

Sayers, Margery

From: Stu Kohn <stukohn@verizon.net>
Sent: Monday, September 04, 2017 9:36 PM
To: howard-citizen@yahooogroups.com
Cc: CouncilMail; Kittleman, Allan; Wilson, B Diane
Subject: Special Legislative Public Hearing -- 11 Sept 2017 at 6PM

FYI,

Next Monday, 11 September 2017 is a continuation of a County Council Public Legislation Hearing starting at 6PM at the George Howard building. It is extremely important as there are two major proposed Bills that the Howard County Citizens Association (HCCA) testified on 17 July. Please go to <http://howardcountyhcca.org/member-info/reports-documents-and-testimonies/> to read our testimony.

They are **CB61/62 - Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance (APFO)** – AN ACT amending the Adequate Public Facilities (APFO) Act requiring certain periodic review; specifying completion timelines for certain types of road remediation projects; requiring that certain agreements contain certain provisions with regard to the timing of road mitigation projects; amend the title of certain charts and other terminology; requiring certain waiting periods; clarifying certain exemptions; defining certain terms; amending certain definitions; making certain technical corrections; and generally relating to the Adequate Public Facilities Act of Howard County. You can go to <https://apps.howardcountymd.gov/olis/PrintSummary.aspx?LegislationID=2890> to see the Public and Written Testimony.

CB62 is an ACT amending PlanHoward 2030, the general plan for Howard County, to reduce the number of allocations in the Growth and Revitalization category and to increase the number of allocations in the Established Communities category, beginning in 2020; and generally relating to planning, zoning and land use in Howard County. You can go to <https://apps.howardcountymd.gov/olis/PrintSummary.aspx?LegislationID=2891> to see Public Testimony. As of the beginning of last week there were 17 additional individuals who had signed up to testify. In addition to the 15 who have already testified. We anticipate a large number to testify on Monday. This is especially true because citizens are very concerned with many aspects of the current APFO especially now hearing of the potential nearly 9000 students being redistricted. APFO simply needs to change. We only hope the Council will use their discretion and do something about placing more than adequate measures to ensure the proper balance is in place regarding quality of life issues which includes all infrastructure – Schools, Roads, Hospital, EMS, Police, Fire, and Stormwater, etc.

CB60 - AN ACT allowing certain composting facilities and emergency natural wood waste recycling facilities as accessory uses under certain conditions in certain Zoning Districts; allowing certain natural wood waste recycling facilities and composting facilities as a use permitted as a matter of right under certain conditions in certain Zoning Districts. This subject has been a very concerned issue for mainly the residents of western Howard County. However it affects all of us to ensure in the east that the proper facilities are protected to ensure the health and welfare of any residents nearby are protected. You can go to <https://apps.howardcountymd.gov/olis/PrintSummary.aspx?LegislationID=2892> to see both the Public and Written Testimony. As of the beginning of last week there were 50 additional individuals who had signed up to testify. In addition to the 15 who have already testified. There will be many more besides these 50 to publically testify.

HCCA was a member of both Task Forces relating to these legislative matters. They comprised of 22 and 24 meetings respectively. Thus far I have been very disappointed with the outcomes of the Task Force recommendations. The only way it will be rectified is if the Council takes the initiative to go way beyond the continuance of “Business as Usual” attitude. Yes – major amendments would be appropriate. I am sure the overwhelming majority of their constituents would be most appreciative for their actions.

I have Cc'd both the Council and the Administration in hopes that something positive will be accomplished in these most important pieces of legislation.

Sincerely,

Stu Kohn
HCCA, President

Sayers, Margery

From: Priscilla Trubin <oldtrube@aol.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 03, 2017 9:58 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: CB60/ZRA180 and our beloved Western Howard County

To the Members of the Howard County Maryland County Council;

We are 35 year residents of Howard County, 17 years of which have been in Dayton Maryland. We want our county farmers to be able to honor the legacy of their families and their land, but with reasonable coexistence with decent air, water and noise quality, and in light of increasingly crowded former carriage roads. This bill needs to be evaluated in consideration of the other "planned" growth events which have been or are about to be approved within a five mile area.

1) Expansion of Route 32

More construction traffic followed by greater access to many more cars and greater residential growth

2) At least 3 subdivisions in planning or under construction in Dayton, including a 46 house subdivision off of Green Bridge Road

After construction traffic and noise is finished, 46 more families, cars, children on a road with no shoulder

How will mulch businesses operating on former carriage roads utilizing eighteen wheeler trucks , noisy equipment and producing polluted water and air fit in with the County's decision to grow residential subdivisions in the West?

