. If you decide to ease the restrictions then they need to repay the money they got for putting the land into preservation.**
- 2. This issue was supposedly debated and resolved in 2014. I do not understand what is driving Kittleman, Fox and Sigaty to push this.**
- 2. Industrial activities (i.e. industrial mulching) are not appropriate on Agricultural Preservation land.**
- 3. The County Executive claims he is against Industrial Mulching on Ag Preservation land but he asked this bill to be submitted. I believe this bill will allow Industrial Mulching on Ag Preservation land. To be consistent with his campaign promises this bill must be withdrawn or significantly restructured.**
- 4. Any attempt to allow industrial activities in our neighborhoods must be carefully considered and structured to not adversely impact the neighborhood. This bill does not provide adequate protection of our neighborhoods.**

If the council still believes there is some overriding community good that drives the need for this legislation than I think the following amendments suggested by Dayton Rural Preservation Society are absolutely necessary:

- Compost/Mulch on RR/RC/All Ag**
- Limit shipment to that required for the farming product produced, i.e. shipment with trees, shrubs, plants**
- Limit truck size to small trucks (include definition) that must contain product from the farm**
- Restrict Industrial Shipment to M1/M2**
- Add restrictions on M1/M2 (covered facilities)**
- Add State Ag to County Ag – same rules**
- Ban these uses on cluster subdivision parcels**
- Stricter enforcement, larger fines that escalate as violations continue, and more aggressive enforcement for violation**
- Further define “Emergency NWWR”**

**William Bird
5251 Ilex Way, Dayton, MD 21036
410-531-2815**

Sayers, Margery

From: Priscilla Trubin <oldtrube@aol.com>
Sent: Friday, July 07, 2017 11:43 AM
To: Ball, Calvin B
Cc: CouncilMail; richeelew@gmail.com
Subject: Re: CB60-2017

Dear Dr. Ball;

You are the first (and the only) Council member to respond to my letter. I appreciate your response and hope that you will take a ride around Western Howard County on your lunch hour to see for yourself the roads and land in question. Imagine the extended construction about to begin on route 32 and the additional traffic congestion on Ten Oaks Road. Imagine 18 wheelers moving trees, debris and mulch several times an hour. Imagine Howard County children waiting for school buses with no shoulders on former carriage roads. I am so sick of public officials only being influenced by near term solutions and crisis management.

Our family will be present at the upcoming events.

Again thank your staff for your sole response to my concerns.

Sincerely,

Priscilla Trubin

5162 Green Bridge Road

Dayton, 21036

Oldtrube@aol.com

410-925-4357

Sent from my iPhone

On Jul 7, 2017, at 10:33 AM, Ball, Calvin B <cball@howardcountymd.gov> wrote:

Good morning,

Thank you for sharing your thoughts about Council Bill 60 (CB60/ZRA 180), sponsored by County Executive Allan Kittleman. I appreciate your insight regarding mulch, composting facilities and natural wood waste recycling operations in Howard County. These are important issues to our community and I want you to know that your voice matters.

While I do not support the bill as drafted, please know that you can count on me to work with my colleagues to address community concerns related to health, safety, and protecting our environment.

Below are some upcoming dates that relate to this legislation and other matters under consideration before the Council. Unless otherwise noted, all meetings are held in the Banneker Room of the George Howard Building, 3430 Courthouse Drive in Ellicott City.

- Monday, July 10 at 8:30am - Monthly Meeting presentation from DPZ/Kittleman Administration
- Monday, July 17 at 7pm - Legislative Public Hearing - Public is invited to testify before the Council
- Monday July 24 at 4:30pm in C. Vernon Gray Room - Council Work Session (if needed)
- Wednesday, July 26 at 10am - Legislative Session

Can't join us but want to tuned in? Stream us online: <http://cc.howardcountymd.gov/Online-Tools/Watch-Us>. As always, I appreciate your lending your voice to this important conversation and our legislative process. I look forward to seeing you on July 17th, if your schedule permits.

