

Sayers, Margery

From: Amy Lynne <amylynn3000@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, May 20, 2019 6:33 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: Fwd: Testimony for continuation of the watershed safety act

[Note: This email originated from outside of the organization. Please only click on links or attachments if you know the sender.]

May be 2nd submission. Trying to make sure it goes through

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

From: **Amy Lynne** <amylynn3000@gmail.com>
Date: Monday, May 20, 2019
Subject: Testimony for continuation of the watershed safety act
To: Councilmail@howardcounty.gov

I live just over the bridge in lower Oella. I testified at the first hearing about my strong feelings against any further development in Ellicott City.

I don't believe that development is the sole contributor to EC's flooding problem. However, it is a contributor, and any further contribution of runoff is unacceptable. I don't believe that the flood mitigation efforts put forth by these developments have been effective. The relatively minor 2011 storm still had water flowing down Main Street, in a volume and a pace that had not previously been happening.

The developers have had their party, they had made plenty of money from the developments already installed. We owe them NOTHING. However, they owe Ellicott City their respect as a fragile historic community that needs the highest level of protection. This includes NO MORE DEVELOPMENT ever. Period.

It's time to pull our heads from the sand and face reality, and make the right decisions for all of Ellicott City's businesses and residents.

Thank you.

Amy Lynne
3000 Westchester Avt
Ellicott City. MD. 21043

Sayers, Margery

From: Amy Lynne <amylynne3000@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, May 20, 2019 6:31 PM
To: Councilmail@howardcounty.gov; CouncilMail
Subject: Re: Testimony for continuation of the watershed safety act

[Note: This email originated from outside of the organization. Please only click on links or attachments if you know the sender.]

On Monday, May 20, 2019, Amy Lynne <amylynne3000@gmail.com> wrote:

I live just over the bridge in lower Oella. I testified at the first hearing about my strong feelings against any further development in Ellicott City.

I don't believe that development is the sole contributor to EC's flooding problem. However, it is a contributor, and any further contribution of runoff is unacceptable. I don't believe that the flood mitigation efforts put forth by these developments have been effective. The relatively minor 2011 storm still had water flowing down Main Street, in a volume and a pace that had not previously been happening.

The developers have had their party, they had made plenty of money from the developments already installed. We owe them NOTHING. However, they owe Ellicott City their respect as a fragile historic community that needs the highest level of protection. This includes NO MORE DEVELOPMENT ever. Period.

It's time to pull our heads from the sand and face reality, and make the right decisions for all of Ellicott City's businesses and residents.

Thank you.

Amy Lynne
3000 Westchester Avt
Ellicott City. MD. 21043

Sayers, Margery

From: Gayle Killen <killchar@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, May 20, 2019 5:38 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: Mon 20MAY19: CB20-2019 Building Moratorium - EXTENSION

[Note: This email originated from outside of the organization. Please only click on links or attachments if you know the sender.]

Monday 20 MAY 2019
CB20-2019
Building Moratorium - EXTENSION

Greetings, Council.

Thank you for your attention. I live on Main Street, and it's been hard to tolerate claims "no runoff was added" in recent years because new development actually has regulations. Hearing from our studies that even if the whole town was "woods in good condition" it would have suffered the same fate. Finally we know not to believe the "freak storm" claims. Lies like this are not acceptable. We demand a real and true effort to understand so we can successfully rebuild and protect our town. The biggest tributary was left out of the watershed study we demanded in 2011 and as a result more development than it could have ever held was let through. Was it intentional? Was it a mistake? Doesn't matter anymore, we are now past the point that we know full well that we must stop adding runoff now.

The culvert behind me continues to fill with debris and deposits. Main St continues to channel what doesn't make The Hudson. Despite having made my home flood proof, I still cannot replace the fence I once had along Main St. It may take years, but I don't think it wise to keep putting a fence up where I can see Main St continues to fall into my yard and this CHANNEL STILL ISN'T CLEARED since 2011.

I don't think it wise to keep adding problems as we struggle to correct existing problems.

Rivers spilling down hills and waterfalls are part of the Patapsco Valley charm, but at today's current volume of rain the ground down here is so saturated that an every day rainstorm can cause problems. Tree removal and the standard grassy slope accelerates runoff, sometimes directly into a home. Our current storm water management practices are insufficient and therefore all prior waivers, permissions, exemptions, etc must be wiped from the slate. Given the rapid depletion of vegetative buffers inside and above our ridges, it is important to protect and stabilize.

The lack of progress we have made in survey and study is shameful. Anyone still shrugging their shoulders and claiming it's out of our control should be fired. We need more time to solidify policies for protection and progress, and there must be only the addition of detention spaces in the meantime.

Thank you for your consideration,
Gayle Killen
8572 Main St
Ellicott City, MD 21043
killchar@gmail.com

Below, I've noted a good example of tree protection in use here: <https://www.monash.vic.gov.au/Building-Planning/Strategic-Planning/Planning-Scheme/Amendments/Amendment-C115>

"The purpose of the Amendment is to modify Schedule 1 to the Vegetation Protection Overlay by including the following the exemptions from requiring a planning permit to remove a tree:

The removal of any tree where the tree will be replaced by two new plantings (which can be planted anywhere on the same property) and which will grow to become canopy trees with spreading crowns, to the satisfaction of the responsible authority.

