Introduced _____
Public Hearing _____
Council Action _____
Executive Action _____
Effective Date _____

County Council Of Howard County, Maryland

2015 Legislative Session

Legislative Day No. 13

Bill No. 52 -2015

Introduced by: The Chairperson at the request of the County Executive
and Cosponsored by Greg Fox

AN ACT amending the existing Watershed Protection and Restoration Fee to include the rates in the Howard County Code; reducing the rates of the fee beginning on July 1, 2016; providing for the application of this Act; providing for the abrogation of certain provisions of the Howard County Code related to the fee, as of July 1, 2017; and generally relating to the Watershed Protection and Restoration Fee.

Introduced and read first time _____, 2015. Ordered posted and hearing scheduled.

By order _____
Jessica Feldmark, Administrator

Having been posted and notice of time & place of hearing & title of Bill having been published according to Charter, the Bill was read for a second time at a public hearing on _____, 2015.

By order _____
Jessica Feldmark, Administrator

This Bill was read the third time on _____, 2016 and Passed ___, Passed with amendments _____, Failed _____.

By order _____
Jessica Feldmark, Administrator

Sealed with the County Seal and presented to the County Executive for approval this ___day of _____, 2016 at ___ a.m./p.m.

By order _____
Jessica Feldmark, Administrator

Approved/Vetoed by the County Executive _____, 2016

_____
Allan H. Kittleman, County Executive

NOTE: [[text in brackets]] indicates deletions from existing law; TEXT IN SMALL CAPITALS indicates additions to existing law; ~~Strike-out~~ indicates material deleted by amendment; Underlining indicates material added by amendment

WHEREAS, we, as a County, have a responsibility to preserve and protect the Chesapeake Bay Watershed for future generations; and

WHEREAS, Senate Bill 863, passed by the General Assembly in 2015, repealed the requirement for jurisdictions to collect a Watershed Protection and Restoration Fee but continues to require that jurisdictions have a Watershed Protection and Restoration fund and program; and

WHEREAS, the County has a plan to maintain funding for the Watershed Protection and Restoration program and is able to continue to finance the stormwater remediation work required under our federally mandated National Pollution Discharge Elimination System ("NPDES") Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System ("MS4") Permit (the "Permit"); and

WHEREAS, the County will continue to implement the numerous programs required by the Permit, including the development of restoration plans that will identify projects to treat untreated impervious acreage; and

WHEREAS, the County Executive believes that the Watershed Protection and Restoration Fee, as enacted by the County Council through passage of Council Bill No. 8-2013, is an excessive burden on the residents and businesses, especially small businesses, of Howard County; and

WHEREAS, the County Executive is confident that the County will continue to exercise fiscal prudence in selecting projects to pursue, as well as utilize innovative practices, in an overarching strategy to address requirements that the federally mandated Permit has on the County.

NOW THEREFORE,

Section 1. Be It Enacted *by the County Council of Howard County, Maryland that the Howard County Code is amended as follows:*

1. By amending:

Title 20. Taxes, Charges and Fees.

Section 20.1102. Watershed protection and restoration fund.

2. By amending:

Title 20. Taxes, Charges and Fees.

Section 20.1103. Watershed protection and restoration fee.

3. By amending:

Title 20. Taxes, Charges and Fees.

Section 20.1104. Schedule of rates; regulations.

Title 20. Taxes, Charges and Fees.

Subtitle 11. - Watershed Protection And Restoration.

Section 20.1102. Watershed protection and restoration fund.

(a) *Dedicated Fund.* In accordance with Title 4, Subtitle 2 of the Environment Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland, the County's Watershed Protection and Restoration Fund is hereby established as a dedicated, non-lapsing, Enterprise Fund.

(b) *Revenue*. The following revenue shall be deposited into the fund:

(1) Monetary contributions to meet the provisions of Title 18, Subtitle 9 of this Code regarding stormwater management alternatives;

(2) All monetary fines, penalties, and costs associated with violations of Title 18, Subtitle 3 and Subtitle 9 of this Code;

(3) All money collected ON BILLINGS DONE PRIOR TO JULY 1, 2017 from the imposition of the WATERSHED PROTECTION AND RESTORATION FEE [[fee]], AS THAT FEE EXISTED PRIOR TO JULY 1, 2017;

(4) All interest or other income earned on the investment of money in the fund; and

(5) Any additional money made available from any sources for the purposes for which the fund has been established.

(c) *Expenses*. In accordance with Title 2, Subtitle 4 of the Environment Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland and subject to subsection (d) of this section, the fund shall only be used for the following expenses:

(1) Capital improvements for stormwater management including stream and wetland restoration projects;

(2) Operation and maintenance of stormwater management systems and facilities;

(3) Public education and outreach relating to stormwater management or stream and wetland restoration;

(4) Stormwater management planning, including:

(i) Mapping and assessment of impervious surfaces; and

(ii) Monitoring, inspection, and enforcement activities to carry out the purposes of the fund;

(5) To the extent that fees imposed under Section 4-204 of the Environment Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland are deposited into the fund, review of stormwater management plans and permit applications for new development;

(6) Grants to nonprofit organizations for up to 100 percent of a project's costs for watershed restoration and rehabilitation projects relating to:

(i) Planning, design, and construction of stormwater management practices;

(ii) Stream and wetland restoration; and

(iii) Public education and outreach related to stormwater management or stream and wetland restoration; and

(7) Reasonable costs necessary to administer the fund.

(d) *Expenditure Priority*. Subject to the County Executive's budget authority under the Charter, the first priority for expenditure of revenue from the watershed protection and restoration fee collected under this subtitle shall be to pay the debt service on bonds, notes, and other obligations issued to finance or refinance capital improvements or related expenses in connection with stormwater management systems and facilities.

Section 20.1103. Watershed protection and restoration fee.

(a) The County shall charge and a property owner shall pay an annual Watershed Protection and Restoration Fee.

[[(b) The fee shall be adopted by resolution of the County Council.

(c) *Setting the Rate*. The County Council shall adopt by resolution a schedule of impervious unit rates and a schedule of rates for residential properties.]]

(B) *RATE FOR RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017.* FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017, BEGINNING ON JULY 1, 2016, THE RATES FOR RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES ARE AS FOLLOWS:

(1) TOWNHOUSE OR CONDOMINIUM UNITS - $7.50

(2) SINGLE FAMILY DETACHED

(I) PROPERTIES UP TO AND INCLUDING .25 ACRES - $22.50

(II) PROPERTIES LARGER THAN.25 ACRES - $45

(C) *IMPERVIOUS UNIT RATE FOR NON-RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017.* FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017, BEGINNING ON JULY 1, 2016, THE RATES FOR NON-RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES ARE AS FOLLOWS:

(1) $7.50 PER APARTMENT FOR APARTMENT BUILDINGS THAT ARE NOT SUBJECT TO THE SCHEDULE OF RATES FOR RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES; AND

(2) $7.50 PER IMPERVIOUS UNIT FOR NON-RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES.

(d) *Method of Calculation.* FOR NON-RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES, THE [[The]] fee based on the amount of impervious surface shall be calculated as follows:

(1) Determine the impervious surface measurement in square feet for the property, rounded to the nearest whole impervious unit.

(2) Multiply the property's impervious units by the Impervious Unit Rate.

(e) *Determining What Constitutes Impervious Area.* The County shall determine the impervious surface measurement for a NON-RESIDENTIAL property based on:

(1) Analysis of aerial photography;

(2) Measurement from approved engineering drawings including, without limitation, as-built drawings or site plans;

(3) Field surveys signed and sealed by a Professional Engineer or Professional Land Surveyor licensed in the State of Maryland; or

(4) Inspections conducted by the Department.

(f) *Agricultural Properties.* If a property has an agricultural use assessment as determined by the State Department of Assessments and Taxation, the fee shall be:

(1) The residential rate if:

(i) The property has a fully implemented Soil Conservation and Water Quality Plan that has been approved by the Soil Conservation District or a forest conservation and management agreement with the Maryland Department of Natural Resources; or

(ii) The property owner has agreed to enter into, and is in the process of implementing, a soil conservation and water quality plan; or

(2) Computed based on the impervious surface measurement calculated for the entire property, if the property has not implemented a Soil Conservation and Water Quality Plan approved by the Soil Conservation District.

Section 20.1104. Schedule of rates; regulations.

(a) The County Council shall adopt by resolution a schedule of rates that shall include:

[[(1) The impervious unit rate that may be based on certain variables relative to a property's characteristics;

(2) Rates for residential properties;]]

([[3]]1)Rates for credits awarded under section 20.1105 of this subtitle;

([[4]]2)Rates for reimbursements awarded under section 20.1106 of this subtitle; and

([[5]]3)Rates for reimbursements awarded under the Watershed Protection and Restoration Fee Assistance Program.

(b) *Regulations*. The County may adopt regulations to administer the provisions of this subtitle.

Section 2. And Be It Further Enacted *by the County Council of Howard County, Maryland that, at the end of July 1, 2017, with no further action required by the County Council, the following sections of the County Code shall be abrogated and of no further force and effect:*

1. Section 18.901(tt);

2. Section 18.907;

3. Section 18.909(e);

4. Section 20.1100;

5. Section 20.1101;

6. Section 20.1103;

7. Section 20.1104;

8. Section 20.1105;

9. Section 20.1106;

10. Section 20.1108;

11. Section 20.1109;

12. Section 20.1110; and

13. Section 20.1111.

***Section 3. And Be It Further Enacted** by the County Council of Howard County, Maryland that Section 1 of this Act shall apply beginning on July 1, 2016.*

***Section 4. And Be It Further Enacted** by the County Council of Howard County, Maryland that this Act shall become effective 61 days after its enactment.*

PATH
People Acting Together In Howard

Name: Lynne Hogan Institution: UUCC

Adress: 2311 Rockwell Ave

Email Address: hogan.lynne@gmail.com

Dear County Council members,

As a leader with PATH, I am asking you to **please vote against CB 52**, the Stormwater Fee Repeal Bill. The current stormwater fee is a progressive way to address harmful runoff into the Chesapeake Bay, and is not an unnecessary burden to taxpayers. The fee supports programs such as the READY Program (created by PATH, the Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay, and the County) to address stormwater remediation and employ and develop Howard County youth. There are many priorities this year and in the years to come that will be critical to the health and success of our county that the general fund supports, such as increasing educational opportunities, expanding transportation for seniors and other residents of the county, and ensuring the availability of affordable housing for current and future residents. Let's keep the general fund strong by keeping the Stormwater Fee intact. Thank you for your support!