All the best,

Dr. Calvin Ball
Howard County Council, District 2
Ph: 410-313-2001

<http://cc.howardcountymd.gov/Districts/District-2/Bio>

A true leader has the confidence to stand alone, the courage to make tough decisions, and the compassion to listen to the needs of others. —Douglas MacArthur

Click below to register for my newsletter:

<image002.png>

From: Priscilla Trubin [<mailto:oldtrube@aol.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, June 27, 2017 10:53 AM
To: CouncilMail <CouncilMail@howardcountymd.gov>
Subject: CB60-2017

I am a resident of Western Howard County, a regular voter- not very politically active, but I am dismayed that the issue of industrial mulch factories on agricultural land has resurfaced to make us sick and pollute our fast diminishing land. My understanding, even though I am a lay person, is that there is scientific proof that our air and water will be affected if this bill becomes law. Who is protecting our health? The Council? The County Executive? Certainly not the Zoning Commission. They have allowed at least three subdivisions to be built on former carriage roads out here. There are 46 houses slated to be built behind my house with access onto Green Bridge Road, a road that doesn't even have a shoulder. Where is the "planning" in the Howard County Plan?

I am disgusted with the secrecy and the lack of representation of my and my neighbors' interests. As regards CB60-2017, it is no coincidence that this bill is being considered in the summer when so many residents go away.

If you respond to this email, it will be a miracle.

Sincerely,

Priscilla Trubin

[5162 Green Bridge Rd](#)

[Dayton, MD 21036](#)

[410-925-4357](#)

Sent from my iPhone

Sayers, Margery

From: Shaw, Molly <mshaw@nvrinc.com>
Sent: Friday, July 07, 2017 10:10 AM
To: CouncilMail
Cc: Shaw, Molly
Subject: Industrial mulching - another example I witnessed this morning - PEASE OPPOSE CB60

Good morning,

As a follow-up to my email yesterday, I wanted to share an experience I had this morning on my way to work.

I live ½ mile south of the Oak Ridge/Bonner industrial operation on Rt. 94 (Woodbine Rd). My address is 3015 Woodbine Rd.

To go to work, I go north on Rt 94, turn right on Florence Road, and then turn right on Jennings Chapel Road toward Rt. 97

As I was on Jennings Chapel road this morning, 3 large "Asplundh" trucks, each carrying a full load of very large logs passed me, going in the opposite direction, on Jennings Chapel road. The trucks were following each other, and it was obvious they were heading to the mulching operation at Oak Ridge/Bonner property.

What concerned me is that right before the trucks passed me, I had to move into the center of the road for 2 walkers and them move over to the right side of the road for a jogger.

As the Asplundh trucks passed me, my immediate thought was the safety of the walkers and jogger I had just passed. Being in a car, I could slow down and give the individuals, out for some exercise, extra room for safety. On this 2 lane, curvy country road, the large trucks loaded down with logs could not do the same.

I said a silent prayer for the safety of the 3 individuals I had just passed.

Industrial mulching must be stopped. The Oak Ridge/Bonner property is not mulching dead wood on its "nursery" property as the residents were first told.

Please oppose CB 60 as written.

If you need to know the exact time, this happened at 7:20am on 7/7/17.

Individual safety, well water safety and road preservation are all at risk.

Thank you,

Molly Shaw
Financial Administrative Office Manager
Ryan Homes
Washington North & Washington East Divisions
4700 Corridor Place, Suite 100, Beltsville MD 20705
301-937-4060

----- This email is confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual to whom it is addressed. If you have received this email in error please contact the sender and be advised that any use, dissemination, forwarding, printing, or copying of this email is strictly prohibited. The terms for the purchase and sale of any property referenced in this email shall be solely determined by a ratified Purchase Agreement. Any information provided in this email, including but not limited to, pricing, financing, features of a property and/or community, is not to be construed as the basis of the bargain for the purchase and sale of any such property.

Sayers, Margery

From: Shaw, Molly <mshaw@nvrinc.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 06, 2017 3:07 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: STOP the Illegal industrial mulching

Good afternoon,

My name is Molly Shaw and I live at 3015 Woodbine Road, Woodbine MD.

I am writing to you to express my deep concern over the continued illegal industrial mulching operation taking place at the Oak Ridge/Bonner Property on Rt. 94 (Woodbine Rd).

I live about ½ mile south of the Oak Ridge property mentioned above. I can tell you that the increased truck traffic carrying heavy logs has increased greatly and is a danger to the area. Larriland Farms is less than ½ mile north of the Oak Ridge Property and there are people unfamiliar with the roads in the area. Bicyclists also use Rt 94 frequently for their long distance rides.

I live on well water, and I am DEEPLY concerned about the well water contamination that will happen. It is only a matter of time until this takes place, unless it has already been affected.