Sincerely,

Priscilla Trubin

Richard Lewis

5162 Green Bridge Road
Dayton, MD 21036

410-925-4357

Sayers, Margery

From: Darren Bush <darbus37@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, September 01, 2017 7:40 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: Cb60

Please do not pass cb 60. It poses significant health issues to our community. I am concerned for our neighborhood and my family. I will continue to oppose this bill.

Thank you,

Darren Bush
14036 Big Branch Drive
Dayton Md 21036

Sayers, Margery

From: Sigaty, Mary Kay
Sent: Wednesday, August 23, 2017 12:22 PM
To: Feldmark, Jessica; Sayers, Margery
Subject: FW: CB-60 Mulcing on farmland

From: george mech <gpmech@verizon.net>

Date: Friday, August 4, 2017 at 4:13 PM

To: Allan Kittleman <AKittleman@howardcountymd.gov>, Calvin Ball <cball@howardcountymd.gov>, Greg Fox <gfox@howardcountymd.gov>, Jen Terrasa <jterrasa@howardcountymd.gov>, Jon Weinstein <jweinstein@howardcountymd.gov>, "Sigaty, Mary Kay" <mksigaty@howardcountymd.gov>

Subject: CB-60 Mulcing on farmland

Howard County Council Members. PLEASE DO NOT ALLOW MULCHING ON FARMLAND PROPERTY IN THIS COUNTY. Only de-minimis (one acre or less) mulching for farmers living on their farmland parcel should be allowed.

The County Council has been made aware (explicitly so) of the toxic effects of large mulching operations on the health and welfare of surrounding communities. The economics of this matter suggests that whatever income the farmer-landowner (or many farmer-landowners) might derive over any span of time, is insignificant to the remedial cost of correcting the consequences (millions of dollars) not mention the toxic health effects that can not always be cured. The farmers have a right to benefits from the land they farm, BUT THEY DO NOT HAVE THE RIGHT TO POLLUTE OUR GROUND WATER OR OUR AIR, OR ENDANGER OUR ROADWAYS!. The enforcement of regulations, in this matter, has a history of ineffectiveness; as county staff testified at the meeting on July 17, 2017. They are still trying to do something in the Woodbine situation. Meanwhile the toxic activity goes on! That is precisely the problem, it takes a while for the toxic consequences to emerge: it takes a while for the enforcement process to bring to a halt the toxic activity, and in the meantime, people are hurt and sometimes beyond repair. The Flint Michigan event is exactly the kind of event we need to prevent. The public officials there wished now that they had done things differently.

At the July 17th hearing Councilwoman Ms.Sigaty, in response to a citizen's testimony stated that Mr. Orndorff had acquired an "M1 or M 2" zoned property and was putting up for sale the Dayton property and therefore would not be using that property for mulching, as if this was to satisfy the matter. The problem is; maybe the next owner or succession of owners might try mulching operations on that property. It appears that this was a short term solution, with long term consequences.

At that same hearing Councilman Fox aggressively over-reacted to testimony provided by an effective citizen who was opposing this bill without significant modifications. Such behavior by a council member at hearing of this nature has a very chilling effect on citizens thinking about testifying before the county council.

Please make my comments part of the public record on this matter.
Thank you for the chance to be heard.

George Mech
5244 Kalmia Drive
Dayton, Maryland, 21036

Sayers, Margery

From: Williams <rawmlw@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 21, 2017 5:57 PM
To: rawmlw@gmail.com
Subject: CB 60 Concerns and Remediation

Once again, we reiterate our disappointment in the proposed zoning abuse by RJL and continue to voice our opposition to CB60 and to facilitate your approval of the following amendments:

No Natural Wood Waste Recycling (NWWR) facilities on Rural Residential (RR) and Rural Conservation (RC) parcels; RC includes both Howard County and State of MD ag preserve farmland

No food waste in compost produced exclusively to support farming activities for use only for/by/on the farm on all RR and RC parcels

No commercial or retail sale of compost produced exclusively to support farming activities for use only for/by/on the farm on all RR and RC parcels

No three axle or tractor-trailer trucks on/off the farm for compost produced exclusively to support farming activities for use only for/by/on the farm on all RR and RC parcels

We oppose the current zoning language in CB 60 given the many obvious loopholes it creates. Our Amendment 1, by default, absolutely prohibits the following on all RR and RC parcels:

No commercial sale of mulch or compost product

No three-axle or tractor-trailer trucks on/off the farm with mulch or compost product

No industrial grade tub grinders, normally used to support typical industrial mulching facilities

No mulching on Howard County ag preserve or State of MD ag preserve farmland

No retail sales of mulch or compost product onsite

What these amendments translate into for NWWR facilities is the reality that these operations belong on M1/M2 industrial-zoned parcels and need to be covered to responsibly prevent mulch dust, compost dust, and endospores from airborne contamination to put nearby residential communities at risk for medical concerns.