Lynne Hogan

2018 JAN 1 P 12:

I could not find in any district in Howard County

C852

93

People Acting Together In Howard

Name: Betsy Osterman Institution: UUCC

Address: 5635 Lightspun Lane Columbia MD 21045

Email Address: e021045@gmail.com

2011 JAN 11 P 12:24 HOWARD COUNTY COUNCIL

Dear County Council members,

As a leader with PATH, I am asking you to **please vote against CB 52**, the Stormwater Fee Repeal Bill. The current stormwater fee is a progressive way to address harmful runoff into the Chesapeake Bay, and is not an unnecessary burden to taxpayers. The fee supports programs such as the READY Program (created by PATH, the Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay, and the County) to address stormwater remediation and employ and develop Howard County youth. There are many priorities this year and in the years to come that will be critical to the health and success of our county that the general fund supports, such as increasing educational opportunities, expanding transportation for seniors and other residents of the county, and ensuring the availability of affordable housing for current and future residents. Let's keep the general fund strong by keeping the Stormwater Fee intact. Thank you for your support!

94

People Acting Together In Howard

Name: Carol Jackson Institution: UUCC

Address: 6225 Free Stone Ct, Columbia, 21045

Email Address: cjackson717@gmail.com

2011 JAN 11 P 12:24 HOWARD COUNTY COUNCIL

Dear County Council members,

As a leader with PATH, I am asking you to **please vote against CB 52**, the Stormwater Fee Repeal Bill. The current stormwater fee is a progressive way to address harmful runoff into the Chesapeake Bay, and is not an unnecessary burden to taxpayers. The fee supports programs such as the READY Program (created by PATH, the Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay, and the County) to address stormwater remediation and employ and develop Howard County youth. There are many priorities this year and in the years to come that will be critical to the health and success of our county that the general fund supports, such as increasing educational opportunities, expanding transportation for seniors and other residents of the county, and ensuring the availability of affordable housing for current and future residents. Let's keep the general fund strong by keeping the Stormwater Fee intact. Thank you for your support!

D

People Acting Together In Howard

Name: LEWELL SAUNDERLAND Institution: UUCC

Address: 5458 WATERLILY PL 21044

Email Address: lol21445@yahoo.com

Dear County Council members,

As a leader with PATH, I am asking you to **please vote against CB 52**, the Stormwater Fee Repeal Bill. The current stormwater fee is a progressive way to address harmful runoff into the Chesapeake Bay, and is not an unnecessary burden to taxpayers. The fee supports programs such as the READY Program (created by PATH, the Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay, and the County) to address stormwater remediation and employ and develop Howard County youth. There are many priorities this year and in the years to come that will be critical to the health and success of our county that the general fund supports, such as increasing educational opportunities, expanding transportation for seniors and other residents of the county, and ensuring the availability of affordable housing for current and future residents. Let's keep the general fund strong by keeping the Stormwater Fee intact. Thank you for your support!

94

People Acting Together In Howard

Name: Shelley VonHasen-Jenn Institution: UUCC

Adress: 9213 Osprey Ct Columbia MD 21045

Email Address: shelleyvhj@gmail.com

Dear County Council members,

As a leader with PATH, I am asking you to **please vote against CB 52**, the Stormwater Fee Repeal Bill. The current stormwater fee is a progressive way to address harmful runoff into the Chesapeake Bay, and is not an unnecessary burden to taxpayers. The fee supports programs such as the READY Program (created by PATH, the Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay, and the County) to address stormwater remediation and employ and develop Howard County youth. There are many priorities this year and in the years to come that will be critical to the health and success of our county that the general fund supports, such as increasing educational opportunities, expanding transportation for seniors and other residents of the county, and ensuring the availability of affordable housing for current and future residents. Let's keep the general fund strong by keeping the Stormwater Fee intact. Thank you for your support!

40

People Acting Together In Howard

Name: Bruce Savadkin Institution: UUCC

Adress: 6437 Spicewind Ct Columbia, MD 21045

Email Address: bsavadkin@gmail.com

Dear County Council members,

As a leader with PATH, I am asking you to **please vote against CB 52**, the Stormwater Fee Repeal Bill. The current stormwater fee is a progressive way to address harmful runoff into the Chesapeake Bay, and is not an unnecessary burden to taxpayers. The fee supports programs such as the READY Program (created by PATH, the Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay, and the County) to address stormwater remediation and employ and develop Howard County youth. There are many priorities this year and in the years to come that will be critical to the health and success of our county that the general fund supports, such as increasing educational opportunities, expanding transportation for seniors and other residents of the county, and ensuring the availability of affordable housing for current and future residents. Let's keep the general fund strong by keeping the Stormwater Fee intact. Thank you for your support!

35

People Acting Together In Howard

Name: STEVEN JAMAR Institution: UUCC

Address: 9213 OSPREY CT, Columbia, MD 21045

Email Address: stevenjamar@gmail.com

Dear County Council members,

As a leader with PATH, I am asking you to **please vote against CB 52**, the Stormwater Fee Repeal Bill. The current stormwater fee is a progressive way to address harmful runoff into the Chesapeake Bay, and is not an unnecessary burden to taxpayers. The fee supports programs such as the READY Program (created by PATH, the Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay, and the County) to address stormwater remediation and employ and develop Howard County youth. There are many priorities this year and in the years to come that will be critical to the health and success of our county that the general fund supports, such as increasing educational opportunities, expanding transportation for seniors and other residents of the county, and ensuring the availability of affordable housing for current and future residents. Let's keep the general fund strong by keeping the Stormwater Fee intact. Thank you for your support!

CB

People Acting Together In Howard

Name: EDWARD NOLAN Institution: UUCC

Adress: 8016 ROLAND CT ELKRIDGE MD 21075

Email Address: TED.WOGGET@GMAIL.COM

Dear County Council members,

As a leader with PATH, I am asking you to **please vote against CB 52**, the Stormwater Fee Repeal Bill. The current stormwater fee is a progressive way to address harmful runoff into the Chesapeake Bay, and is not an unnecessary burden to taxpayers. The fee supports programs such as the READY Program (created by PATH, the Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay, and the County) to address stormwater remediation and employ and develop Howard County youth. There are many priorities this year and in the years to come that will be critical to the health and success of our county that the general fund supports, such as increasing educational opportunities, expanding transportation for seniors and other residents of the county, and ensuring the availability of affordable housing for current and future residents. Let's keep the general fund strong by keeping the Stormwater Fee intact. Thank you for your support!

14

People Acting Together In Howard

Name: Diane Savadkin Institution: UUCC

Adress: 4437 Spicewind Ct. Columbia, MD 21045

Email Address: dsavadkin@gmail.com

Dear County Council members,

As a leader with PATH, I am asking you to **please vote against CB 52**, the Stormwater Fee Repeal Bill. The current stormwater fee is a progressive way to address harmful runoff into the Chesapeake Bay, and is not an unnecessary burden to taxpayers. The fee supports programs such as the READY Program (created by PATH, the Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay, and the County) to address stormwater remediation and employ and develop Howard County youth. There are many priorities this year and in the years to come that will be critical to the health and success of our county that the general fund supports, such as increasing educational opportunities, expanding transportation for seniors and other residents of the county, and ensuring the availability of affordable housing for current and future residents. Let's keep the general fund strong by keeping the Stormwater Fee intact. Thank you for your support!

People Acting Together In Howard

Name: Jill Storms Institution: VUCC

Address: 9993 Blue Pool Columbia 21045

Email Address: jas9989.aol.com

2016 JAN 11 P 12:15 HOWARD COUNTY COUNCIL RECEIVED

Dear County Council members,

As a leader with PATH, I am asking you to **please vote against CB 52**, the Stormwater Fee Repeal Bill. The current stormwater fee is a progressive way to address harmful runoff into the Chesapeake Bay, and is not an unnecessary burden to taxpayers. The fee supports programs such as the READY Program (created by PATH, the Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay, and the County) to address stormwater remediation and employ and develop Howard County youth. There are many priorities this year and in the years to come that will be critical to the health and success of our county that the general fund supports, such as increasing educational opportunities, expanding transportation for seniors and other residents of the county, and ensuring the availability of affordable housing for current and future residents. Let's keep the general fund strong by keeping the Stormwater Fee intact. Thank you for your support!

People Acting Together In Howard

Name: Betty Jackson Institution: UVCC

Address: 6205 FARSTAR Place

Email Address: jack0374@gmail.com

2016 JAN 11 P 12:15 HOWARD COUNTY COUNCIL RECEIVED

Dear County Council members,

As a leader with PATH, I am asking you to **please vote against CB 52**, the Stormwater Fee Repeal Bill. The current stormwater fee is a progressive way to address harmful runoff into the Chesapeake Bay, and is not an unnecessary burden to taxpayers. The fee supports programs such as the READY Program (created by PATH, the Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay, and the County) to address stormwater remediation and employ and develop Howard County youth. There are many priorities this year and in the years to come that will be critical to the health and success of our county that the general fund supports, such as increasing educational opportunities, expanding transportation for seniors and other residents of the county, and ensuring the availability of affordable housing for current and future residents. Let's keep the general fund strong by keeping the Stormwater Fee intact. Thank you for your support!

PATH
People Acting Together In Howard

Name: Bob Jackson Institution: UUCC

Address: 6205 Farstar Place Columbia Md 21045

Email Address: bobjackson716@gmail.com

2006 JAN 11 P 2:[illegible]

Dear County Council members,

As a leader with PATH, I am asking you to **please vote against CB 52**, the Stormwater Fee Repeal Bill. The current stormwater fee is a progressive way to address harmful runoff into the Chesapeake Bay, and is not an unnecessary burden to taxpayers. The fee supports programs such as the READY Program (created by PATH, the Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay, and the County) to address stormwater remediation and employ and develop Howard County youth. There are many priorities this year and in the years to come that will be critical to the health and success of our county that the general fund supports, such as increasing educational opportunities, expanding transportation for seniors and other residents of the county, and ensuring the availability of affordable housing for current and future residents. Let's keep the general fund strong by keeping the Stormwater Fee intact. Thank you for your support!

74

PATH
People Acting Together In Howard

Name: Laurie Coltri Institution: UU Cong. of Columbia

Adress: 5223 Patriot Lane Columbia, MD 21045

Email Address: LSCOLTRI@verizon.net

2006 JAN 11 P 2:[illegible]

Dear County Council members,

As a leader with PATH, I am asking you to **please vote against CB 52**, the Stormwater Fee Repeal Bill. The current stormwater fee is a progressive way to address harmful runoff into the Chesapeake Bay, and is not an unnecessary burden to taxpayers. The fee supports programs such as the READY Program (created by PATH, the Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay, and the County) to address stormwater remediation and employ and develop Howard County youth. There are many priorities this year and in the years to come that will be critical to the health and success of our county that the general fund supports, such as increasing educational opportunities, expanding transportation for seniors and other residents of the county, and ensuring the availability of affordable housing for current and future residents. Let's keep the general fund strong by keeping the Stormwater Fee intact. Thank you for your support!