PLEASE OPPOSE CB 60 without amendments controlling the activity of the illegal industrial mulching.

My husband grew up on a farm and understands the need for farmers to make money. However, what is happening at that property is not a tree farmer or nursery trying to get rid of old stock. Trucks are constantly pulling into this property bringing logs for mulching.

Thank you and I will be attending the meeting on July 17.

Molly Shaw
Financial Administrative Office Manager
Ryan Homes
Washington North & Washington East Divisions
4700 Corridor Place, Suite 100, Beltsville MD 20705
301-937-4060

----- This email is confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual to whom it is addressed. If you have received this email in error please contact the sender and be advised that any use, dissemination, forwarding, printing, or copying of this email is strictly prohibited. The terms for the purchase and sale of any property referenced in this email shall be solely determined by a ratified Purchase Agreement. Any information provided in this email, including but not limited to, pricing, financing, features of a property and/or community, is not to be construed as the basis of the bargain for the purchase and sale of any such property.

Sayers, Margery

From: Darren Bush <darbus37@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 05, 2017 7:46 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: Cb 60

I am a very concerned resident of western Howard county in regards to the proposed regulation. It was something that I was worried about prior to moving here from Columbia. When we were informed that the rule was shot down and they would not allow it, it helped make my decision to move our family out here that much easier. We love it out here and do not want the added traffic, trucks, and noted health issues associated with it. We have also seen pictures of other mulch facilities in the area operating on ag preserve and are very fearful.

I strongly oppose the rule and fear for the health and safety of our families.

Sayers, Margery

From: Jeff Harp <irishchargermd@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 05, 2017 6:01 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: CB60

Please review the new NY Suffolk County Health Department report where they unequivocally state that mulch facilities cause groundwater contamination. That is a fact and if these NWWRFs are allowed in groundwater use areas, residents wells will be impacted and nobody wants an "I told you so moment". Amend CB60 to protect us, that is your job to protect us.

Sayers, Margery

From: no-reply@howardcountymd.gov
Sent: Wednesday, July 05, 2017 2:53 PM
To: heckmanfarm@yahoo.com
Subject: CB-60

First Name: Katherine

Last Name: Heckman

Email: heckmanfarm@yahoo.com

Street Address: 3101 Cabin Run

City: Woodbine

Subject: CB-60

Message: I am opposed to this bill enabling mulching on this property, Thank you

Sayers, Margery

From: Sunnyside1998@aol.com
Sent: Wednesday, July 05, 2017 1:37 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: Oppose CB60

Dear Council Persons,

I oppose CB60 because there are no stipulations for these operations. There is an issue with an illegal operation in Woodbine that has caused numerous health issues which have been willfully ignored by the County. This operation continues as of today.

Respectfully,

***Leslie Long
2701 Woodbine Rd.
Woodbine, Md. 21797***

(410) 442-9707

Sayers, Margery

From: Sunnyside1998@aol.com
Sent: Wednesday, July 05, 2017 1:25 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: Oppose CB 60

I oppose CB60 due to Health,Safety,and Welfare of the Citizens of Howard County.

**Robert Long
2701 Woodbine Road
Woodbine,Md. 21797**

410-442-9705

Sayers, Margery

From: Arthur Klaunberg <artklaunberg@verizon.net>
Sent: Wednesday, July 05, 2017 10:54 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: CB-60

Dear Council Members,

I am sending this message to you regarding my concerns about CB-60 and the ways that this bill will affect our lives/health. The toxic byproducts of industrial mulching/manufacturing entering our air and our water wells are most disturbing and must be researched to prevent further damage to our life support systems! Your serious and detailed review and changes to CB-60 will be needed ASAP!

Respectfully submitted,

G. A. Klaunberg
3119 Cabin Run
Woodbine, MD 21797
gklaunberg@verizon.net

Sayers, Margery

From: Arthur Klaunberg <artklaunberg@verizon.net>
Sent: Wednesday, July 05, 2017 10:33 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: CB-60

Dear Council Members,

I am sending this message to you regarding my concerns about CB-60 and the ways that this bill will affect our lives/health. The toxic byproducts of industrial mulching/manufacturing entering our air and our water wells are most disturbing and must be researched to prevent further damage to our life support systems! Your serious and detailed review and changes to CB-60 will be needed ASAP!