RJL must either remain on its industrial-zoned site or sell the agriculture-zoned land that was purchased with the intention of bending the rules and running a commercial operation. We stand united against this blatant abuse of the established agricultural zoning, and we expect that our Howard County elected representatives will make the morally and technically correct decision and not accept CB 60 with all of its loopholes which do not address the well-documented health risks of such a proposal.

We look forward to your support as we meet again on 11 September.

Monica and Rich Williams
Big Branch Drive
Dayton

Sayers, Margery

From: Lisa and Jeff Caplan <LJCAPLAN@msn.com>
Sent: Sunday, August 20, 2017 8:48 PM
To: CouncilMail; Kittleman, Allan
Cc: Feldmark, Jessica; Regner, Robin
Subject: Opposition to CB60 Without Major Amendments

Council members and Mr. Kittleman:

My wife and I are very concerned with CB60, which without significant amendments, 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 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 in the past. 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? The answer is, it cannot.

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 fix the problem and add all the necessary amendments 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 to 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.

This needs a thorough evaluation - not a quick, cursory review. If you take the time to understand the issues, it will become clear to you that the amendments are necessary.

As a reminder, here is Mr. Kittleman's quote from only a couple years ago:

"In response to your inquiry regarding industrial mulching on agricultural farm land, I can unequivocally state that I am opposed. There have been three major public hearings on this issues: one at Dayton Oaks Elementary School, one in Sykesville and another at the Ten Oaks Ballroom with an estimated attendance of over five hundred, where I stated that I firmly opposed industrial mulching. As County Executive, I will actively continue my opposition."

Mr Kittleman, this new bill without major amendments, does not represent continued opposition.

Thank you,

Jeff Caplan
Marriottsville, MD 21104

Sayers, Margery

From: michael pantos <mjpantos@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, August 20, 2017 8:27 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: CB60 UNACCEPTABLE as is

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.

These amendments are CRITICAL and must be included in CB60:

- 1. No Natural Wood Waste Recycling (NWWR) facilities on Rural Residential (RR) and Rural Conservation (RC) parcels; RC includes both Howard County and State of MD ag preserve farmland**
- 2. No food waste in compost produced exclusively to support farming activities for use only for/by/on the farm on all RR and RC parcels**
- 3. No commercial or retail sale of compost produced exclusively to support farming activities for use only for/by/on the farm on all RR and RC parcels**

4. **No three axle or tractor-trailer trucks on/off the farm for compost produced exclusively to support farming activities for use only for/by/on the farm on all RR and RC parcels**

Thank you,
Dr. Michael Pantos

Sayers, Margery

From: David M Banwarth <dmbanwarth@verizon.net>
Sent: Monday, August 14, 2017 6:35 PM
To: Ball, Calvin B; Fox, Greg; Sigaty, Mary Kay; Terrasa, Jen; CouncilMail; Weinstein, Jon
Cc: Kittleman, Allan; Delorenzo, Carl; Knight, Karen; CouncilMail; Kate Magill
Subject: Opposition to CB60 - No Mulch Manufacturing on Ag Pres, RR, or RC lands
Attachments: Testimony Submitted to Council on 08 14 2017.pdf

County Council Chairman and Council Members,

I ask you to vote down CB60, which is a serious threat to public health and safety. Do not allow mulch manufacturing on Ag Pres, RR and RC lands.

Safeguard our quality of life in Howard County. Limit NWWR mulch manufacturing to M1/M2 Zoning only, and establish safeguards against dust and airborne toxins from those industrial sites. Anything less will bring the threat of these Industrial Hazards being sited near, or into, every rural residential community in Western Howard County on RC, RR or Ag Pres lands.

Please read my attached position statement and record it as my official testimony regarding CB60-2017.