People Acting Together In Howard

Name: DAVID J. HAYKIN, JR. Institution: UUCC

Adress: 13841 WAYSIDE COURT, CLARKSVILLE, MD 21029

Email Address: GEORGIEN DAVE@VERIZON.NET

Dear County Council members,

As a leader with PATH, I am asking you to **please vote against CB 52**, the Stormwater Fee Repeal Bill. The current stormwater fee is a progressive way to address harmful runoff into the Chesapeake Bay, and is not an unnecessary burden to taxpayers. The fee supports programs such as the READY Program (created by PATH, the Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay, and the County) to address stormwater remediation and employ and develop Howard County youth. There are many priorities this year and in the years to come that will be critical to the health and success of our county that the general fund supports, such as increasing educational opportunities, expanding transportation for seniors and other residents of the county, and ensuring the availability of affordable housing for current and future residents. Let's keep the general fund strong by keeping the Stormwater Fee intact. Thank you for your support!

People Acting Together In Howard

Name: Linda Uphoff Institution: UUCC

Address: 6256 Golden Coin Ct., Columbia, MD 21045

Email Address: UphoffL@hotmail.com

Dear County Council members,

As a leader with PATH, I am asking you to **please vote against CB 52**, the Stormwater Fee Repeal Bill. The current stormwater fee is a progressive way to address harmful runoff into the Chesapeake Bay, and is not an unnecessary burden to taxpayers. The fee supports programs such as the READY Program (created by PATH, the Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay, and the County) to address stormwater remediation and employ and develop Howard County youth. There are many priorities this year and in the years to come that will be critical to the health and success of our county that the general fund supports, such as increasing educational opportunities, expanding transportation for seniors and other residents of the county, and ensuring the availability of affordable housing for current and future residents. Let's keep the general fund strong by keeping the Stormwater Fee intact. Thank you for your support!

KMD
GF

People Acting Together in Howard

Name: Georgeann T. Hayflin Institution: UUCC

Address: 13341 Wayside Court, Clarksville, MD

Email Address: Georgiendave@verizon.net

2007 JAN 11 P 12:19

Dear County Council members,

As a leader with PATH, I am asking you to **please vote against CB 52**, the Stormwater Fee Repeal Bill. The current stormwater fee is a progressive way to address harmful runoff into the Chesapeake Bay, and is not an unnecessary burden to taxpayers. The fee supports programs such as the READY Program (created by PATH, the Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay, and the County) to address stormwater remediation and employ and develop Howard County youth. There are many priorities this year and in the years to come that will be critical to the health and success of our county that the general fund supports, such as increasing educational opportunities, expanding transportation for seniors and other residents of the county, and ensuring the availability of affordable housing for current and future residents. Let's keep the general fund strong by keeping the Stormwater Fee intact. Thank you for your support!

MKS

People Acting Together In Howard

Name: NANCY BIENIA Institution: UUCC

Address: 11806 LONE TREE CT, COLUMBIA, MD

Email Address: NBIENIA@VERIZON.NET

2014 JAN 11 P 12:24 HOWARD COUNTY COUNCIL

Dear County Council members,

As a leader with PATH, I am asking you to **please vote against CB 52**, the Stormwater Fee Repeal Bill. The current stormwater fee is a progressive way to address harmful runoff into the Chesapeake Bay, and is not an unnecessary burden to taxpayers. The fee supports programs such as the READY Program (created by PATH, the Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay, and the County) to address stormwater remediation and employ and develop Howard County youth. There are many priorities this year and in the years to come that will be critical to the health and success of our county that the general fund supports, such as increasing educational opportunities, expanding transportation for seniors and other residents of the county, and ensuring the availability of affordable housing for current and future residents. Let's keep the general fund strong by keeping the Stormwater Fee intact. Thank you for your support!

14

People Acting Together In Howard

Name: Christopher Horn Institution: Unitarian Universalist Church Colum

Adress: 10509 Tolling Clock Way Columbia MD 21044

Email Address: chris.a.horn@gmail.com

2014 JAN 11 P 12:24 HOWARD COUNTY COUNCIL

Dear County Council members,

As a leader with PATH, I am asking you to **please vote against CB 52**, the Stormwater Fee Repeal Bill. The current stormwater fee is a progressive way to address harmful runoff into the Chesapeake Bay, and is not an unnecessary burden to taxpayers. The fee supports programs such as the READY Program (created by PATH, the Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay, and the County) to address stormwater remediation and employ and develop Howard County youth. There are many priorities this year and in the years to come that will be critical to the health and success of our county that the general fund supports, such as increasing educational opportunities, expanding transportation for seniors and other residents of the county, and ensuring the availability of affordable housing for current and future residents. Let's keep the general fund strong by keeping the Stormwater Fee intact. Thank you for your support!

MES

People Acting Together in Howard

Name: John Harris Institution: UUCC

Adress: 5685-C Harpers Farm Rd, Columbia MD

Email Address: johnw@harris.net

2018 JAN 11 P 12:24 HOWARD COUNTY COUNCIL

Dear County Council members,

As a leader with PATH, I am asking you to **please vote against CB 52**, the Stormwater Fee Repeal Bill. The current stormwater fee is a progressive way to address harmful runoff into the Chesapeake Bay, and is not an unnecessary burden to taxpayers. The fee supports programs such as the READY Program (created by PATH, the Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay, and the County) to address stormwater remediation and employ and develop Howard County youth. There are many priorities this year and in the years to come that will be critical to the health and success of our county that the general fund supports, such as increasing educational opportunities, expanding transportation for seniors and other residents of the county, and ensuring the availability of affordable housing for current and future residents. Let's keep the general fund strong by keeping the Stormwater Fee intact. Thank you for your support!

5

People Acting Together in Howard

Name: Kathy Harris Institution: uucc

Adress: 5685 Harpers Farm Rd

Email Address: kathy@harris.net

2018 JAN 11 P 12:25 HOWARD COUNTY COUNCIL

Dear County Council members,

As a leader with PATH, I am asking you to **please vote against CB 52**, the Stormwater Fee Repeal Bill. The current stormwater fee is a progressive way to address harmful runoff into the Chesapeake Bay, and is not an unnecessary burden to taxpayers. The fee supports programs such as the READY Program (created by PATH, the Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay, and the County) to address stormwater remediation and employ and develop Howard County youth. There are many priorities this year and in the years to come that will be critical to the health and success of our county that the general fund supports, such as increasing educational opportunities, expanding transportation for seniors and other residents of the county, and ensuring the availability of affordable housing for current and future residents. Let's keep the general fund strong by keeping the Stormwater Fee intact. Thank you for your support!

Lukas

People Acting Together In Howard

Name: Steve Pakas Institution: UUCC

Address: 11649 Wintelog Way

Email Address: spakas@comcast.net

2015 JAN 1 P 12:21

Dear County Council members,

As a leader with PATH, I am asking you to **please vote against CB 52**, the Stormwater Fee Repeal Bill. The current stormwater fee is a progressive way to address harmful runoff into the Chesapeake Bay, and is not an unnecessary burden to taxpayers. The fee supports programs such as the READY Program (created by PATH, the Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay, and the County) to address stormwater remediation and employ and develop Howard County youth. There are many priorities this year and in the years to come that will be critical to the health and success of our county that the general fund supports, such as increasing educational opportunities, expanding transportation for seniors and other residents of the county, and ensuring the availability of affordable housing for current and future residents. Let's keep the general fund strong by keeping the Stormwater Fee intact. Thank you for your support!

#5

People Acting Together In Howard

Name: LINDSAY LUKAS Institution: UUCC

Adress: 5062 Wetstone Rd Columbia MD 21044

Email Address: dakota1956@comcast.net

2015 JAN 1 P 12:21

Dear County Council members,

As a leader with PATH, I am asking you to **please vote against CB 52**, the Stormwater Fee Repeal Bill. The current stormwater fee is a progressive way to address harmful runoff into the Chesapeake Bay, and is not an unnecessary burden to taxpayers. The fee supports programs such as the READY Program (created by PATH, the Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay, and the County) to address stormwater remediation and employ and develop Howard County youth. There are many priorities this year and in the years to come that will be critical to the health and success of our county that the general fund supports, such as increasing educational opportunities, expanding transportation for seniors and other residents of the county, and ensuring the availability of affordable housing for current and future residents. Let's keep the general fund strong by keeping the Stormwater Fee intact. Thank you for your support!

mtgs

People Acting Together In Howard

Name: John McDermott Institution: UMCC

Adress: 6307 Golden Hook, Columbia, MD 21044

Email Address:

Dear County Council members,

As a leader with PATH, I am asking you to **please vote against CB 52**, the Stormwater Fee Repeal Bill. The current stormwater fee is a progressive way to address harmful runoff into the Chesapeake Bay, and is not an unnecessary burden to taxpayers. The fee supports programs such as the READY Program (created by PATH, the Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay, and the County) to address stormwater remediation and employ and develop Howard County youth. There are many priorities this year and in the years to come that will be critical to the health and success of our county that the general fund supports, such as increasing educational opportunities, expanding transportation for seniors and other residents of the county, and ensuring the availability of affordable housing for current and future residents. Let's keep the general fund strong by keeping the Stormwater Fee intact. Thank you for your support!

5

People Acting Together In Howard

Name: Judy McDermott Institution: UMCC

Adress: 6307 Golden Hook, Columbia, MD 21044

Email Address: jmcderm150@verizon.net

Dear County Council members,

As a leader with PATH, I am asking you to **please vote against CB 52**, the Stormwater Fee Repeal Bill. The current stormwater fee is a progressive way to address harmful runoff into the Chesapeake Bay, and is not an unnecessary burden to taxpayers. The fee supports programs such as the READY Program (created by PATH, the Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay, and the County) to address stormwater remediation and employ and develop Howard County youth. There are many priorities this year and in the years to come that will be critical to the health and success of our county that the general fund supports, such as increasing educational opportunities, expanding transportation for seniors and other residents of the county, and ensuring the availability of affordable housing for current and future residents. Let's keep the general fund strong by keeping the Stormwater Fee intact. Thank you for your support!

People Acting Together In Howard

Name: Joe Carmel Institution: UUCC

Address: 11849 Winterlong Lane, Columbia, MD 21044

Email Address: joe.carmel@comcast.net

Dear County Council members,

As a leader with PATH, I am asking you to **please vote against CB 52**, the Stormwater Fee Repeal Bill. The current stormwater fee is a progressive way to address harmful runoff into the Chesapeake Bay, and is not an unnecessary burden to taxpayers. The fee supports programs such as the READY Program (created by PATH, the Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay, and the County) to address stormwater remediation and employ and develop Howard County youth. There are many priorities this year and in the years to come that will be critical to the health and success of our county that the general fund supports, such as increasing educational opportunities, expanding transportation for seniors and other residents of the county, and ensuring the availability of affordable housing for current and future residents. Let's keep the general fund strong by keeping the Stormwater Fee intact. Thank you for your support!

People Acting Together In Howard

Name: FLORENCE WAGNER Institution: UUCC

Adress: 10101 GOVERNOR WARFIELD PKWY APT 146 Columbia, MD 21044

Email Address: florence.wagner9@gmail.com

Dear County Council members,

As a leader with PATH, I am asking you to **please vote against CB 52**, the Stormwater Fee Repeal Bill. The current stormwater fee is a progressive way to address harmful runoff into the Chesapeake Bay, and is not an unnecessary burden to taxpayers. The fee supports programs such as the READY Program (created by PATH, the Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay, and the County) to address stormwater remediation and employ and develop Howard County youth. There are many priorities this year and in the years to come that will be critical to the health and success of our county that the general fund supports, such as increasing educational opportunities, expanding transportation for seniors and other residents of the county, and ensuring the availability of affordable housing for current and future residents. Let's keep the general fund strong by keeping the Stormwater Fee intact. Thank you for your support!

