

CB-17

Sayers, Margery

From: Betsy Singer <betsysing@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 28, 2021 5:47 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: CB-17 Solar Zoning

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

Dear Council Members: Thanks to those of you who were able to meet with us. We know it's a very busy time. We feel passionately about solar energy and want all of you to know our position concerning CB-17. Generally, we believe that CB-17 strikes a balance regarding commercial solar facilities (CSF) on properties in the Agricultural Land Preservation Program (ALPP). Under existing law, ALPP properties that can support a CSF are already limited by the requirement to be near high power transmission lines. Of this subset of eligible properties, CB-17 would reduce the amount of land available for a CSF from 75 acres to 16 acres or 34%, whichever is less. We believe this is already a major concession. Having 66% of the property available for farming is in accordance with the current criteria to be able to enter into the ALPP program.

Amendment 1: Strongly oppose - This amendment would require large minimum setbacks along the property line. This could force the solar facility to be placed on farmable portions of the property. This amendment is solely for aesthetic concerns of adjacent property owners and restricts the rights of farm owners to decide the best use of their land.

Amendment 2: Support - This amendment would require the solar facility to be co-located with some "harmonious" agricultural use. We think this dual use can greatly improve soil health while strengthening rural communities and their economies, so we support this amendment. In his report "[Exploring Farming and Solar Synergies](#)," Dr. Arjun Makhijani at [IEER](#) finds that "joint agricultural and solar sector development can result in large benefits for both and for rural communities more generally."

Amendment 3: Strongly oppose - This amendment would prohibit solar facilities unless active farming is on site. The Agricultural Land Preservation Program doesn't require ongoing farming, so we oppose this more onerous requirement. Amendment 2, the requirement to co-locate a solar facility with agricultural use, is sufficient and in keeping with the intent and goals of the agricultural preservation program.

Amendment 4: Support - This amendment would stipulate that ground-mount solar collector installations in specified business districts be allowed as a matter of right. We support amendments that eliminate some of the permitting processes that solar arrays need for zoning approval.

Amendment 5: Oppose - This amendment, requiring that a glare study or certification be provided, is unnecessary. The technology and use of single-axis tracking eliminates the need for this extra certification process.

Amendments 6: Oppose - This amendment would reduce the amount of agricultural preservation land available for solar to 20% of the property, while allowing up to 34% under certain conditions. CB-17 already restricts the land available to 34% or 16 acres, whichever is less. Existing law allows solar on 75 acres, so CB-17 would already impose major restrictions on the subset of ALPP properties eligible for CSFs. An analysis of the [properties acquired in the ALPP program since 2013](#) indicates that only 3 properties reach the 34% limit; the others were limited to 16 acres. Please see [the spreadsheet here](#). In addition, on average, only 26% of the land would be available for solar on these ALPP properties under CB-17 as proposed, excluding the other eligibility criteria. Very few properties would reach the 34% limit.

Amendment 7: Strongly oppose - This amendment would limit the amount of agricultural preservation land available for solar to 20%. On average, because of other restrictions, even less than 20% of the land would actually be available. To help meet our climate goals, the county needs smart solar policies that aren't overly restrictive and burdensome.

For more insight at the state level, according to Richard Deutschmann from Indivisible Howard County:

"For a bit of perspective on the effects on our farmland, we offer the following numbers. If Maryland were to develop an astounding 5,000MW of solar in the coming decades (well beyond the current

carveout from the Clean Energy Jobs Act of 2019, and beyond most industry projections) and 3/4 of this were larger ground-mounted systems, this would take up approximately 15,000 acres across the state. The State of MD in 2019 estimated the amount of farmland in Maryland to be 2,000,000 acres. ***In other words, the highest forecasted amount of solar in the coming decades is likely to take up less than 3/4 of 1% of all farmland.*** This is hardly an attack on our rural communities, sustainable agriculture, or our ability to grow sufficient food in the state.”

Amendment 8: Oppose - This amendment would require solar collectors to be removed when no longer in service. This is unnecessary as it is already specified in Section 131.0: - Conditional Uses.