Thank you,

David M Banwarth

Dayton, MD

Sayers, Margery

From: David Banwarth <dmbanwarth@verizon.net>
Sent: Monday, August 07, 2017 2:10 PM
To: CouncilMail
Cc: John Tegeris; Fox, Greg
Subject: Opposed to CB60!

Council Members,

CB60 needs to be withdrawn or voted down!

There is no legitimate purpose or supportive argument for enactment of CB60 as a "farming" measure. It is a blatant special interest Bill for existing, or aspiring, NWWR industrial operators to move onto Ag Pres and RC/RR properties, while disregarding the documented health and safety risks for residents.

Not a single farmer in the State is an NWWR license holder - does anyone need more proof that this has nothing to do with farming?

CB60 is irresponsibly reckless and endangering legislation. Mulch manufacturing belongs only on M1/M2 zoning, by Conditional Use only, as per current law.

Please record my opposition to CB60 accordingly.

David Banwarth
Dayton, MD

Testimony Submitted to Council on 08/14/2017

In OPPOSITION to CB60-2017

By: David M Banwarth, Dayton, MD

I strongly **OPPOSE** CB60-2017. Mulch Manufacturing belongs on M1/M2 only, and not on Ag Pres or RC or RR properties. And even M1/M2, there should be safeguards against toxic leachate runoff, dust, and windblown spores. It should also remain a conditional use in M1/M2. Industrial mulch manufacturing hazards are present on even a 1-acre site. Many major fires that have occurred on same and a 1-acre site has all the same hazards as a 10 acres site regarding aquifer contamination, truck traffic, noise, dust, etc. M1/M2 ensures an adequate public water supply for firefighting, adequate firefighting access, and roads built for commercial truck traffic. Rural areas of Western Howard County do not have these safeguards. Below are a few recent local fires that occurred on less than 1 acre, yet tied up enormous public safety resources from multiple jurisdictions. Howard County Fire Department responded to each of these extensive mulch pile fires.

**SOME RECENT SIGNIFICANT LOCAL MULCH FACILITY FIRES
(< 1 ACRE OF MULCH INVOLVED IN EACH FIRE)**

Location / Mulch Acreage	Date	Fire/EMS Service Impact	Fire Incident Photos
7800 Block, Kabik Ct., Woodbine	05/14/2017	2 Counties, 25+ firefighters	 <p style="text-align: right;">MDE Reg's = 12' Actual Height = 68'</p>
Upper Marlboro	04/11/2013	3 Counties + AAFB, 100+ firefighters	 
ReCycled Green, Woodbine	09/01/2013	4 Counties, 80+ firefighters	

Allowing Ag Pres, RC or RR mulch manufacturing sites would be disastrous in terms of known hazardous impacts on community safety. Even 2 acres (as proposed for Ag Pres), represents 24,000 TONS of annual production, with endless grinding, noise, respiratory damaging dust and windblown fungal spores traveling up to 3 miles, fire hazards, dangerous trucking on narrow rural roads, traffic congestion, groundwater aquifer contamination, over 75+ triple axel dump truck trips per day, reduced quality of life, and reduced property values. By official MDE records, a 2-acre NWWR facility would rank 5th in the entire State of Maryland! There would be more than a dozen commercially licensed NWWR facilities producing less that what can be produced on 1 acre! One has to wonder if the attempt to pass this off as “not Industrial” is either due to being sadly misinformed or intentionally deceitful.

An extreme affrent is that Ag Pres is a TAXPAYER funded program! Yet it is attempted to be used by CB60-2017 to foster hazardous Industrial NWWR processing sites on residentially zoned lands that are legally

protected against such public safety threats by both the current Zoning Ordinance, and by specific easement restrictions purchased with our tax funds.

ALPP Sec. 15.511 – "Restrictions":
"(b) Land subject to an agricultural land preservation easement may not be used for:
(1) Developed for purposes other than agricultural uses.
(2) Used for commercial, industrial ..."

Ag Pres Deeds of Easement

COVENANTS, CONDITIONS, LIMITATIONS AND RESTRICTIONS

A. Subject to the reservations hereinafter contained, the Grantor covenants, grants and relinquishes the right to develop the Land for any purpose, except those which are related directly to or as an accessory use of the premises for farming and agricultural purposes ("Development Rights"). Development Rights include, but are not limited to, the right to develop the Land for use in the following manner:

(1) industrial or commercial uses;



This has all the appearances of being pushed to benefit a few special interest NWWR operators at the abuse of those who have paid their tax money to preserve the tranquil and peaceful agricultural farming practices in their communities. Any "limits" imposed by CB60 have no actual restricting effect. They are not going to be enforced by DPZ (by their own admission in Planning Board testimony and in the DPZ Technical Staff Report), or by MDE (e.g. - 68' mulch pile fire in a facility "limited" to 12' by MDE), and provide no assurances of safeguards what-so-ever. The only reliable safeguard is to limit it to M1/M2 zoning, as per the current laws (CB-20).