MKS

People Acting Together In Howard

Name: Sherry Perazzi Institution: Unitarian Universalist Congregation of Columbia

Adress: 5692 Vantage Point Rd., Columbia, MD 21044

Email Address: sulasula@gmail.com

Dear County Council members,

As a leader with PATH, I am asking you to **please vote against CB 52**, the Stormwater Fee Repeal Bill. The current stormwater fee is a progressive way to address harmful runoff into the Chesapeake Bay, and is not an unnecessary burden to taxpayers. The fee supports programs such as the READY Program (created by PATH, the Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay, and the County) to address stormwater remediation and employ and develop Howard County youth. There are many priorities this year and in the years to come that will be critical to the health and success of our county that the general fund supports, such as increasing educational opportunities, expanding transportation for seniors and other residents of the county, and ensuring the availability of affordable housing for current and future residents. Let's keep the general fund strong by keeping the Stormwater Fee intact. Thank you for your support!

People Acting Together In Howard

Name: JANET RAMSEY Institution: UNITARIAN UNIVERSAL. Congreg of Columbia

Address: 5253 EVEN STAR PL, COLUMBIA, MD 21044

Email Address: janetramsey1@comcast.net

Dear County Council members,

As a leader with PATH, I am asking you to **please vote against CB 52**, the Stormwater Fee Repeal Bill. The current stormwater fee is a progressive way to address harmful runoff into the Chesapeake Bay, and is not an unnecessary burden to taxpayers. The fee supports programs such as the READY Program (created by PATH, the Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay, and the County) to address stormwater remediation and employ and develop Howard County youth. There are many priorities this year and in the years to come that will be critical to the health and success of our county that the general fund supports, such as increasing educational opportunities, expanding transportation for seniors and other residents of the county, and ensuring the availability of affordable housing for current and future residents. Let's keep the general fund strong by keeping the Stormwater Fee intact. Thank you for your support!

Janet N. Ramsey

MES

PATH
People Acting Together in Howard

Name: Mark Brooks Institution: UUCC

Address: 5541 Green Mountain Cir. #4 Columbia, MD 21044

Email Address: Markdbrooks1963@comcast.net

Dear County Council members, No E-mail, please

As a leader with PATH, I am asking you to **please vote against CB 52**, the Stormwater Fee Repeal Bill. The current stormwater fee is a progressive way to address harmful runoff into the Chesapeake Bay, and is not an unnecessary burden to taxpayers. The fee supports programs such as the READY Program (created by PATH, the Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay, and the County) to address stormwater remediation and employ and develop Howard County youth. There are many priorities this year and in the years to come that will be critical to the health and success of our county that the general fund supports, such as increasing educational opportunities, expanding transportation for seniors and other residents of the county, and ensuring the availability of affordable housing for current and future residents. Let's keep the general fund strong by keeping the Stormwater Fee intact. Thank you for your support!

5

PATH
People Acting Together in Howard

Name: Frank Hazzard Institution: UUCC

Adress: 5901 Hay Boat Court 21029

Email Address: frank@buzzquake.com

Dear County Council members,

As a leader with PATH, I am asking you to **please vote against CB 52**, the Stormwater Fee Repeal Bill. The current stormwater fee is a progressive way to address harmful runoff into the Chesapeake Bay, and is not an unnecessary burden to taxpayers. The fee supports programs such as the READY Program (created by PATH, the Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay, and the County) to address stormwater remediation and employ and develop Howard County youth. There are many priorities this year and in the years to come that will be critical to the health and success of our county that the general fund supports, such as increasing educational opportunities, expanding transportation for seniors and other residents of the county, and ensuring the availability of affordable housing for current and future residents. Let's keep the general fund strong by keeping the Stormwater Fee intact. Thank you for your support!

MACS

People Acting Together in Howard

Name: INGE HYDER Institution: UUCC

Address: 5475 Mystic Ct. Col MD 21044

Email Address: ingehy@gmail.com

Dear County Council members,

As a leader with PATH, I am asking you to **please vote against CB 52**, the Stormwater Fee Repeal Bill. The current stormwater fee is a progressive way to address harmful runoff into the Chesapeake Bay, and is not an unnecessary burden to taxpayers. The fee supports programs such as the READY Program (created by PATH, the Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay, and the County) to address stormwater remediation and employ and develop Howard County youth. There are many priorities this year and in the years to come that will be critical to the health and success of our county that the general fund supports, such as increasing educational opportunities, expanding transportation for seniors and other residents of the county, and ensuring the availability of affordable housing for current and future residents. Let's keep the general fund strong by keeping the Stormwater Fee intact. Thank you for your support!

5

People Acting Together in Howard

Name: Anne Gould Institution: UCC

Address: 6277 Audubon Drive Col MD 21044

Email Address: aigould@comcast.net

Dear County Council members,

As a leader with PATH, I am asking you to **please vote against CB 52**, the Stormwater Fee Repeal Bill. The current stormwater fee is a progressive way to address harmful runoff into the Chesapeake Bay, and is not an unnecessary burden to taxpayers. The fee supports programs such as the READY Program (created by PATH, the Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay, and the County) to address stormwater remediation and employ and develop Howard County youth. There are many priorities this year and in the years to come that will be critical to the health and success of our county that the general fund supports, such as increasing educational opportunities, expanding transportation for seniors and other residents of the county, and ensuring the availability of affordable housing for current and future residents. Let's keep the general fund strong by keeping the Stormwater Fee intact. Thank you for your support!

Notes

People Acting Together in Howard

Name: Carla [illegible] Institution: UUCC

Address: 5417 Camino Columbia, MD 21044

Email Address: cmigates725@gmail.com

2016 JAN 11 P 12:19 HOWARD COUNTY COUNCIL

Dear County Council members,

As a leader with PATH, I am asking you to **please vote against CB 52**, the Stormwater Fee Repeal Bill. The current stormwater fee is a progressive way to address harmful runoff into the Chesapeake Bay, and is not an unnecessary burden to taxpayers. The fee supports programs such as the READY Program (created by PATH, the Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay, and the County) to address stormwater remediation and employ and develop Howard County youth. There are many priorities this year and in the years to come that will be critical to the health and success of our county that the general fund supports, such as increasing educational opportunities, expanding transportation for seniors and other residents of the county, and ensuring the availability of affordable housing for current and future residents. Let's keep the general fund strong by keeping the Stormwater Fee intact. Thank you for your support!

5

People Acting Together in Howard

Name: Christine (Tina) Horn Institution: UUCC

Address: 10509 Tolling Clock Way

Email Address: tinahorn-cae@hotmail.com

2016 JAN 11 P 12:19 HOWARD COUNTY COUNCIL

Dear County Council members,

As a leader with PATH, I am asking you to **please vote against CB 52**, the Stormwater Fee Repeal Bill. The current stormwater fee is a progressive way to address harmful runoff into the Chesapeake Bay, and is not an unnecessary burden to taxpayers. The fee supports programs such as the READY Program (created by PATH, the Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay, and the County) to address stormwater remediation and employ and develop Howard County youth. There are many priorities this year and in the years to come that will be critical to the health and success of our county that the general fund supports, such as increasing educational opportunities, expanding transportation for seniors and other residents of the county, and ensuring the availability of affordable housing for current and future residents. Let's keep the general fund strong by keeping the Stormwater Fee intact. Thank you for your support!

mics

People Acting Together In Howard

Name: RAE MILLMAN Institution: UMCP

Adress: 10000 TOWN CENTER AVE., APT. 38
COL., MD 21044

Email Address: RAEMILLMAN@gmail.com

Dear County Council members,

As a leader with PATH, I am asking you to **please vote against CB 52**, the Stormwater Fee Repeal Bill. The current stormwater fee is a progressive way to address harmful runoff into the Chesapeake Bay, and is not an unnecessary burden to taxpayers. The fee supports programs such as the READY Program (created by PATH, the Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay, and the County) to address stormwater remediation and employ and develop Howard County youth. There are many priorities this year and in the years to come that will be critical to the health and success of our county that the general fund supports, such as increasing educational opportunities, expanding transportation for seniors and other residents of the county, and ensuring the availability of affordable housing for current and future residents. Let's keep the general fund strong by keeping the Stormwater Fee intact. Thank you for your support!

54

PATH
People Acting Together In Howard

Name: Cindy Scilipoti Institution: UUCC

Adress: 9402 N. Laurel rd Laurel MD 20723

Email Address: cindy@scilpoti.name

2016 JAN 11 P 12:23

Dear County Council members,

As a leader with PATH, I am asking you to **please vote against CB 52**, the Stormwater Fee Repeal Bill. The current stormwater fee is a progressive way to address harmful runoff into the Chesapeake Bay, and is not an unnecessary burden to taxpayers. The fee supports programs such as the READY Program (created by PATH, the Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay, and the County) to address stormwater remediation and employ and develop Howard County youth. There are many priorities this year and in the years to come that will be critical to the health and success of our county that the general fund supports, such as increasing educational opportunities, expanding transportation for seniors and other residents of the county, and ensuring the availability of affordable housing for current and future residents. Let's keep the general fund strong by keeping the Stormwater Fee intact. Thank you for your support!

55

PATH
People Acting Together In Howard

Name: Miriam W. Alberg Institution: UUCC

Address: 6509 Carlinda Ave. Columbia, MD 21044

Email Address:

2016 JAN 11 P 12:24

Dear County Council members,

As a leader with PATH, I am asking you to **please vote against CB 52**, the Stormwater Fee Repeal Bill. The current stormwater fee is a progressive way to address harmful runoff into the Chesapeake Bay, and is not an unnecessary burden to taxpayers. The fee supports programs such as the READY Program (created by PATH, the Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay, and the County) to address stormwater remediation and employ and develop Howard County youth. There are many priorities this year and in the years to come that will be critical to the health and success of our county that the general fund supports, such as increasing educational opportunities, expanding transportation for seniors and other residents of the county, and ensuring the availability of affordable housing for current and future residents. Let's keep the general fund strong by keeping the Stormwater Fee intact. Thank you for your support!

54

People Acting Together In Howard

Name: Wendy Alberg Institution: UUCC

Address: 6509 Carlinda Ave, Columbia, MD 21046 (Jen Tenessa

Email Address: wendy.alberg@gmail.com

2018 JAN 11 P 12:25

Dear County Council members,

As a leader with PATH, I am asking you to **please vote against CB 52**, the Stormwater Fee Repeal Bill. The current stormwater fee is a progressive way to address harmful runoff into the Chesapeake Bay, and is not an unnecessary burden to taxpayers. The fee supports programs such as the READY Program (created by PATH, the Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay, and the County) to address stormwater remediation and employ and develop Howard County youth. There are many priorities this year and in the years to come that will be critical to the health and success of our county that the general fund supports, such as increasing educational opportunities, expanding transportation for seniors and other residents of the county, and ensuring the availability of affordable housing for current and future residents. Let's keep the general fund strong by keeping the Stormwater Fee intact. Thank you for your support!