Prior to the removal of the tree for which the exemption is sought, a plan or simple diagram of the site identifying the tree to be removed and the species and planting location of the two replacement tree plantings, must be submitted to and endorsed by the responsible authority.

The two replacement tree plantings must be planted within six months of the tree removal taking place and then appropriately maintained to the satisfaction of the responsible authority.

Non native trees and environmental weeds.

For tree maintenance or where a tree is being maintained in accordance with a management program, developed by a suitably qualified arborist.

Dead, dying or dangerous trees.

The removal of a tree necessary for the construction of a dwelling, dwelling extension or outbuilding where no planning permit is required subject to a building permit having been granted and tree(s) are only removed from the building footprint or within 2 meters of the proposed building."

--

Every great advance in natural knowledge has involved the absolute rejection of authority.

~Thomas H. Huxley

Sayers, Margery

From: Angelica Bailey <abailey@marylandbuilders.org>
Sent: Monday, May 20, 2019 3:23 PM
To: CouncilMail; Rigby, Christiana; Facchine, Felix; Walsh, Elizabeth; Dvorak, Nicole; Jung, Deb; Williams, China; Jones, Opel; Harris, Michael; Yungmann, David; Knight, Karen; Ball, Calvin; Sidh, Sameer; Feldmark, Jessica
Cc: Lori Graf; 'Jason Van Kirk'; Lazdins, Valdis; Irvin, Jim
Subject: MBIA Written Testimony re. CB20-2019
Attachments: MBIA Letter of Concern re. CB20 – Ellicott City Moratorium.pdf

[Note: This email originated from outside of the organization. Please only click on links or attachments if you know the sender.]

Good Afternoon,

Please find MBIA written testimony attached for this evening's hearing on CB20-2019.

Thank you,
Angelica Bailey

Angelica Bailey, Esq.
Vice President of Government Affairs
abailey@marylandbuilders.org
Maryland Building Industry Association
11825 W. Market Place
Fulton, MD 20759
Cell: 202-815-4445
Dir: 301-776-6205
Ph: 301-776-MBIA



Advocate | Educate | Network | Build

May 20, 2019

Re: LETTER OF CONCERN FOR – Extending the building moratorium in the Tiber Branch and Plumtree Branch Watersheds

Dear Chairwoman Mercer Rigby and Members of the Howard County Council:

The Howard County Chapter of the Maryland Building Industry Association (MBIA) writes with concerns regarding Council Bill 20, which extends the building moratorium in the Tiber Branch and Plumtree Branch Watersheds an additional 3 months.

The Watershed Safety Act was passed in July of 2018 to temporarily halt new development in the Tiber-Hudson Watershed (Ellicott City, generally) to give the Department of Planning and Zoning, the Department of Public Works, and the County Council an opportunity to study flooding in this area and identify potential public policy and private solutions to future flooding in the Ellicott City area.

While we disagree that new development is the reason for flooding, and believe that twelve months is a reasonable time period to study the true and relevant factors that contribute to flooding, determine best practices, and implement new policies, we also recognize that these are complex issues and thorough analysis can be time-consuming. It is imperative that the County make real changes to the landscape and infrastructure in and above Ellicott City based on the results of recent studies, designs developed by hydrologic experts, and the best science available. If the Council needs three more months to implement new standards for development in Ellicott City and end the moratorium, we believe that extension is reasonable.

However, we are concerned at CB20's mention of zoning. Rezoning would be a more significant change than implementing new stormwater standards. Furthermore, zoning and rezoning decisions are made within the Department of Planning and Zoning; it would be inappropriate for the Council to make zoning decisions to address flooding in Ellicott City instead of DPZ.

We also hope any policy changes introduced at the end of the three-month extension will propose new stormwater standards and an end to the moratorium; or new stormwater standards that allows our members to proceed past the moratorium if certain design requirements are met.

The MBIA urges the County Council to consider these concerns when voting on CB20. Howard County MBIA members are not only builders, developers, engineers and environmental experts; they are also residents of the County, and hope to see Ellicott City continue to serve as a cultural, social and economic hub in the future. We are confident that a three-month extension will bring effective stormwater policies that will have a measurable impact on flooding to save lives, re-energize the business district and improve the environment without punishing Howard County.

If you have any questions about these comments and would like to discuss MBIA's position further, please do not hesitate to contact me at abailey@marylandbuilders.org or (202) 815-4445.

Best regards,



Angelica Bailey, Esq., Vice President of Government Affairs

Cc: Councilman David Yungmann
Councilman Opel Jones
Councilmember Elizabeth Walsh
Councilmember Deb Jung
County Executive Calvin Ball
Sameer Sidh, Chief of Staff to the County Executive
Valdis Lazdins, Director of Planning
James Irvin, Director of Public Works

Sayers, Margery

From: Russ Roder <roderra@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, May 20, 2019 11:58 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: testimony in favor of CB20-2019

[Note: This email originated from outside of the organization. Please only click on links or attachments if you know the sender.]