Respectfully submitted,

A. J. Klaunberg, Jr
3119 Cabin Run
Woodbine, MD 21797
Artklaunberg@verizon.net

Sayers, Margery

From: David M Banwarth <dmbanwarth@verizon.net>
Sent: Tuesday, July 04, 2017 8:56 PM
To: CouncilMail; Jess Groves
Subject: Stop CB60-2017 which invites Industrial Mulch Manufacturing onto Ag Pres land and endangers our rural communities.

Council Members,

Respectfully, Council Members Fox and Sigaty, I think you must be unaware of what a 2-acre mulch manufacturing site represents (as you propose on Ag Pres properties in the middle of residential areas). I can only surmise you have been misled into thinking that this is not industrial scale.

For all Council Members, **here is the true scale of 2 acres**, based on published MDE/NWWRF records:

2 acres can generate 24,000 TONS of mulch per year => 48 MILLION lbs/yr => **155,000 lbs/DAY**, based on the 6 day work week your CB60 proposes. Do you realize that equals 387 cubic yards/day, which is **76 round trips per day of heavy dump trucks on our narrow winding rural roads** having poor sight lines and no shoulders? This is a VERY conservative truck number because the industry is very seasonal, so it could easily be 150+ round trips per day during peak seasons carrying out mulch products. This does not even take into account the trucks hauling the raw NWWRF products in for grinding from off-site - these figures only represent the output hauling trucks and equal amounts of trucks will be hauling wood waste into the site! Since a "tree farm" is undefined by CB60, it is another obvious loophole as to what that constitutes. And, since only the "grinding" hours are regulated by CB60, it means hauling and other activities can continue at all hours, with backup alarms, slamming dump truck tailgates, front end loader noises, etc.

With CB20, you promised NO industrial mulch manufacturing on Ag Pres land. **This is unarguably an open door to large scale industrial mulch manufacturing (disguised as "tree farms") and does not belong in the middle of rural residential areas for so many safety reasons (noise, dust, traffic, road safety, fire hazards, wind-borne fungal spores, etc, etc).** Please live up to your promise to residents and don't be misled by special interests. This is unmistakably not farming, it is industrial use, with all the associated hazards - and on Ag Pres properties, for which commercial or industrial uses are specifically prohibited by easements ironically paid for by taxpayer monies. It does not belong there at all and you should immediately remove Ag Pres from CB60-2017 entirely.

Please don't abandon the **thousands** of us residents (and voters) who live near the 74 existing Ag Pres sites in Howard County whose lives would be terribly impacted by this Bill in favor of Industrial special interest operators. I will be watching with keen interest and voting for those who truly look out for our interests, and actively opposing all of those who don't.

The courtesy of a reply is requested.

David Banwarth

Dayton, MD

Sayers, Margery

From: Bruce Trout <brucetrout@icloud.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 04, 2017 8:50 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: Block industrial mulching

/Council members -

Please block industrial mulching from being allowed in Western Howard County, and especially on Ag preserve land. Please amend CB-60 to close all loopholes that might potentially allow industrial mulching to occur on Ag preserve or western Howard County land.

Thanks for your attention to this important matter.

Sayers, Margery

From: Michael Macmurray <macmumc1@verizon.net>
Sent: Tuesday, July 04, 2017 8:25 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: CB - 60

Michael Macmurray

I am very concerned about CB - 60. This bill needs at the very least to be amended to protect our rural communities. I will be at all the meetings that concern this bill.

Mike

Sayers, Margery

From: Maxwell Yao <maxwellyao25@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 03, 2017 5:00 PM
To: James Nickel
Cc: Kittleman, Allan; CouncilMail; Terri Hill; Melanie Dzwonchyk
Subject: Re: CB60-2017 and MD House Bill 171

Jim,

Great point, we should bring this up during the Public Hearing on 7/17.

Max

On Mon, Jul 3, 2017 at 4:26 PM, James Nickel <james.nickel55@gmail.com> wrote:

Dayton Area Residents and other interested parties,

On May 4th, 2017 Governor Lawrence Joseph Hogan Jr., approved Maryland House Bill 171. Howard County Delegate, District 12, [Terri L. Hill](#) was a cosponsor of that bill.

You can see the legislation here.

[MD House Bill - Department of the Environment - Yard Waste, Food Residuals, and Other Organic Materials Diversion and Infrastructure - Study](#)

Synopsis. “Requiring the Department of the Environment, in consultation with specified persons, to study, review, explore, identify, and make recommendations regarding specified matters that relate to the diversion of yard waste, food residuals, and other organic materials from refuse disposal facilities, including the status of infrastructure in the State ; requiring the Department to provide a final report of its findings and recommendations to the Governor and the General Assembly by July 1, 2019; etc.”