We understand the need to balance the preservation of farmland and the need to rapidly transition to clean energy. Climate change is a threat to farming. Allowing farmers a steady income from solar will help make farming more economically viable. We also understand that the county has funded the protection of farmland at considerable cost. We will compromise ourselves into devastating weather events fueled by climate change if we restrict too severely the land available for smart solar deployment. The cost for farmland protection will pale in comparison to the cost of climate change mitigation. Look no farther than Ellicott City.

Again, thank you for hearing our concerns. Please let me know if you are able to meet via Zoom.

Thank you, Betsy

Betsy Singer, Ho Co Climate Action

Liz Feighner - HoCo Climate Action & Green Team Chair, Emmanuel UMC

Ruth Alice White - HoCo Climate Action & Sierra Club of MD

Charlie Goedeke - HoCo Climate Action and Transition HoCo

Meagan Braganca - Our Revolution Howard County

Paul Baicich - Our Revolution Howard County

--

Betsy Singer

410-730-7740

443-812-2525 cell

Sayers, Margery

From: Gick, Ginnie
Sent: Friday, April 23, 2021 9:44 PM
To: Sayers, Margery
Subject: FW: Solar Power as a Source of County Wealth

From: Crl Zrvs <zervascarol@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 18, 2021 6:13 AM
To: Yungmann, David <dyungmann@howardcountymd.gov>; Walsh, Elizabeth <ewalsh@howardcountymd.gov>; Jones, Opel <oJones@howardcountymd.gov>; Rigby, Christiana <crigby@howardcountymd.gov>; Jung, Deb <djung@howardcountymd.gov>; Feldmark, Joshua <jofeldmark@howardcountymd.gov>; Mahoney, William <WMahoney@howardcountymd.gov>; Miller, Leah <lemiller@howardcountymd.gov>; Hoover, Matthew <mhoover@howardcountymd.gov>
Subject: Solar Power as a Source of County Wealth

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

To Howard County Office of Community Sustainability and Howard County Councilmembers:

In light of the legislation now before you which deals with solar installations on private property, and the likelihood of much more solar development on the horizon, it seems that this is the point when COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING of the County's overall approach to solar power should happen.

I think almost everyone recognizes that this is a pivotal time for the County, when many kinds of change will be considered to produce a new, thriving County. Personally, I hope that narrow real estate considerations shall not dominate the decisionmaking as it has. In the instance of solar, I think it should be viewed as a potential asset to be carefully, widely, and smartly deployed across County-owned properties. In other words, some large sections of County-owned land and buildings can be viewed as sources of highly valuable assets to be strategically deployed for the benefit of the County as a whole, not as means of helping only one or two sectors of the economy, or as means of securing political advantage, or to achieve the appearance of reduced dependence on nonrenewable energy sources where no actual reduction has occurred.

Let me offer what is to me an inspiring example of excellent planning and public-private cooperation. It is a city which has based some of its "wealth" on comprehensive, strategically located solar collection and storage in a variety of forms and locations. A commitment to use of solar on a similar scale could become one important pillar in HoCo's economy, viewed not as a service to the planet but as part of the engine for the County's growth.

Respectfully offered,

Carol Zervas

<https://www.babcockranch.com/about-us/solar/>

Sayers, Margery

From: Jung, Deb
Sent: Monday, April 19, 2021 1:36 PM
To: Sayers, Margery
Subject: FW: Solar Power as a Source of County Wealth

Deb Jung

Councilmember, District 4
3430 Court House Drive
Ellicott City, MD 21043
410-313-2001

Sign up for my newsletter [here](#).



From: Crl Zrvs <zervascarol@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 18, 2021 6:13 AM
To: Yungmann, David <dyungmann@howardcountymd.gov>; Walsh, Elizabeth <ewalsh@howardcountymd.gov>; Jones, Opel <ojones@howardcountymd.gov>; Rigby, Christiana <crigby@howardcountymd.gov>; Jung, Deb <djung@howardcountymd.gov>; Feldmark, Joshua <jofeldmark@howardcountymd.gov>; Mahoney, William <WMahoney@howardcountymd.gov>; Miller, Leah <lemiller@howardcountymd.gov>; Hoover, Matthew <mhoover@howardcountymd.gov>
Subject: Solar Power as a Source of County Wealth

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

To Howard County Office of Community Sustainability and Howard County Councilmembers:

In light of the legislation now before you which deals with solar installations on private property, and the likelihood of much more solar development on the horizon, it seems that this is the point when COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING of the County's overall approach to solar power should happen.