55

People Acting Together In Howard

Name: Terry Paul Institution: UUCC

Adress: 3118 Evergreen Way, Ellicott City MD 21042

Email Address: terry.d.paul@gmail.com

2018 JAN 11 P 12:

Dear County Council members,

As a leader with PATH, I am asking you to **please vote against CB 52**, the Stormwater Fee Repeal Bill. The current stormwater fee is a progressive way to address harmful runoff into the Chesapeake Bay, and is not an unnecessary burden to taxpayers. The fee supports programs such as the READY Program (created by PATH, the Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay, and the County) to address stormwater remediation and employ and develop Howard County youth. There are many priorities this year and in the years to come that will be critical to the health and success of our county that the general fund supports, such as increasing educational opportunities, expanding transportation for seniors and other residents of the county, and ensuring the availability of affordable housing for current and future residents. Let's keep the general fund strong by keeping the Stormwater Fee intact. Thank you for your support!

#4

People Acting Together In Howard

Name: Christine Carey Institution: UUCC

Address: 9313 Angelina Circle Columbia MD 21045

Email Address: christinecarey10@outlook.com

Dear County Council members,

As a leader with PATH, I am asking you to **please vote against CB 52**, the Stormwater Fee Repeal Bill. The current stormwater fee is a progressive way to address harmful runoff into the Chesapeake Bay, and is not an unnecessary burden to taxpayers. The fee supports programs such as the READY Program (created by PATH, the Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay, and the County) to address stormwater remediation and employ and develop Howard County youth. There are many priorities this year and in the years to come that will be critical to the health and success of our county that the general fund supports, such as increasing educational opportunities, expanding transportation for seniors and other residents of the county, and ensuring the availability of affordable housing for current and future residents. Let's keep the general fund strong by keeping the Stormwater Fee intact. Thank you for your support!

#5

People Acting Together In Howard

Name: Phil Webster Institution: UUCC

Adress: 7553 Broadcloth Way Columbia 21046

Email Address: Phil.Webster@ME.com

Dear County Council members,

As a leader with PATH, I am asking you to **please vote against CB 52**, the Stormwater Fee Repeal Bill. The current stormwater fee is a progressive way to address harmful runoff into the Chesapeake Bay, and is not an unnecessary burden to taxpayers. The fee supports programs such as the READY Program (created by PATH, the Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay, and the County) to address stormwater remediation and employ and develop Howard County youth. There are many priorities this year and in the years to come that will be critical to the health and success of our county that the general fund supports, such as increasing educational opportunities, expanding transportation for seniors and other residents of the county, and ensuring the availability of affordable housing for current and future residents. Let's keep the general fund strong by keeping the Stormwater Fee intact. Thank you for your support!

JH

PATH
People Acting Together In Howard

Name: Eleanor McManuels Institution: UUCC

Address: 8759 Carriage Hill Drive

Email Address: ellie.mcmanuels@gmail.com

Dear County Council members,

As a leader with PATH, I am asking you to **please vote against CB 52**, the Stormwater Fee Repeal Bill. The current stormwater fee is a progressive way to address harmful runoff into the Chesapeake Bay, and is not an unnecessary burden to taxpayers. The fee supports programs such as the READY Program (created by PATH, the Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay, and the County) to address stormwater remediation and employ and develop Howard County youth. There are many priorities this year and in the years to come that will be critical to the health and success of our county that the general fund supports, such as increasing educational opportunities, expanding transportation for seniors and other residents of the county, and ensuring the availability of affordable housing for current and future residents. Let's keep the general fund strong by keeping the Stormwater Fee intact. Thank you for your support!

Eleanor E. McM

JH

PATH
People Acting Together In Howard

Name: ALICE PHAM Institution: UUCC

Adress: 9650 SANDLIGHT CT COL MD 21046

Email Address: alicekpham@yahoo.com

Dear County Council members,

As a leader with PATH, I am asking you to **please vote against CB 52**, the Stormwater Fee Repeal Bill. The current stormwater fee is a progressive way to address harmful runoff into the Chesapeake Bay, and is not an unnecessary burden to taxpayers. The fee supports programs such as the READY Program (created by PATH, the Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay, and the County) to address stormwater remediation and employ and develop Howard County youth. There are many priorities this year and in the years to come that will be critical to the health and success of our county that the general fund supports, such as increasing educational opportunities, expanding transportation for seniors and other residents of the county, and ensuring the availability of affordable housing for current and future residents. Let's keep the general fund strong by keeping the Stormwater Fee intact. Thank you for your support!

54

People Acting Together In Howard

Name: Lynn Numma Institution: Universalist Unitarian Congregation of Columbia

Address: 9377 Breamore Ct., Laurel 20723

Email Address: lynn_numma@yahoo.com

2016 JAN 11 P 12:20

Dear County Council members,

As a leader with PATH, I am asking you to **please vote against CB 52**, the Stormwater Fee Repeal Bill. The current stormwater fee is a progressive way to address harmful runoff into the Chesapeake Bay, and is not an unnecessary burden to taxpayers. The fee supports programs such as the READY Program (created by PATH, the Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay, and the County) to address stormwater remediation and employ and develop Howard County youth. There are many priorities this year and in the years to come that will be critical to the health and success of our county that the general fund supports, such as increasing educational opportunities, expanding transportation for seniors and other residents of the county, and ensuring the availability of affordable housing for current and future residents. Let's keep the general fund strong by keeping the Stormwater Fee intact. Thank you for your support!

55

People Acting Together In Howard

Name: Matt Scilipoti Institution: UUCC

Address: 9402 N. Laurel Rd. Laurel, MD 20723

Email Address: matt@scilipoti.name

2016 JAN 11 P 12:20

Dear County Council members,

As a leader with PATH, I am asking you to **please vote against CB 52**, the Stormwater Fee Repeal Bill. The current stormwater fee is a progressive way to address harmful runoff into the Chesapeake Bay, and is not an unnecessary burden to taxpayers. The fee supports programs such as the READY Program (created by PATH, the Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay, and the County) to address stormwater remediation and employ and develop Howard County youth. There are many priorities this year and in the years to come that will be critical to the health and success of our county that the general fund supports, such as increasing educational opportunities, expanding transportation for seniors and other residents of the county, and ensuring the availability of affordable housing for current and future residents. Let's keep the general fund strong by keeping the Stormwater Fee intact. Thank you for your support!

JW

People Acting Together In Howard

Name: MARC VOLKMANN Institution: UUCC

Address: 4712 DORSEY HALL DR. #409, EC, 21042

Email Address: MARCVOLKMANN @ HOTMAIL.COM

Dear County Council members,

As a leader with PATH, I am asking you to **please vote against CB 52**, the Stormwater Fee Repeal Bill. The current stormwater fee is a progressive way to address harmful runoff into the Chesapeake Bay, and is not an unnecessary burden to taxpayers. The fee supports programs such as the READY Program (created by PATH, the Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay, and the County) to address stormwater remediation and employ and develop Howard County youth. There are many priorities this year and in the years to come that will be critical to the health and success of our county that the general fund supports, such as increasing educational opportunities, expanding transportation for seniors and other residents of the county, and ensuring the availability of affordable housing for current and future residents. Let's keep the general fund strong by keeping the Stormwater Fee intact. Thank you for your support!

People Acting Together In Howard

Name: Sara Cherni-Koff Institution: UUCC

Address: 4727 Hallowed Stream

Email Address: SaraCherni@yahoo.com

Dear County Council members,

As a leader with PATH, I am asking you to **please vote against CB 52**, the Stormwater Fee Repeal Bill. The current stormwater fee is a progressive way to address harmful runoff into the Chesapeake Bay, and is not an unnecessary burden to taxpayers. The fee supports programs such as the READY Program (created by PATH, the Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay, and the County) to address stormwater remediation and employ and develop Howard County youth. There are many priorities this year and in the years to come that will be critical to the health and success of our county that the general fund supports, such as increasing educational opportunities, expanding transportation for seniors and other residents of the county, and ensuring the availability of affordable housing for current and future residents. Let's keep the general fund strong by keeping the Stormwater Fee intact. Thank you for your support!

5

People Acting Together In Howard

Name: Cindy Williams Institution: UUCC

Address: 4025 Argyle Ct. Ellicott city MD 21042

Email Address: familywilliams1@verizon.net

Dear County Council members,

As a leader with PATH, I am asking you to **please vote against CB 52**, the Stormwater Fee Repeal Bill. The current stormwater fee is a progressive way to address harmful runoff into the Chesapeake Bay, and is not an unnecessary burden to taxpayers. The fee supports programs such as the READY Program (created by PATH, the Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay, and the County) to address stormwater remediation and employ and develop Howard County youth. There are many priorities this year and in the years to come that will be critical to the health and success of our county that the general fund supports, such as increasing educational opportunities, expanding transportation for seniors and other residents of the county, and ensuring the availability of affordable housing for current and future residents. Let's keep the general fund strong by keeping the Stormwater Fee intact. Thank you for your support!

5

People Acting Together In Howard

Name: Haley Besner Institution: UUCC

Adress: 3337 Hollan Ct Ellicott City MD

Email Address: haleybesner@gmail.com

Dear County Council members,

As a leader with PATH, I am asking you to **please vote against CB 52**, the Stormwater Fee Repeal Bill. The current stormwater fee is a progressive way to address harmful runoff into the Chesapeake Bay, and is not an unnecessary burden to taxpayers. The fee supports programs such as the READY Program (created by PATH, the Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay, and the County) to address stormwater remediation and employ and develop Howard County youth. There are many priorities this year and in the years to come that will be critical to the health and success of our county that the general fund supports, such as increasing educational opportunities, expanding transportation for seniors and other residents of the county, and ensuring the availability of affordable housing for current and future residents. Let's keep the general fund strong by keeping the Stormwater Fee intact. Thank you for your support!

PATH
People Acting Together In Howard

Name: Jenny Bonilla Institution: UUCC Community Dasher Green

Adress: 7217 Talisman Lane, Columbia MD 21045

Email Address: arnolddebonilla@yahoo.com

Dear County Council members,

As a leader with PATH, I am asking you to **please vote against CB 52**, the Stormwater Fee Repeal Bill. The current stormwater fee is a progressive way to address harmful runoff into the Chesapeake Bay, and is not an unnecessary burden to taxpayers. The fee supports programs such as the READY Program (created by PATH, the Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay, and the County) to address stormwater remediation and employ and develop Howard County youth. There are many priorities this year and in the years to come that will be critical to the health and success of our county that the general fund supports, such as increasing educational opportunities, expanding transportation for seniors and other residents of the county, and ensuring the availability of affordable housing for current and future residents. Let's keep the general fund strong by keeping the Stormwater Fee intact. Thank you for your support!