In other words, the MD Department of the Environment will be doing a thorough study to include the health impacts of the very kind of operation that is proposed in CB60-2017.

Why should the County Executive and the Council even consider CB60-2017 when the MD Legislature and MD Governor have seen fit to do a thorough study of the very subject that our

County Executive has demonstrably glossed over? Is it a rushed attempt to get Howard County Industrial mulch manufacturing established on Ag Pres land prior to the State issuing proper health and safety standards?

- I have shown in my previous correspondence that the NWWRF in Frederick County proves that 24,000 tons per year of product can be accomplished on 2 acres. That certainly qualifies as **industrial manufacturing of mulch**. Yet, Mr. Kittleman refuses to acknowledge that fact.
- DPZ has stated that they are incapable of measuring pile height and acreage for compliance. Other factors that contribute to the baseless claim that 2 acres in not industrial manufacturing of mulch.
- I've shown that there are real health and safety risks and Mr. Kittleman's fact sheet fails to provide details that show otherwise.
- Mr. Kittleman's "fact sheet" contains numerous claims of safeguards that are not actually in the bill (e.g.- soils analysis testing, nutrient management plan, consideration of the size of the tree farm, etc.)
- Not a single operating farm in the entire State of Maryland is a permitted NWWRF. If this is for "farmers" then why is there no operating farm in the State of Maryland that has an NWWRF permit?
- A representative of the Alpha Ridge Land Fill proclaimed at the Planning Board meeting that the zero-waste landfill rules were a justification for CB60-2017. The Governor of Maryland has rescinded the zero-waste landfill rules.
- Farmers have been disposing of wood waste since long before Howard County existed and there have been no reports of their inability to do that now.
- Mr. Kittleman claims weather related events may result in large amounts of wood waste, e.g., a tornado, and that demands an Emergency NWWRF declaration. An Emergency NWWRF declaration doesn't create new equipment. Operators of wood chipping machinery are not going to invest in purchasing equipment to handle a 1 in 5-year event. Therefore, the Emergency declaration will be useless for achieving its intent.

CB60-2017 should be withdrawn. Period. There is no justification for it. It does not demonstrably provide Howard County residents the protections we deserve. MDE is beginning a study to evaluate diversion of various organic waste to include wood waste and compost. That study will include the health risks and provide recommendations for the handling of those materials. There is no reason to even consider CB60-2017 until that study has been completed. To do otherwise would be irresponsible.

Best Regards,

Jim Nickel

Sayers, Margery

From: James Nickel <james.nickel55@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 03, 2017 4:27 PM
To: Kittleman, Allan; CouncilMail; Terri Hill
Cc: Melanie Dzwonchyk
Subject: CB60-2017 and MD House Bill 171

Dayton Area Residents and other interested parties,

On May 4th, 2017 Governor Lawrence Joseph Hogan Jr., approved Maryland House Bill 171. Howard County Delegate, District 12, [Terri L. Hill](#) was a cosponsor of that bill.

You can see the legislation here.

[MD House Bill - Department of the Environment - Yard Waste, Food Residuals, and Other Organic Materials Diversion and Infrastructure - Study](#)

Synopsis. “Requiring the Department of the Environment, in consultation with specified persons, to study, review, explore, identify, and make recommendations regarding specified matters that relate to the diversion of yard waste, food residuals, and other organic materials from refuse disposal facilities, including the status of infrastructure in the State ; requiring the Department to provide a final report of its findings and recommendations to the Governor and the General Assembly by July 1, 2019; etc.”

In other words, the MD Department of the Environment will be doing a thorough study to include the health impacts of the very kind of operation that is proposed in CB60-2017.

Why should the County Executive and the Council even consider CB60-2017 when the MD Legislature and MD Governor have seen fit to do a thorough study of the very subject that our County Executive has demonstrably glossed over? Is it a rushed attempt to get Howard County Industrial mulch manufacturing established on Ag Pres land prior to the State issuing proper health and safety standards?

- I have shown in my previous correspondence that the NWWRF in Frederick County proves that 24,000 tons per year of product can be accomplished on 2 acres. That certainly qualifies

as **industrial manufacturing of mulch**. Yet, Mr. Kittleman refuses to acknowledge that fact.

