

**Sayers, Margery**

---

**From:** Jones, Diane  
**Sent:** Friday, September 13, 2019 4:44 PM  
**To:** Sayers, Margery  
**Subject:** FW: Testimony for CB38, CR122 and CR123  
**Attachments:** CB38 CR122 CR123\_Lilly.pdf

Margery, can you please remove Ms. Lilly from the testifying list and include her testimony?

Thank you,

Diane

---

**From:** Lori Lilly <lorililly@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, September 13, 2019 4:34 PM  
**To:** Walsh, Elizabeth <ewalsh@howardcountymd.gov>; Jones, Opel <ojones@howardcountymd.gov>; Rigby, Christiana <crigby@howardcountymd.gov>; Jung, Deb <djung@howardcountymd.gov>; Yungmann, David <dyungmann@howardcountymd.gov>  
**Cc:** Jones, Diane <dijones@howardcountymd.gov>  
**Subject:** Testimony for CB38, CR122 and CR123

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

Good afternoon,

I was not able to submit written testimony through the online sign-up (and accidentally signed up to testify in person though I will not be able to attend. Diane, can you remove me and include this written testimony below?).

Thank you very much.

9/13/2019

Dear Members of the Howard County Council,

---


Thank you for considering these comments in your review of CB38, CR122 and CR123. Please note that these comments are from myself as an individual and resident of Howard County and do not represent the organization or Board Members of Howard EcoWorks.

With regards to CB38, first, thank you to Council Member Walsh for putting forth this legislation to protect the Lower North Branch Patapsco Watershed. It is heartening to have a council representative with so much dedication to protecting our natural resources.

I do have some reservations with regards to this legislation. While I know it was put forward with the best of intentions, the geographic scope seems arbitrary. If the legislation had been limited to the Tiber Hudson or Plumtree, I would have had no question. I do not understand the justification for the legislation to the entire

Lower North Branch Patapsco as compared to other areas in the County. I feel these protections should be applied to all of our sensitive resources and, to that end, my recommendation would be to apply this legislation to the entirety of Howard County's Green Infrastructure Network (GIN).

The GIN represents our County's most important ecological areas. The County has done extensive planning and GIS analysis to identify and map these special areas yet there is no regulatory protection, and every year the GIN becomes more and more fragmented. Ecosystem services function best when they are connected and what we need, with threats of climate change looming right in front of us, is resilient natural infrastructure, that is, a functional network of hubs and corridors that is maximized for benefits to people and wildlife. If you are not familiar with the GIN, below is a screenshot from [Howard County's interactive map](#) noting the location throughout all of your districts.



Recently I attended the County Executive's announcement about Howard County becoming a Bee City. I applaud this initiative but the irony was not lost on me that, as we all stood in the meadow at the Howard County Conservancy to extol an effort to benefit ecosystem services, the sounds of bulldozers rumbled in the background as areas directly adjacent to the Conservancy and Patapsco Park were (and still are) being plowed under for a new development. That particular parcel is, strangely, not in the GIN even though it sits between two protected pieces of land. Part of the Conservancy is not in the GIN either. In discussions with the Office of Community Sustainability about why a portion of the Conservancy or this area under development are not identified for inclusion in the GIN, the answer is that the mapping was a high level planning exercise and it is not perfect. And I get that, which is why I think that we need to protect both the GIN and a buffered area around its perimeter, have triggers in place when development is occurring within or adjacent to the GIN, and then regulatory legislation as outlined in CB38 to provide protection for these exceptional resources. In addition, restoration of the GIN is needed as so much has already been fragmented. Just one example of the affects of this fragmentation, is the number of car collisions with deer. Deer thrive on "edge" habitat and every year we make more and more of that such that the wildlife do not have safe places to travel and therefore endanger our own travel-ways. What is the rate of deer collisions over the past couple of

decades? I did not have time to look it up, but my best guess is that it has increased significantly over the years.

In conclusion with regards to CB38, I hope that the Council will consider **bold** action to extend Council Member's Walsh's legislation to the entirety of Howard County's Green Infrastructure Network. That truly would be an incredible act that would provide benefits to many future generations while preparing our County and its people for the uncertainties that we face with climate change.