Jenny Bonilla

PATH
People Acting Together In Howard

Name: Cynthia Parr Institution: UUCC

Adress: 4238 Chariots Flight Way

Email Address: CSparr1@yahoo.com

Dear County Council members,

As a leader with PATH, I am asking you to **please vote against CB 52**, the Stormwater Fee Repeal Bill. The current stormwater fee is a progressive way to address harmful runoff into the Chesapeake Bay, and is not an unnecessary burden to taxpayers. The fee supports programs such as the READY Program (created by PATH, the Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay, and the County) to address stormwater remediation and employ and develop Howard County youth. There are many priorities this year and in the years to come that will be critical to the health and success of our county that the general fund supports, such as increasing educational opportunities, expanding transportation for seniors and other residents of the county, and ensuring the availability of affordable housing for current and future residents. Let's keep the general fund strong by keeping the Stormwater Fee intact. Thank you for your support!

53

PATH
People Acting Together In Howard

Name: SallyAnn Cooper Institution: U.U.C.C.

Adress: 5365 Chase Lions Way Col. 21044

Email Address: sacooper1@comcast.net

2010 JAN 11 P 12:20 HOWARD COUNTY COUNCIL

Dear County Council members,

As a leader with PATH, I am asking you to **please vote against CB 52**, the Stormwater Fee Repeal Bill. The current stormwater fee is a progressive way to address harmful runoff into the Chesapeake Bay, and is not an unnecessary burden to taxpayers. The fee supports programs such as the READY Program (created by PATH, the Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay, and the County) to address stormwater remediation and employ and develop Howard County youth. There are many priorities this year and in the years to come that will be critical to the health and success of our county that the general fund supports, such as increasing educational opportunities, expanding transportation for seniors and other residents of the county, and ensuring the availability of affordable housing for current and future residents. Let's keep the general fund strong by keeping the Stormwater Fee intact. Thank you for your support!

54

PATH
People Acting Together In Howard

Name: Bruce Berlage Institution: Self (UUCC)

Address: 4066 Fragile Sail Way Ellicott City MD 21042

Email Address: N/A

2010 JAN 11 P 12:20 HOWARD COUNTY COUNCIL

Dear County Council members,

As a leader with PATH, I am asking you to **please vote against CB 52**, the Stormwater Fee Repeal Bill. The current stormwater fee is a progressive way to address harmful runoff into the Chesapeake Bay, and is not an unnecessary burden to taxpayers. The fee supports programs such as the READY Program (created by PATH, the Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay, and the County) to address stormwater remediation and employ and develop Howard County youth. There are many priorities this year and in the years to come that will be critical to the health and success of our county that the general fund supports, such as increasing educational opportunities, expanding transportation for seniors and other residents of the county, and ensuring the availability of affordable housing for current and future residents. Let's keep the general fund strong by keeping the Stormwater Fee intact. Thank you for your support!

CB52

FILE COPY

keep the storm water fee in Howard County

Wendel Dean Renner [WendelDRenner@comcast.net]

Sent: Tuesday, January 05, 2016 8:24 PM
To: CouncilMail; Ball, Calvin B

I am in favor of keeping the storm water fee for Howard County to be able to clean up our run off and protect the Chesapeake Bay.

Wendel Dean Renner
5975 Gales Lane
Columbia, MD 21045

Vote NO on CB52-2015

Sander Zaben [Sander.Zaben@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, January 03, 2016 11:50 AM
To: CouncilMail

Dear County Executive Kittleman and Howard County Council:

I understand that CB52-2015 was recently introduced to repeal Howard County's Watershed Protection and Restoration fee.

I'm deeply concerned that removing the fee would undermine our county's Watershed Protection and Restoration Program and erode our ability to meet the requirements of our federal MS4 (Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System) permit. Removing the fee is a bad choice that could jeopardize Howard County's water quality and a future of fishable, swimmable rivers and streams.

Several analyses done by the County over the past several years point to the need for this fee.

Our 2012 Phase II County Watershed Implementation Plan (WIP) suggests that such a fee would be the most fiscally prudent and reliable way to fund our stormwater management program. This assessment predates the state mandate for a county fee that was removed in the last session of the Maryland General Assembly. State mandates aside, I still believe that the fee is the most reliable and fiscally prudent way to address our stormwater management needs and requirements.

Recent County budget shortfalls indicate that finding dollars in the County General Fund will not be as simple and painless as the County Executive's financial assurance plan suggests. The need to fulfill the requirements of our MS4 permit may mean that other county public services get short shrift, and that is not a choice that I as a citizen and voter want to see us make. Better to keep the dedicated funding provided by the fee in place so that clean-up efforts don't have to compete with other priorities for County funds.

I have not yet heard a compelling argument for CB52-2015 that overrides the significant tide of the County's own evidence in support of maintaining our Watershed Protection and Restoration Fee.

And, perhaps most significant for me as a citizen, since the advent of the Watershed Protection and Restoration Fee, I'm seeing the money I've contributed going into the ground, getting important work done. The stream restorations, tree plantings, infrastructure repairs and upgrades, and other projects already being done using dedicated funds from the fee have put us on the path towards safe, fishable, swimmable water in our local rivers and streams. I want to see that critical work continue apace, without being put at risk by budget uncertainties.

I hope that you will see the fiscal prudence of having a dedicated stormwater remediation fee available to help fund the important work of cleaning up polluted runoff in our county.

Please vote "no" on CB52-2015, and keep our Watershed Protection and Restoration Fee in place.

Thank you.

Sander Zaben
8712 Haycarriage Ct
Ellicott City, MD 21043

Vote NO on CB52-2015

Maura Duffy [etrainridah23@comcast.net]
Sent: Saturday, December 19, 2015 12:55 PM
To: CouncilMail

Dear County Executive Kittleman and Howard County Council:

I understand that CB52-2015 was recently introduced to repeal Howard County's Watershed Protection and Restoration fee.

I'm deeply concerned that removing the fee would undermine our county's Watershed Protection and Restoration Program and erode our ability to meet the requirements of our federal MS4 (Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System) permit. Removing the fee is a bad choice that could jeopardize Howard County's water quality and a future of fishable, swimmable rivers and streams.

Several analyses done by the County over the past several years point to the need for this fee.

Our 2012 Phase II County Watershed Implementation Plan (WIP) suggests that such a fee would be the most fiscally prudent and reliable way to fund our stormwater management program. This assessment predates the state mandate for a county fee that was removed in the last session of the Maryland General Assembly. State mandates aside, I still believe that the fee is the most reliable and fiscally prudent way to address our stormwater management needs and requirements.

Recent County budget shortfalls indicate that finding dollars in the County General Fund will not be as simple and painless as the County Executive's financial assurance plan suggests. The need to fulfill the requirements of our MS4 permit may mean that other county public services get short shrift, and that is not a choice that I as a citizen and voter want to see us make. Better to keep the dedicated funding provided by the fee in place so that clean-up efforts don't have to compete with other priorities for County funds.

I have not yet heard a compelling argument for CB52-2015 that overrides the significant tide of the County's own evidence in support of maintaining our Watershed Protection and Restoration Fee.

And, perhaps most significant for me as a citizen, since the advent of the Watershed Protection and Restoration Fee, I'm seeing the money I've contributed going into the ground, getting important work done. The stream restorations, tree plantings, infrastructure repairs and upgrades, and other projects already being done using dedicated funds from the fee have put us on the path towards safe, fishable, swimmable water in our local rivers and streams. I want to see that critical work continue apace, without being put at risk by budget uncertainties.

I hope that you will see the fiscal prudence of having a dedicated stormwater remediation fee available to help fund the important work of cleaning up polluted runoff in our county.

Please vote "no" on CB52-2015, and keep our Watershed Protection and Restoration Fee in place.

Thank you.

Maura Duffy
9379 Tiller Drive
Ellicott City, MD 21042

Vote NO on CB52-2015

Chiara D'Amore [chiaradamore@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, December 17, 2015 2:33 PM
To: CouncilMail

Dear County Executive Kittleman and Howard County Council:

I understand that CB52-2015 was recently introduced to repeal Howard County's Watershed Protection and Restoration fee.

I'm deeply concerned that removing the fee would undermine our county's Watershed Protection and Restoration Program and erode our ability to meet the requirements of our federal MS4 (Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System) permit. Removing the fee is a bad choice that could jeopardize Howard County's water quality and a future of fishable, swimmable rivers and streams.

Several analyses done by the County over the past several years point to the need for this fee.

Our 2012 Phase II County Watershed Implementation Plan (WIP) suggests that such a fee would be the most fiscally prudent and reliable way to fund our stormwater management program. This assessment predates the state mandate for a county fee that was removed in the last session of the Maryland General Assembly. State mandates aside, I still believe that the fee is the most reliable and fiscally prudent way to address our stormwater management needs and requirements.

Recent County budget shortfalls indicate that finding dollars in the County General Fund will not be as simple and painless as the County Executive's financial assurance plan suggests. The need to fulfill the requirements of our MS4 permit may mean that other county public services get short shrift, and that is not a choice that I as a citizen and voter want to see us make. Better to keep the dedicated funding provided by the fee in place so that clean-up efforts don't have to compete with other priorities for County funds.

I have not yet heard a compelling argument for CB52-2015 that overrides the significant tide of the County's own evidence in support of maintaining our Watershed Protection and Restoration Fee.

And, perhaps most significant for me as a citizen, since the advent of the Watershed Protection and Restoration Fee, I'm seeing the money I've contributed going into the ground, getting important work done. The stream restorations, tree plantings, infrastructure repairs and upgrades, and other projects already being done using dedicated funds from the fee have put us on the path towards safe, fishable, swimmable water in our local rivers and streams. I want to see that critical work continue apace, without being put at risk by budget uncertainties.

I hope that you will see the fiscal prudence of having a dedicated stormwater remediation fee available to help fund the important work of cleaning up polluted runoff in our county.

Please vote "no" on CB52-2015, and keep our Watershed Protection and Restoration Fee in place.

Thank you.

Chiara D'Amore
Endicott Lane
Columbia, MD 21044

Vote NO on CB52-2015

Robert Smith [smithatec@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, December 16, 2015 9:26 PM
To: CouncilMail

Dear County Executive Kittleman and Howard County Council:

I understand that CB52-2015 was recently introduced to repeal Howard County's Watershed Protection and Restoration fee.

I'm deeply concerned that removing the fee would undermine our county's Watershed Protection and Restoration Program and erode our ability to meet the requirements of our federal MS4 (Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System) permit. Removing the fee is a bad choice that could jeopardize Howard County's water quality and a future of fishable, swimmable rivers and streams.

Several analyses done by the County over the past several years point to the need for this fee.

Our 2012 Phase II County Watershed Implementation Plan (WIP) suggests that such a fee would be the most fiscally prudent and reliable way to fund our stormwater management program. This assessment predates the state mandate for a county fee that was removed in the last session of the Maryland General Assembly. State mandates aside, I still believe that the fee is the most reliable and fiscally prudent way to address our stormwater management needs and requirements.