I think almost everyone recognizes that this is a pivotal time for the County, when many kinds of change will be considered to produce a new, thriving County. Personally, I hope that narrow real estate considerations shall not dominate the decisionmaking as it has. In the instance of solar, I think it should be viewed as a potential asset to be carefully, widely, and smartly deployed across County-owned properties. In other words, some large sections of County-owned land and buildings can be viewed as sources of highly valuable assets to be strategically deployed for the benefit of the County as a whole, not as means of helping only one or two sectors of the economy, or as means of securing political advantage, or to achieve the appearance of reduced dependence on nonrenewable energy sources where no actual reduction has occurred.

Let me offer what is to me an inspiring example of excellent planning and public-private cooperation. It is a city which has based some of its "wealth" on comprehensive, strategically located solar collection and storage in a variety of forms and locations. A commitment to use of solar on a similar scale could become one important

pillar in HoCo's economy, viewed not as a service to the planet but as part of the engine for the County's growth.

Respectfully offered,

Carol Zervas

<https://www.babcockranch.com/about-us/solar/>

Sayers, Margery

From: mramsay21104@verizon.net
Sent: Saturday, April 17, 2021 2:18 PM
To: CouncilMail
Cc: dramsay21104@verizon.net
Subject: Objection to CB-17, solar expansion

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

Dear Councilmembers,

I spoke about this topic when you provided a public forum on March 15. Here is the transcript of my talk, plus some links to relevant information.

Hello, I'm mark Ramsay, of Adam David Way, Marriottsville, a registered professional engineer. I worked for Constellation Energy where I learned about the electrical grid and solar installations. I also worked 25 years in the chemical industry. I researched climate change for three weeks a year ago. While energy conservation measures work, alternate energy production methods pose a lot of unreported drawbacks.

Accessory solar collectors, I see no problem there.

What I want to show is that County Policy 4.12's good intention to reduce greenhouse gas won't be met by freeing 16-acre parcels for more solar farms.

The problem is China's coal-fired power plant plans. Reuters news states that China has more than the entire coal power plant capacity of the US on the drawing board. To offset this, the US would need to shutdown all its like generation plants and erect 125,000, yes 125,000, 16-acre solar farms in their place, and provide nighttime power some other way. Hundreds of coal power plants are underway in Asia. The bill's proposed 16-acre solar farms, therefore, won't mitigate The CO2 to come. And it takes two years of operation to make up for the energy required to manufacture the panels, energy that has to come from high-temperature burning coal.

Solar panels contain carcinogenic cadmium and lead. When panels reach their end of life, they are disposed. If they break during disposal, or in service, such as from ferocious winds, cadmium will leach into groundwater. California recognizes this as a serious problem and legislatively is getting active about it. I did not see in the bill this pollutant addressed.

Hostile foreign actors are buying US land. Please be aware of this risk and mitigate against it. Landowners may want to sell solar converted land, after signing power agreements, as it has no farming value left. Through well-disguised US subsidiaries, China bought 146,000 acres of farmland in 2013 in the mid-west. They bought 140,000 acres for solar and wind power in Texas. Howard County's western farmland in toto is attractive for purchase. We don't need hostile actors acting through proxies on our electrical grid, nor buying our land.

Solar panels in any large farms should be mandated to be manufactured in the US. There are over a dozen US manufacturers.

A book entitled The Rational Optimist, published in 2010, estimates that the earth will grow by 3 billion more people 30 years from now. Therefore, I think it is better to reserve our farmland for future crops rather than contribute next to nothing to the global environment with new solar farms.

Now, here is a link to the filmmaker Michael Moore video where he exposes the fraud of solar energy promises. He interview a knowledgeable engineer; something we need to have more in these discussions nowadays. Youtube has put it in private viewing mode, but you may find it here using a DuckDuckGo browser: [planet of the humans at DuckDuckGo](#)

And here is an article by Forbes: [If Solar Panels Are So Clean, Why Do They Produce So Much Toxic Waste? \(forbes.com\)](#)

Concluding, laying down solar panels may make some people feel good, but in reality it will do nothing for our climate.