- DPZ has stated that they are incapable of measuring pile height and acreage for compliance. Other factors that contribute to the baseless claim that 2 acres in not industrial manufacturing of mulch.
- I've shown that there are real health and safety risks and Mr. Kittleman's fact sheet fails to provide details that show otherwise.
- Mr. Kittleman's "fact sheet" contains numerous claims of safeguards that are not actually in the bill (e.g.- soils analysis testing, nutrient management plan, consideration of the size of the tree farm, etc.)
- Not a single operating farm in the entire State of Maryland is a permitted NWWRF. If this is for "farmers" then why is there no operating farm in the State of Maryland that has an NWWRF permit?
- A representative of the Alpha Ridge Land Fill proclaimed at the Planning Board meeting that the zero-waste landfill rules were a justification for CB60-2017. The Governor of Maryland has rescinded the zero-waste landfill rules.
- Farmers have been disposing of wood waste since long before Howard County existed and there have been no reports of their inability to do that now.
- Mr. Kittleman claims weather related events may result in large amounts of wood waste, e.g., a tornado, and that demands an Emergency NWWRF declaration. An Emergency NWWRF declaration doesn't create new equipment. Operators of wood chipping machinery are not going to invest in purchasing equipment to handle a 1 in 5-year event. Therefore, the Emergency declaration will be useless for achieving its intent.

CB60-2017 should be withdrawn. Period. There is no justification for it. It does not demonstrably provide Howard County residents the protections we deserve. MDE is beginning a study to evaluate diversion of various organic waste to include wood waste and compost. That study will include the health risks and provide recommendations for the handling of those materials. There is no reason to even consider CB60-2017 until that study has been completed. To do otherwise would be irresponsible.

Best Regards,

Jim Nickel

Sayers, Margery

From: Craig Ostrom <cdostrom@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, July 03, 2017 11:13 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: Reject CB60 as it is written

Please amend CB60 to protect:
health of residents from air and water contaminants.
safety of residents on the roadways
not allowing "tree farm" mulching to be a transfer station / industrial processing center
define enforcement and fines that show that Howard county means business when it comes to compliance.

Thanks,
Craig Ostrom
Dayton resident

Sayers, Margery

From: Maxwell Yao <maxwellyao25@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, July 02, 2017 9:49 PM
To: CouncilMail
Cc: Kittleman, Allan; James Nickel
Subject: CB60

Dear Council Members,

I am writing this mail to express my grave concerns about this bill. They are as follows:

1. Traffic and safety:

The transport of the cut trees/logs on the narrow roads in my neighborhood may pose serious traffic jams. It is also conceivable that fallen logs from the trucks could cause accidents to cars in both directions that personal injuries may result.

2. Noise and dust:

The mulching operations in no doubt will generate loud noise and great amount of dusts. Residents around the site would be negatively impacted.

3. Surface and ground water contamination:

Leachate from the mulch piles could pollute the nearby creeks that flow to the reservoir nearby. A bigger problem is groundwater contamination due to the very fact that tracing the groundwater flows is very very difficult. Most all residents in the area depend on groundwater as their drinking water source which the Count has a responsibility to protect.

4. Environmental Impact Assessment:

Has the County government performed an Environmental Impact Assessment required by National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) on this proposed project? If so I would like to obtain a copy of this document to review if adequate environmental protection measures have been provided? But if not, why?

I would appreciate your prompt response to my above concerns. Thank you.

Maxwell Yao, Ph.D.

Sayers, Margery

From: Shaw, Jon <jon.shaw@orbitalatk.com>
Sent: Friday, June 30, 2017 3:54 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: Industrial Mulching

I am writing you to inform you that I strongly oppose industrial mulching operations on farm land.

I live approximately ½ mile from the Bonner operation on Rt 94. The pollution you allow him to put into the ground eventually ends up in my drinking water.

More immediately, the heavy truck traffic poses a serious danger on our roads. More than once, I have pulled out of my driveway and had an 80,000-lb truck nearly run over me. Rt 94 is a small, twisting country road. Visibility is often only a few hundred feet ahead of a driveway or crossroad. There is also heavy bicycle traffic on this road, and no shoulder for them to ride on. These trucks are going to cause a serious, and potentially fatal accident. You can shrug your shoulders and pretend you're not responsible. But if you allow this truck traffic to continue, you ARE responsible.