Recent County budget shortfalls indicate that finding dollars in the County General Fund will not be as simple and painless as the County Executive's financial assurance plan suggests. The need to fulfill the requirements of our MS4 permit may mean that other county public services get short shrift, and that is not a choice that I as a citizen and voter want to see us make. Better to keep the dedicated funding provided by the fee in place so that clean-up efforts don't have to compete with other priorities for County funds.

I have not yet heard a compelling argument for CB52-2015 that overrides the significant tide of the County's own evidence in support of maintaining our Watershed Protection and Restoration Fee.

And, perhaps most significant for me as a citizen, since the advent of the Watershed Protection and Restoration Fee, I'm seeing the money I've contributed going into the ground, getting important work done. The stream restorations, tree plantings, infrastructure repairs and upgrades, and other projects already being done using dedicated funds from the fee have put us on the path towards safe, fishable, swimmable water in our local rivers and streams. I want to see that critical work continue apace, without being put at risk by budget uncertainties.

I hope that you will see the fiscal prudence of having a dedicated stormwater remediation fee available to help fund the important work of cleaning up polluted runoff in our county.

Please vote "no" on CB52-2015, and keep our Watershed Protection and Restoration Fee in place.

Thank you.

Robert Smith
4054 Crescent Rd.
Ellicott City, MD 21042

Vote NO on CB52-2015

Patricia Schuyler [paschuyler@hotmail.com]
Sent: Friday, January 08, 2016 12:17 PM
To: CouncilMail

FILE COPY

Dear County Executive Kittleman and Howard County Council:

I understand that CB52-2015 was recently introduced to repeal Howard County's Watershed Protection and Restoration fee.

I'm deeply concerned that removing the fee would undermine our county's Watershed Protection and Restoration Program and erode our ability to meet the requirements of our federal MS4 (Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System) permit. Removing the fee is a bad choice that could jeopardize Howard County's water quality and a future of fishable, swimmable rivers and streams.

Several analyses done by the County over the past several years point to the need for this fee.

Our 2012 Phase II County Watershed Implementation Plan (WIP) suggests that such a fee would be the most fiscally prudent and reliable way to fund our stormwater management program. This assessment predates the state mandate for a county fee that was removed in the last session of the Maryland General Assembly. State mandates aside, I still believe that the fee is the most reliable and fiscally prudent way to address our stormwater management needs and requirements.

Recent County budget shortfalls indicate that finding dollars in the County General Fund will not be as simple and painless as the County Executive's financial assurance plan suggests. The need to fulfill the requirements of our MS4 permit may mean that other county public services get short shrift, and that is not a choice that I as a citizen and voter want to see us make. Better to keep the dedicated funding provided by the fee in place so that clean-up efforts don't have to compete with other priorities for County funds.

I have not yet heard a compelling argument for CB52-2015 that overrides the significant tide of the County's own evidence in support of maintaining our Watershed Protection and Restoration Fee.

And, perhaps most significant for me as a citizen, since the advent of the Watershed Protection and Restoration Fee, I'm seeing the money I've contributed going into the ground, getting important work done. The stream restorations, tree plantings, infrastructure repairs and upgrades, and other projects already being done using dedicated funds from the fee have put us on the path towards safe, fishable, swimmable water in our local rivers and streams. I want to see that critical work continue apace, without being put at risk by budget uncertainties.

I hope that you will see the fiscal prudence of having a dedicated stormwater remediation fee available to help fund the important work of cleaning up polluted runoff in our county.

Please vote "no" on CB52-2015, and keep our Watershed Protection and Restoration Fee in place.

Thank you.

Patricia Schuyler
5134 Rondel Place
Columbia, MD 21044

Vote NO on CB52-2015

Lisa Ott [lisamichelsott@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, January 08, 2016 12:29 PM
To: CouncilMail

Dear County Executive Kittleman and Howard County Council:

I understand that CB52-2015 was recently introduced to repeal Howard County's Watershed Protection and Restoration fee.

I'm deeply concerned that removing the fee would undermine our county's Watershed Protection and Restoration Program and erode our ability to meet the requirements of our federal MS4 (Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System) permit. Removing the fee is a bad choice that could jeopardize Howard County's water quality and a future of fishable, swimmable rivers and streams.

Several analyses done by the County over the past several years point to the need for this fee.

Our 2012 Phase II County Watershed Implementation Plan (WIP) suggests that such a fee would be the most fiscally prudent and reliable way to fund our stormwater management program. This assessment predates the state mandate for a county fee that was removed in the last session of the Maryland General Assembly. State mandates aside, I still believe that the fee is the most reliable and fiscally prudent way to address our stormwater management needs and requirements.

Recent County budget shortfalls indicate that finding dollars in the County General Fund will not be as simple and painless as the County Executive's financial assurance plan suggests. The need to fulfill the requirements of our MS4 permit may mean that other county public services get short shrift, and that is not a choice that I as a citizen and voter want to see us make. Better to keep the dedicated funding provided by the fee in place so that clean-up efforts don't have to compete with other priorities for County funds.

I have not yet heard a compelling argument for CB52-2015 that overrides the significant tide of the County's own evidence in support of maintaining our Watershed Protection and Restoration Fee.

And, perhaps most significant for me as a citizen, since the advent of the Watershed Protection and Restoration Fee, I'm seeing the money I've contributed going into the ground, getting important work done. The stream restorations, tree plantings, infrastructure repairs and upgrades, and other projects already being done using dedicated funds from the fee have put us on the path towards safe, fishable, swimmable water in our local rivers and streams. I want to see that critical work continue apace, without being put at risk by budget uncertainties.

I hope that you will see the fiscal prudence of having a dedicated stormwater remediation fee available to help fund the important work of cleaning up polluted runoff in our county.

Please vote "no" on CB52-2015, and keep our Watershed Protection and Restoration Fee in place.

Thank you.

Lisa Ott
9643 Green Moon Path
Columbia, MD 21046

Vote NO on CB52-2015

Dwayne Johnson [johnson.dwayne.k@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, January 08, 2016 1:19 PM
To: CouncilMail

Dear County Executive Kittleman and Howard County Council:

I understand that CB52-2015 was recently introduced to repeal Howard County's Watershed Protection and Restoration fee.

I'm deeply concerned that removing the fee would undermine our county's Watershed Protection and Restoration Program and erode our ability to meet the requirements of our federal MS4 (Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System) permit. Removing the fee is a bad choice that could jeopardize Howard County's water quality and a future of fishable, swimmable rivers and streams.

Several analyses done by the County over the past several years point to the need for this fee.

Our 2012 Phase II County Watershed Implementation Plan (WIP) suggests that such a fee would be the most fiscally prudent and reliable way to fund our stormwater management program. This assessment predates the state mandate for a county fee that was removed in the last session of the Maryland General Assembly. State mandates aside, I still believe that the fee is the most reliable and fiscally prudent way to address our stormwater management needs and requirements.

Recent County budget shortfalls indicate that finding dollars in the County General Fund will not be as simple and painless as the County Executive's financial assurance plan suggests. The need to fulfill the requirements of our MS4 permit may mean that other county public services get short shrift, and that is not a choice that I as a citizen and voter want to see us make. Better to keep the dedicated funding provided by the fee in place so that clean-up efforts don't have to compete with other priorities for County funds.

I have not yet heard a compelling argument for CB52-2015 that overrides the significant tide of the County's own evidence in support of maintaining our Watershed Protection and Restoration Fee.

And, perhaps most significant for me as a citizen, since the advent of the Watershed Protection and Restoration Fee, I'm seeing the money I've contributed going into the ground, getting important work done. The stream restorations, tree plantings, infrastructure repairs and upgrades, and other projects already being done using dedicated funds from the fee have put us on the path towards safe, fishable, swimmable water in our local rivers and streams. I want to see that critical work continue apace, without being put at risk by budget uncertainties.

I hope that you will see the fiscal prudence of having a dedicated stormwater remediation fee available to help fund the important work of cleaning up polluted runoff in our county.

Please vote "no" on CB52-2015, and keep our Watershed Protection and Restoration Fee in place.

Thank you.

Dwayne Johnson
5901 Rising Star
Elkridge, MD 21075

Vote NO on CB52-2015

William Fox [wfoxmd7@verizon.net]
Sent: Friday, January 08, 2016 2:09 PM
To: CouncilMail

Dear County Executive Kittleman and Howard County Council:

I understand that CB52-2015 was recently introduced to repeal Howard County's Watershed Protection and Restoration fee.

I'm deeply concerned that removing the fee would undermine our county's Watershed Protection and Restoration Program and erode our ability to meet the requirements of our federal MS4 (Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System) permit. Removing the fee is a bad choice that could jeopardize Howard County's water quality and a future of fishable, swimmable rivers and streams.

Several analyses done by the County over the past several years point to the need for this fee.

Our 2012 Phase II County Watershed Implementation Plan (WIP) suggests that such a fee would be the most fiscally prudent and reliable way to fund our stormwater management program. This assessment predates the state mandate for a county fee that was removed in the last session of the Maryland General Assembly. State mandates aside, I still believe that the fee is the most reliable and fiscally prudent way to address our stormwater management needs and requirements.

Recent County budget shortfalls indicate that finding dollars in the County General Fund will not be as simple and painless as the County Executive's financial assurance plan suggests. The need to fulfill the requirements of our MS4 permit may mean that other county public services get short shrift, and that is not a choice that I as a citizen and voter want to see us make. Better to keep the dedicated funding provided by the fee in place so that clean-up efforts don't have to compete with other priorities for County funds.

I have not yet heard a compelling argument for CB52-2015 that overrides the significant tide of the County's own evidence in support of maintaining our Watershed Protection and Restoration Fee.

And, perhaps most significant for me as a citizen, since the advent of the Watershed Protection and Restoration Fee, I'm seeing the money I've contributed going into the ground, getting important work done. The stream restorations, tree plantings, infrastructure repairs and upgrades, and other projects already being done using dedicated funds from the fee have put us on the path towards safe, fishable, swimmable water in our local rivers and streams. I want to see that critical work continue apace, without being put at risk by budget uncertainties.

I hope that you will see the fiscal prudence of having a dedicated stormwater remediation fee available to help fund the important work of cleaning up polluted runoff in our county.

Please vote "no" on CB52-2015, and keep our Watershed Protection and Restoration Fee in place.

Thank you.

William Fox
11837 Winterlong Way
Columbia, MD 21044

Vote NO on CB52-2015

Kurt Schwarz [krschwa1@verizon.net]
Sent: Friday, January 08, 2016 3:33 PM
To: CouncilMail

Dear County Executive Kittleman and Howard County Council:

I understand that CB52-2015 was recently introduced to repeal Howard County's Watershed Protection and Restoration fee.

I wish to reiterate my concern that removing the fee would undermine our county's Watershed Protection and Restoration Program and erode our ability to meet the requirements of our federal MS4 (Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System) permit. Removing the fee is a bad choice that could jeopardize Howard County's water quality and a future of fishable, swimmable rivers and streams.