Of the more than 10,000+ farmers in Maryland, not a single one of them has an NWWR permit. Obviously, actual farmers have no need or desire to be a licensed NWWR operator to process the very limited quantities of NWWR materials truly generated/grown on-site. There has been no demonstrated need or outcry for farmers to become NWWR operators. Farmers currently compost the limited amounts they generate on site, burn it, bury it, or haul it to a licensed NWWR processing facility if needed. They certainly do not have need of expensive commercial volume wood grinders for agricultural use that are required of an NWWR facility. If you really mean to not permit Industrial Mulch Manufacturing on Ag Pres or RR or RC, then do not permit trucking of natural wood waste onto these properties – it's really very simple. Yet CB60 as written permits unlimited trucking and grinding. With that open door to commercial exploitation of Ag Pres lands, it is truly unbelievable that anyone can say with a straight face that it is not Industrial Mulch Manufacturing (Council Members Sigaty and Fox please take special note).

MULCHING OF FARM GROWN MATERIALS FOR ON-FARM USE VS. COMMERCIAL /INDUSTRIAL GRINDING OF TRUCKED WOOD WASTE

- ▶ **COMMERCIAL/INDUSTRIAL NWWR PROCESSING**
- ▶ **Not Agricultural Based:** Raw materials originate primarily from Off-Site commercial land-clearing operations
- ▶ **Industrial Scale:** Significant quantities and near continuous grinding and trucking of materials onto and off site
- ▶ **End Use: Commercial sale.**

- ▶ **AGRICULTURAL FARM BASED PRACTICE**
- ▶ **"From the Farm – For the Farm"**
- ▶ **Agriculture Based:** Feedstock is originated on-site, crop production or maintenance activities.
- ▶ **Small Scale:** Seasonal/Temporary/intermittent processing and transportation of materials.
- ▶ **End Use: agricultural purposes** - soil amendment, water retention, weed blocking, erosion control, no-till farming, etc.
- ▶ Currently done without need of CB60-2017!



CB60 is not about farming. It is about NWWR operators collecting money for receiving tons of imported wood waste, and grinding, selling, and exporting the finished product. And, that is the very definition of an 'Industrial Use', fraught with well documented hazards to safety and quality of life.

CB60 Problems	Specific Concerns	Solutions
<p>CB60 Violates Zoning Intent – Inconsistent with character of existing RR and RC Zoning</p>	<p>CB60 Permits Industrial Scale Mulch Manufacturing on Ag Pres, RC and RR Land:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 Acres = 24,000 TONS output per Year • 2 Acres = 75 Dump Trucks/Day • 2 Acres = Ranks 5th in MD among Industrial NWWR Operators 	<p>Limit NWWR to M1/M2 Zoning only, by conditional use, Establish safeguards against dust, airborne toxins</p>
<p>CB60 Violates Health and Safety Zoning Provisions, 100.0. (A), Legislative Intent - "secure safety from fire and other danger..."</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proven Drinking Water Aquifer Contamination, • Proven Toxic Leachates, • Increased Fire Hazards beyond Normal Rural Levels, • Continuous Noise Pollution (Grinding, Trucks, Alarms), • Trucking Safety Hazards on Small Narrow Rural Roads, • Dust Pollution, Fungal Spores Health Risk, • Traffic Congestion by Large Trucks, • Lowered Quality of Life, • Reduced Property Values 	<p>Same As Above</p>
<p>CB60 Violates Ag Pres Easement Restrictions</p>	<p>"No Commercial Use" "No Industrial Use", Per Easements</p>	<p>Eliminate Ag Pres Exceptions for Tree Farms and Emergencies!</p>

The above chart summarizes my concerns and proposed solutions. **I strongly urge the County Council to limit NWWR to M1/M2 Zoning only and establish safeguards against dust and airborne toxins from those industrial sites. I ask you to vote down CB60, which is a threat to public health and safety. Safeguard our quality of life in Howard County. Anything less will bring the threat of these Industrial Hazards being sited near, or into, every rural residential community in Western Howard County on RC, RR or Ag Pres lands.**