I grew up on a dairy farm. I know, better than most, the need to occasionally move a piece of equipment on the road or the unintended erosion or pollution that can come from farm operation. But my Mother and Father respected the land, and they respected our neighbors. I know the lengths they went to in order to minimize the impact to both. Men like Bonner have no respect for either the land or the neighbors. This is not their home. They just want to turn a quick dollar and leave others to deal with the mess they made.

I know several Ho Co executives have talked of opposing industrial mulching. That talk is meaningless. We don't care if you appear to oppose these operations. We care if you allow them to continue. The inescapable fact is that you have not raised a finger to stop these operations for the past 4-5 years.

Promises worked in the last election. They won't work again. Stop these men from threatening our health and safety, or we'll elect someone who will.

Sincerely,

Jon Shaw

Notice: This e-mail is intended solely for use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is proprietary, privileged and/or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If the reader is not the intended recipient or agent responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. This communication may also contain data subject to U.S. export laws. If so, data subject to the International Traffic in Arms Regulation cannot be disseminated, distributed, transferred, or copied, whether incorporated or in its original form, to foreign nationals residing in the U.S. or abroad, absent the express prior approval of the U.S. Department of State. Data subject to the Export Administration Act may not be disseminated, distributed, transferred or copied contrary to U. S. Department of Commerce regulations. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender by reply e-mail and destroy the e-mail message and any physical copies made of the communication.

Thank you.

Sayers, Margery

From: Egan, Jennifer A.
Sent: Friday, June 30, 2017 2:30 PM
To: Smith, Gary; Keller, Jessie; Pruum, Kimberly; Bailey, Najee; McLeod, Kate; Clay, Mary; Singleton, Julia; Knight, Karen
Cc: Hightower, Rozonna; Hammond, Patricia; Habicht, Kelli; Gold, Rebecca; Sayers, Margery
Subject: Took phone call CB 60

Good Afternoon,

Took a phone call from John Bos 443-878-3211 who wanted to share with all Councilmembers that the trucks on Howard Road are outrageous. Council needs to do something about it..have a backbone.

Thank you,
Jennifer Egan
Howard County Council
410-313-3302

Sayers, Margery

From: Leslie Englehart <leslietutor@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, June 30, 2017 12:30 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: CB-60

I am highly concerned over CB-60! This is another attempt by Orendorf/Bonner and minions to find loopholes through which they can make money on Ag Preserve land at the expense of their neighbors' health and safety. It is unconscionable that our political allies of three years ago should allow themselves to be 'persuaded' that profit trumps the health and safety of their constituents. We demand amendments to close those loopholes. Industrial production of mulch and compost to be trucked out of our community is NOT FARMING!

- Leslie Englehart

Sayers, Margery

From: Dennis Leaf <dennisleaf@verizon.net>
Sent: Friday, June 30, 2017 12:10 PM
To: CouncilMail
Cc: info@preservedayton.com
Subject: CB-60-2017

My wife and I oppose CB-60-2017 that would pave the way for increased industrial mulching on ag preserve land. There are many negative health, environmental and quality of life issues associated with these mulching operations. We encourage you to reconsider your support of this legislation in the absence of significant amendments such as those being promoted by the Dayton Rural Preservation Society. We will never support any candidate for office who votes for this bill in an unamended form.

Dennis Leaf

5226 Green Bridge Road
Dayton, MD 21036
dennisleafverizonnet@verizon.net

Sayers, Margery

From: Sigaty, Mary Kay
Sent: Friday, June 30, 2017 9:34 AM
To: Michael P; CouncilMail
Subject: Re: Opposition to CB60

Mr. Pantos,

Thank you for contacting the Howard County Council regarding Council Bill 60-2017.

It appears that you were given information that leads you to believe that this legislation allows for industrial mulching on land zoned Rural Conservation or Rural Residential and on agriculturally preserved land. It does not.

The Howard County Department of Planning and Zoning has prepared a document of Frequently Asked Questions. Here is the link to the webpage,
<https://www.howardcountymd.gov/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=HI5bRNBrxvA%3d&portalid=0>.

I hope that you find the document helpful.

Sincerely,

Mary Kay Sigaty
Howard County Council
District 4
410-313-2001

From: Michael P <mjpantos@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 29, 2017 7:19:51 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: Opposition to CB60

We oppose industrial mulching on farmland including RR, RC, ag preserve. We oppose CB60 without major ammendments

Sent from [BlueMail](#)