Thank you,
Mark Ramsay

Sayers, Margery

From: Tom Bannister <tom.bannister@nvc-inc.net>
Sent: Wednesday, April 14, 2021 9:47 AM
To: CouncilMail; Thomas Bannister
Subject: Solar Farms

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

To All,

What is up with all the new Solar Farms in Western Howard County?

Ten Oaks Road and Brighton Dam Road, 6600 Tenoaks Road, and now Carrs Mill Road.

Is anyone tracking these and why so many? What is the benefit to the County besides land lost for agriculture use and a ton of ugly solar panels that are useless in bad weather and there is no facility storing any energy for use during that bad weather.

What is the plan going forward to regulate where and when to allow these Solar Farms to be constructed?

Thank you,

Tom Bannister
14821 Michele Drive
Glenelg, MD 21737

Sayers, Margery

From: Douglas Creswell <dougtcreswell@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 13, 2021 3:06 PM
To: CouncilMail
Subject: CB-63 and CB-17

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

Dear Council members,

We are 30 year residents of safe, beautiful Howard County. Both CB-63 and CB—17 threaten to seriously diminish the way of life and values we sought when we moved here. CB-13 is strongly opposed by us, and many of our neighbors support that position. To roll out a welcome mat to those who have no regard for lawful controls now in place is unconscionable. The concept of sanctuary cities and counties deifies common sense and rational behavior in civil life. Those in authority in this county should strongly oppose this Bill. It is so bad, it should not even be given a place on the ballot.

Respectfully,

Douglas and Ruth Creswell
Mount Airy, Maryland, District 5

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

Sayers, Margery

From: Jung, Deb
Sent: Tuesday, April 13, 2021 2:39 PM
To: Sayers, Margery
Subject: FW: CB 17 - Solar on Agricultural Land- Oppose Amendments 3, 7 and 8

Deb Jung

Councilmember, District 4
3430 Court House Drive
Ellicott City, MD 21043
410-313-2001

Sign up for my newsletter [here](#).



From: Betsy Singer <betsysing@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 5, 2021 12:59 PM
To: Jung, Deb <djung@howardcountymd.gov>
Subject: CB 17 - Solar on Agricultural Land- Oppose Amendments 3, 7 and 8

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

Dear Deb: I hope you and your family are enjoying the beginning of spring and the hope that it inspires.

I am writing to you because I am concerned about certain amendments to the County's recent solar siting bill CB17 which is scheduled for a vote in the County Council tonight.

As a supporter of clean energy and our need as a community to shift from fossil fuels to solar and wind, I strongly support CB17 as a reasonable extension and clarification of Howard County's existing solar siting policy and hope you do, too.

However, of the Amendments proposed, I OPPOSE Amendment 3 that would require farming on the non-solar part of the property. I oppose Amendment 7 that flatly requires solar restriction to only 20% of the property. I OPPOSE Amendment 8 because of the extra expense as a requirement for installation.

I sincerely hope that CB 17 passes without Amendments 3, 7 and 8.

Thank you for considering my views in voting tonight on CB 17.

Sincerely, Betsy

Elizabeth Singer
6180 Devon Dr.
Columbia, MD 21044
410-730-7740
443-812-2525 cell

Sayers, Margery

From: Jung, Deb
Sent: Tuesday, April 13, 2021 2:37 PM
To: Sayers, Margery
Subject: FW: CB-17

Deb Jung

Councilmember, District 4
3430 Court House Drive
Ellicott City, MD 21043
410-313-2001

Sign up for my newsletter [here](#).



From: Carla Tevelow <perlpubl@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 5, 2021 1:28 PM
To: Jung, Deb <djung@howardcountymd.gov>
Subject: CB-17

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

(forgive me if i already sent this)

Dear Councilwoman Jung,

As a constituent of your district -4- i'm asking you to please oppose most of the amendments for CB-17. The bill as originally written is a reasonable clarification with minor improved changes to the County's existing solar siting program. If necessary, i can support amendments 2 and 6. I urge you to oppose all other amendments which unnecessarily weaken CB-17.

Thank you.

Peace,

Carla Tevelow

10205 Wincopin Circle
21044

Sayers, Margery

From: Jung, Deb
Sent: Tuesday, April 13, 2021 2:36 PM
To: Sayers, Margery
Subject: FW: CB17 - 2021 Zoning Changes for Solar Siting

Deb Jung

Councilmember, District 4
3430 Court House Drive
Ellicott City, MD 21043
410-313-2001

Sign up for my newsletter [here](#).