With regards to CR122 and CR123 – while my preference would be for a complete and indefinite moratorium on development in the Tiber Hudson and Plumtree watersheds, I support these resolution and modifications to the Howard County Design Manual as a positive step that will help to limit and dissuade development in the watershed. I hope that you will pass these resolutions as a next step in protecting Ellicott City.

Thank you for your consideration of this testimony.

Sincerely,

Lori Lilly  
10520 Old Frederick Rd.  
Woodstock, MD 21163

--  
Lori A. Lilly, CEP, CBLP



9/13/2019


Dear Members of the Howard County Council,

Thank you for considering these comments in your review of CB38, CR122 and CR123. Please note that these comments are from myself as an individual and resident of Howard County and do not represent the organization or Board Members of Howard EcoWorks.

With regards to CB38, first, thank you to Council Member Walsh for putting forth this legislation to protect the Lower North Branch Patapsco Watershed. It is heartening to have a council representative with so much dedication to protecting our natural resources.

I do have some reservations with regards to this legislation. While I know it was put forward with the best of intentions, the geographic scope seems arbitrary. If the legislation had been limited to the Tiber Hudson or Plumtree, I would have had no question. I do not understand the justification for the legislation to the entire Lower North Branch Patapsco as compared to other areas in the County. I feel these protections should be applied to all of our sensitive resources and, to that end, my recommendation would be to apply this legislation to the entirety of Howard County's Green Infrastructure Network (GIN).

The GIN represents our County's most important ecological areas. The County has done extensive planning and GIS analysis to identify and map these special areas yet there is no regulatory protection, and every year the GIN becomes more and more fragmented. Ecosystem services function best when they are connected and what we need, with threats of climate change looming right in front of us, is resilient natural infrastructure, that is, a functional network of hubs and corridors that is maximized for benefits to people and wildlife. If you are not familiar with the GIN, below is a screenshot from [Howard County's interactive map](#) noting the location throughout all of your districts.



Recently I attended the County Executive's announcement about Howard County becoming a Bee City. I applaud this initiative but the irony was not lost on me that, as we all stood in the meadow at the Howard County Conservancy to extol an effort to benefit ecosystem services, the sounds of bulldozers rumbled in the background as areas directly adjacent to the Conservancy and Patapsco Park were (and still are) being plowed under for a new development. That particular parcel is, strangely, not in the GIN even though it sits between two protected pieces of land. Part of the Conservancy is not in the GIN either. In discussions with the Office of Community Sustainability about why a portion of the Conservancy or this area under development are not identified for inclusion in the GIN, the answer is that the mapping was a high level planning exercise and it is not perfect. And I get that, which is why I think that we need to protect both the GIN and a buffered area around its perimeter, have triggers in place when development is occurring within or adjacent to the GIN, and then regulatory legislation as outlined in CB38 to provide protection for these exceptional resources. In addition, restoration of the GIN is needed as so much has already been fragmented. Just one example of the affects of this fragmentation, is the number of car collisions with deer. Deer thrive on "edge" habitat and every year we make more and more of that such that the wildlife do not have safe places to travel and therefore endanger our own travel-ways. What is the rate of deer collisions over the past couple of decades? I did not have time to look it up, but my best guess is that it has increased significantly over the years.

In conclusion with regards to CB38, I hope that the Council will consider **bold** action to extend Council Member's Walsh's legislation to the entirety of Howard County's Green Infrastructure Network. That truly would be an incredible act that would provide benefits to many future generations while preparing our County and its people for the uncertainties that we face with climate change.

With regards to CR122 and CR123 – while my preference would be for a complete and indefinite moratorium on development in the Tiber Hudson and Plumtree watersheds, I support these resolution and modifications to the Howard County Design Manual as a positive step that will help to limit and dissuade development in the watershed. I hope that you will pass these resolutions as a next step in protecting Ellicott City.

Thank you for your consideration of this testimony.

Sincerely,

Lori Lilly  
10520 Old Frederick Rd.  
Woodstock, MD 21163