Please see below for my testimony in favor of CB20-2019.

Thanks,
Russell Roder

The County plans to present the results of the most recent flood studies on May 21st. The roughly two months from this date to the end of the current moratorium are insufficient to allow the County and residents to understand the results, develop plans for moving forward and come to agreement on the details of implementation. Extending the moratorium by three months is absolutely necessary.

It's highly likely that another extension, beyond October, will be required. For example, the details of any new requirements for stormwater retention will probably be the subject of intense debate. It's much more important to get the details right than to rush new requirements through. This process should be given as much time as necessary, within reason.

I urge all Council members to vote in favor of CB20-2019.

Sayers, Margery

From: William Lilley <ecrfpres@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, May 20, 2019 8:18 AM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: CB20-2019

[Note: This email originated from outside of the organization. Please only click on links or attachments if you know the sender.]

Please vote in favor of CB20-2019.

Keep Ellicott City protected!

Ed Lilley
4805 Wilkens Avenue
Catonsville, MD 21228
410-303-2959

Sayers, Margery

From: no-reply@howardcountymd.gov
Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2019 5:25 PM
To: shonchar@msn.com
Subject: Extension to the 2018 Watershed Safety Act

First Name: Sharon
Last Name: Honcharik
Email: shonchar@msn.com
Street Address: 9842 Longview Dr.
City: Ellicott City
Subject: Extension to the 2018 Watershed Safety Act

Message: I reside in Valley Mede and have witnessed the damaging affect that flooding has had on the lives, homes and property of people in this community. Unless the problems of inadequate watershed management can be rectified, we will continue to have flooding that will only be exacerbated by unbridled development in designated watershed areas like Valley Mede. I strongly urge you to support the extension of the 2018 Watershed Safety Act.

Sayers, Margery

From: Suzanne Jones <jones.suze@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, May 17, 2019 1:41 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: FOR CB 20-19

[Note: This email originated from outside of the organization. Please only click on links or attachments if you know the sender.]

I am FOR CB 20-19.

The stakes are too high and too many details remain to be worked out, especially for the Plumtree watershed.

Due to the visibility of Old Ellicott City, more storm water management and legislation is worked out and favors the Tiber watershed. Flooding of the Plumtree -- just as risky to human life -- comes in as a seeming afterthought.

During the May 2018 flooding event, Howard County Fire and Rescue was either too busy or, due to the excessive storm water, unable to help out in Valley Mede. Residents had to resort to their own swift water rescue to save the stranded occupant(s) of a vehicle submerged near the Church of the Resurrection. (I sent council members a photo of the event shortly after it occurred.) This is not an acceptable and sustainable response for our neighbors in Valley Mede!

Based on the slides from the recent working session on storm water management, I learned the following:

- * Stormwater Storage Facilities are already planned for the Tiber watershed. No such things are planned for the Plumtree and may not even be feasible.
- * Much of the Plumtree Stormwater Conveyance Improvements are not yet fully planned.
- * In the region of the Plumtree watershed, 81% of the development was built without storm water management.
- * Only 7% of the developed acreage around the Plumtree is open space and -- the Plumtree region is more developed than the Tiber.
- * Presently, only ESD management (i.e. 1-year event/~2.64 inches of rain over 24-hours) is required for the Plumtree.

In the slides from the working session, I read that legislation is in the works, is likely to include accommodations for 1,000 year flooding events -- *yet, that legislation is not complete and approved*. In other words, it's all just words with absolutely no guarantees of any of the safeguards that area already proven -- via the 2011 tropical storm, 2016 flooding event, and the repeat flooding event in 2018 - to be needed.

Further, to me the fee-in-lieu and "maximum extent practicable" approaches sound vague, if not entirely risking of more unsafe flooding events.

CB 80-16 regulated for the Tiber, but did nothing for the Plumtree watershed -- again, secondary treatment for those not in/around Old Ellicott City.

In the working session, it was mentioned that ~140 properties within 100-year floodplains receive 3-foot or greater inundations and it was also stated that some of the worst inundations are in Valley Mede. What are the addresses of these properties and what is being done to address their issues?

Regarding the special assessments against those in the Plumtree watershed, I question why they would be made to pay the price when -- based on the county's own report on the 2011 Tropical Storm Lee -- the flooding started as early as 1992! In other words, Valley Mede was just fine until excessive development -- Wetherburn, Waverly Woods, Raleigh

Tavern, Olde Mill, and so on and so forth -- started to overtake the areas north and west that flow into the Plumtree watershed.

Clearly, more time is needed to work out an abundance of issues that exist with regards to the Tiber and Plumtree watersheds.

I am FOR CB 20-19.

--

Regards,

Sue

Go placidly amid the noise and the haste.

You are a child of the universe.

And whether or not it is clear to you,
no doubt the universe is unfolding as it should.