From: Richard D <rdeutschmann2@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 5, 2021 3:58 PM
To: Walsh, Elizabeth <ewalsh@howardcountymd.gov>; Jung, Deb <djung@howardcountymd.gov>; Rigby, Christiana <crigby@howardcountymd.gov>; Jones, Opel <ojones@howardcountymd.gov>; Yungmann, David <dyungmann@howardcountymd.gov>
Cc: Ball, Calvin <cball@howardcountymd.gov>; Feldmark, Joshua <jofeldmark@howardcountymd.gov>
Subject: CB17 - 2021 Zoning Changes for Solar Siting

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

Members of the Howard County Council,

On behalf of the 750 members of Indivisible Howard County, we oppose most of the proposed changes to the current zoning. In particular, while we can support Amendment 2 to encourage positive interaction of solar energy projects with harmonious agriculture such as pollinator habitat, and neutral on Amendment 6, **we are opposed to all other proposed amendments to CB17.**

We don't have to tell you that climate change is a very real global emergency, whose effects are slowly playing out before us in the form of coastal inundation, drought, unprecedented fires, higher levels of hurricane and tornado activity. Answering the call will require us to rapidly move to non-fossil, non-carbon forms of electricity like solar, wind, and associated battery storage. Some counties across the state are putting unreasonable limits on solar energy siting for community and utility scale solar in the state, which will have a disastrous effect on our ability to make this transition.

For a bit of perspective on the effects on our farmland, we offer the following numbers. If Maryland were to develop an astounding 5,000MW of solar in the coming decades (well beyond the current carveout from the Clean Energy Jobs Act of 2019, and beyond most industry projections, and 3/4 of this were larger ground mounted systems, this would take up approximately 15,000 acres across the state. The State of MD in 2019 estimated the amount of farmland in Maryland to be 2,000,000 acres. **In other words, the highest forecasted amount of solar in the coming decades is likely to take**

up less than 3/4 of 1% of all farmland. This is hardly an attack on our rural communities, sustainable agriculture, or our ability to grow sufficient food in the state.

What this will do is to allow us to transition away from most all of the coal and gas-fired electricity that currently makes up a majority of our generation, and for us to have a fighting chance at doing our part to combat global climate change. All, while bringing \$Billions in investment, thousands of good paying jobs, and saving us further \$Billions in resiliency costs such as protecting our thousands of miles of coastland.

We urge you to vote "No" on all amendments with the exception of #2 and possibly #6 as you consider these changes.

Thank you,

Richard Deutschmann, PE
9485 Hickory Limb
Columbia, MD 21045

Lead/Climate Action Team
Indivisible Howard County
M – (410)707-4368

Sayers, Margery

From: Jung, Deb
Sent: Tuesday, April 13, 2021 2:36 PM
To: Sayers, Margery
Subject: FW: Amendments to CB-17, ZRA-197

Deb Jung

Councilmember, District 4
3430 Court House Drive
Ellicott City, MD 21043
410-313-2001

Sign up for my newsletter [here](#).



From: Stuart Kohn <stukohn@verizon.net>
Sent: Monday, April 5, 2021 3:01 PM
To: Jung, Deb <djung@howardcountymd.gov>; Walsh, Elizabeth <ewalsh@howardcountymd.gov>
Subject: Fwd: Amendments to CB-17, ZRA-197

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

Dear Deb and Liz,

Good Afternoon.

I would like to reinforce the email below by Ted Mariani regarding CB17-2021 sent to Councilman Yungmann. Ted's email clearly depicts the importance to ensure that the protection and integrity of the Agriculture Program is always inherent.

We are simply hoping and depending on you for the right decision.

Thanks for your consideration.

Stu Kohn
HCCA President

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Theodore Mariani <theodore.f.mariani@icloud.com>
Date: April 5, 2021 at 12:16:27 PM EDT

To: "Yungmann, David" <dyungmann@howardcountymd.gov>

Cc: Cathy Hudson <cmhudson@comcast.net>, Ann Jones <annholmesjones@yahoo.com>, Dan O'Leary <danielol12832h@gmail.com>, Stu Kohn <stukohn@verizon.net>

Subject: Re: Amendments to CB-17, ZRA-197

David

I have a problem with allowing more than 2MW on any Ag Pres site.

If a solar project that can exceed 2MW it falls under the jurisdiction of the PSC and the County loses control.

Furthermore it was the clear that the Howard County Solar Task Force as well as the APB endorsed the limitation of 2MW to ensure that AgPres land could never become a site for a utility scale CSF. Anything beyond a 2MW capacity is not Community Solar which is the correct scale for Solar on Ag Pres.

In addition to the 2 MW limit the 16 acre max should be retained or even tightened .

My recommendation in this regard is that the limit be 12 acres but could be increased to max of 16 upon showing that 2 MW cannot be achieved within the 12 acre limit.

Ted

Theodore F. Mariani's
16449 Ed Warfield Rd.
Woodbine, MD 21797

301-523-6190

On Apr 5, 2021, at 08:32, Yungmann, David <dyungmann@howardcountymd.gov> wrote:

Thanks Dan

David Yungmann
410-207-7777
www.HowardCountyMove.com

On Apr 5, 2021, at 7:47 AM, Dan O'Leary <danielol12832h@gmail.com> wrote:

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

David,

We appreciate your careful consideration of these matters that have occupied us for the last 5 years. We will be sending another

email today encouraging you and others to protect the other residential zones in the manner that you have represented RR and RC.

Best,
Dan O'Leary
Ted Mariani

On Mon, Apr 5, 2021 at 4:55 AM Yungmann, David
<dyungmann@howardcountymd.gov> wrote:

Thank you Dan. I believe we have the votes for the 20% cap. The administration's amendment was negotiated in order to protect the properties with a large percentage of non-productive, which is the actual concern of the folks on the ALB who promoted the 20%. I agree that the 20% is more predictable and easier to manage. Hopefully we will get that one tonight.

The consensus appears to be that, if someone get can more than 2 MW on the same size field someday, that's a good thing. I'd prefer to have another mechanism to control size and keep them out of the PSC. Well I'd really prefer to make it all go away!

David Yungmann

Howard County Council – District 5

(410) 313-2001

<https://cc.howardcountymd.gov/Districts/District-5>

From: Dan O'Leary <danielol12832h@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, April 2, 2021 8:34 AM

To: CouncilMail <CouncilMail@howardcountymd.gov>

Cc: Theodore Mariani <theodore.f.mariani@icloud.com>; Stu Kohn

[<stukohn@verizon.net>](mailto:stukohn@verizon.net)

Subject: Amendments to CB-17, ZRA-197

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

Dear Council Members,

Please accept the attached comments on
proposed amendments to this measure.
We are available to answer any questions
you may have.

We hope you find it useful in your
deliberations.

Ted Mariani, President

CCHWC

Stu Kohn, President

HCCA

Dan O'Leary, Chairman

Sayers, Margery

From: Jung, Deb
Sent: Tuesday, April 13, 2021 2:35 PM
To: Sayers, Margery
Subject: FW: CB-17 amendments comments to county council

Deb Jung

Councilmember, District 4
3430 Court House Drive
Ellicott City, MD 21043
410-313-2001

Sign up for my newsletter [here](#).



From: Linda Kangrga <lkangrga@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 5, 2021 3:00 PM
To: Jung, Deb <djung@howardcountymd.gov>
Subject: CB-17 amendments comments to county council

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

Dear Deb,

Thank you for all you do for Howard County. I hear you are voting today on a solar Bill. I ask that you vote against the add on bills that would restrict who can choose to benefit from a solar farm and where it can exist in our county. Howard is so behind on this that I already subscribe to a solar farm in Baltimore County and get the rest of my electric from wind power where it is purchased from states that have wind farms. I live in Longfellow in the woods and choose not to cut down trees to qualify for solar on my roof. There are many communities and Howard County farms that no longer "farm" that could benefit from a solar farm business on their property. The Senior development in Clarksville for one and friends of mine in West Friendship, but also there are acres in Columbia that could generate local electricity where farms no longer exist. Please consider these when you vote today.

Best wishes,
Linda Kangrga,
5163 Endymion Ln, Columbia, MD 21044
410-262-2254

<http://docs.google.com/document/u/0/d/1ZQw9VggjdeWTasq621uMG0RfvU82z0PMMgUR7yK4EOw/mobilebasic>