Several analyses done by the County over the past several years point to the need for this fee.

Our 2012 Phase II County Watershed Implementation Plan (WIP) suggests that such a fee would be the most fiscally prudent and reliable way to fund our stormwater management program. This assessment predates the state mandate for a county fee that was removed in the last session of the Maryland General Assembly. State mandates aside, I still believe that the fee is the most reliable and fiscally prudent way to address our stormwater management needs and requirements.

Recent County budget shortfalls indicate that finding dollars in the County General Fund will not be as simple and painless as the County Executive's financial assurance plan suggests. The need to fulfill the requirements of our MS4 permit may mean that other county public services get short shrift, and that is not a choice that I as a citizen and voter want to see us make. Better to keep the dedicated funding provided by the fee in place so that clean-up efforts don't have to compete with other priorities for County funds.

I have not yet heard a compelling argument for CB52-2015 that overrides the significant tide of the County's own evidence in support of maintaining our Watershed Protection and Restoration Fee.

And, perhaps most significant for me as a citizen, since the advent of the Watershed Protection and Restoration Fee, I'm seeing the money I've contributed going into the ground, getting important work done. The stream restorations, tree plantings, infrastructure repairs and upgrades, and other projects already being done using dedicated funds from the fee have put us on the path towards safe, fishable, swimmable water in our local rivers and streams. I want to see that critical work continue apace, without being put at risk by budget uncertainties. Further, such projects have already been shown to improve water quality in Baltimore County. The same will occur here in Howard.

I hope that you will see the fiscal prudence of having a dedicated stormwater remediation fee available to help fund the important work of cleaning up polluted runoff in our county.

Please vote "no" on CB52-2015, and keep our Watershed Protection and Restoration Fee in place.

Thank you.

Kurt Schwarz
9045 Dunloggin Court
Ellicott City, MD 21042

Vote NO on CB52-2015

Anna Farb [anna.r.farb@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, January 08, 2016 3:46 PM
To: CouncilMail

Dear County Executive Kittleman and Howard County Council:

I understand that CB52-2015 was recently introduced to repeal Howard County's Watershed Protection and Restoration fee.

I'm deeply concerned that removing the fee would undermine our county's Watershed Protection and Restoration Program and erode our ability to meet the requirements of our federal MS4 (Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System) permit. Removing the fee could jeopardize Howard County's water quality and a future of fishable, swimmable rivers and streams.

Several analyses done by the County over the past several years point to the need for this fee.

Our 2012 Phase II County Watershed Implementation Plan (WIP) suggests that such a fee would be the most fiscally prudent and reliable way to fund our stormwater management program. This assessment predates the state mandate for a county fee that was removed in the last session of the Maryland General Assembly. State mandates aside, I still believe that the fee is the most reliable and fiscally prudent way to address our stormwater management needs and requirements.

Recent County budget shortfalls indicate that finding dollars in the County General Fund will not be as simple and painless as the County Executive's financial assurance plan suggests. The need to fulfill the requirements of our MS4 permit may mean that other county public services get short shrift, and that is not a choice that I as a citizen and voter want to see us make. Better to keep the dedicated funding provided by the fee in place so that clean-up efforts don't have to compete with other priorities for County funds.

I have not yet heard a compelling argument for CB52-2015 that overrides the significant tide of the County's own evidence in support of maintaining our Watershed Protection and Restoration Fee.

And, perhaps most significant for me as a citizen, since the advent of the Watershed Protection and Restoration Fee, I'm seeing the money I've contributed going into the ground, getting important work done. The stream restorations, tree plantings, infrastructure repairs and upgrades, and other projects already being done using dedicated funds from the fee have put us on the path towards safe, fishable, swimmable water in our local rivers and streams. I want to see that critical work continue apace, without being put at risk by budget uncertainties. I also think the incentives for homeowner installing BMPs are important to maintain.

I hope that you will see the fiscal prudence of having a dedicated stormwater remediation fee available to help fund the important work of cleaning up polluted runoff in our county.

Please vote "no" on CB52-2015, and keep our Watershed Protection and Restoration Fee in place.

Thank you.

Anna Farb

Columbia, MD 21044

Vote NO on CB52-2015

Gregory Buffaloe [easyman123@verizon.net]
Sent: Friday, January 08, 2016 5:33 PM
To: CouncilMail

Dear County Executive Kittleman and Howard County Council:

I understand that CB52-2015 was recently introduced to repeal Howard County's Watershed Protection and Restoration fee.

I'm deeply concerned that removing the fee would undermine our county's Watershed Protection and Restoration Program and erode our ability to meet the requirements of our federal MS4 (Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System) permit. Removing the fee is a bad choice that could jeopardize Howard County's water quality and a future of fishable, swimmable rivers and streams.

Several analyses done by the County over the past several years point to the need for this fee.

Our 2012 Phase II County Watershed Implementation Plan (WIP) suggests that such a fee would be the most fiscally prudent and reliable way to fund our stormwater management program. This assessment predates the state mandate for a county fee that was removed in the last session of the Maryland General Assembly. State mandates aside, I still believe that the fee is the most reliable and fiscally prudent way to address our stormwater management needs and requirements.

Recent County budget shortfalls indicate that finding dollars in the County General Fund will not be as simple and painless as the County Executive's financial assurance plan suggests. The need to fulfill the requirements of our MS4 permit may mean that other county public services get short shrift, and that is not a choice that I as a citizen and voter want to see us make. Better to keep the dedicated funding provided by the fee in place so that clean-up efforts don't have to compete with other priorities for County funds.

I have not yet heard a compelling argument for CB52-2015 that overrides the significant tide of the County's own evidence in support of maintaining our Watershed Protection and Restoration Fee.

And, perhaps most significant for me as a citizen, since the advent of the Watershed Protection and Restoration Fee, I'm seeing the money I've contributed going into the ground, getting important work done. The stream restorations, tree plantings, infrastructure repairs and upgrades, and other projects already being done using dedicated funds from the fee have put us on the path towards safe, fishable, swimmable water in our local rivers and streams. I want to see that critical work continue apace, without being put at risk by budget uncertainties.

I hope that you will see the fiscal prudence of having a dedicated stormwater remediation fee available to help fund the important work of cleaning up polluted runoff in our county.

Please vote "no" on CB52-2015, and keep our Watershed Protection and Restoration Fee in place.

Thank you.

Gregory Buffaloe
8026 Jane Garth
Jessup, MD 20794

Vote NO on CB52-2015

Fran Terry [bestmadelemonade@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, January 08, 2016 6:20 PM
To: CouncilMail

Dear County Executive Kittleman and Howard County Council:

I understand that CB52-2015 was recently introduced to repeal Howard County's Watershed Protection and Restoration fee.

I'm deeply concerned that removing the fee would undermine our county's Watershed Protection and Restoration Program and erode our ability to meet the requirements of our federal MS4 (Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System) permit. Removing the fee is a bad choice that could jeopardize Howard County's water quality and a future of fishable, swimmable rivers and streams.

Several analyses done by the County over the past several years point to the need for this fee.

Our 2012 Phase II County Watershed Implementation Plan (WIP) suggests that such a fee would be the most fiscally prudent and reliable way to fund our stormwater management program. This assessment predates the state mandate for a county fee that was removed in the last session of the Maryland General Assembly. State mandates aside, I still believe that the fee is the most reliable and fiscally prudent way to address our stormwater management needs and requirements.

Recent County budget shortfalls indicate that finding dollars in the County General Fund will not be as simple and painless as the County Executive's financial assurance plan suggests. The need to fulfill the requirements of our MS4 permit may mean that other county public services get short shrift, and that is not a choice that I as a citizen and voter want to see us make. Better to keep the dedicated funding provided by the fee in place so that clean-up efforts don't have to compete with other priorities for County funds.

I have not yet heard a compelling argument for CB52-2015 that overrides the significant tide of the County's own evidence in support of maintaining our Watershed Protection and Restoration Fee.

And, perhaps most significant for me as a citizen, since the advent of the Watershed Protection and Restoration Fee, I'm seeing the money I've contributed going into the ground, getting important work done. The stream restorations, tree plantings, infrastructure repairs and upgrades, and other projects already being done using dedicated funds from the fee have put us on the path towards safe, fishable, swimmable water in our local rivers and streams. I want to see that critical work continue apace, without being put at risk by budget uncertainties.

I hope that you will see the fiscal prudence of having a dedicated stormwater remediation fee available to help fund the important work of cleaning up polluted runoff in our county.

Please vote "no" on CB52-2015, and keep our Watershed Protection and Restoration Fee in place.

Thank you.

Fran Terry
10837 Braeburn Rd
Columbia, MD 21044

Howard County Bill 52-2015

Jodi Rose [jodi@interfaithchesapeake.org]

Sent: Thursday, January 07, 2016 11:12 PM
To: CouncilMail
Attachments: IPC letter to Chair of Cou~1.pdf (189 KB)

Dr. Ball -
Attached please accept electronic testimony in regards to Howard County Bill 52-2015. I will be unable to attend the Jan. 19th hearing, but am grateful that you will accept this testimony electronically.

Thank you,

Jodi Rose
Executive Director
Interfaith Partners for the Chesapeake

interfaithchesapeake.org

501 6th Street
Annapolis, MD 21403
410-609-6852

"We accomplish in our lifetime only a tiny fraction of the magnificent enterprise that is God's work."
Archbishop Oscar Romero, peace activist

Interfaith Partners for the CHESAPEAKE

Forming Faithful Stewards, Caring for Sacred Waters

501 Sixth Street
Annapolis, Maryland 21403

January 4, 2016

Dr. Calvin Ball
George Howard Building
1st Floor
3430 Courthouse Drive
Ellicott City, MD 21043

RE: Howard County Bill 52-2015

Council Chair Dr. Ball:

We are writing you to express our opposition to a repeal of the Howard County stormwater fee, Council Bill 52-2015.

As you know, polluted runoff is created when rain falls on manmade surfaces and becomes polluted. We make this pollution in our daily living: by driving our cars, or dropping cigarette butts, or over-applying our salt. By expanding our communities with new shopping centers and schools. We never intend to pollute, but that doesn't mean we're not responsible. God makes the rain, but we make the runoff.

There is a cost to polluted runoff, and one that we must all share fairly. Many congregations throughout Maryland are already rolling up their sleeves and getting to work to reduce their polluted runoff. They understand that we cannot shirk our responsibilities. If nonprofit congregations are willing to carry their fair share of the responsibility, why are so many others passing the buck?

We believe there is a deep connection between caring for the environment and caring for humanity around us, and those yet to come. We appreciate your respectful consideration of these viewpoints in regards to repeal.

In hope for a balanced web of life,

Jodi Rose

Jodi Rose
Executive Director

Vote NO on CB52-2015

Peter Katan [peterkatan@comcast.net]
Sent: Friday, January 08, 2016 10:18 AM
To: CouncilMail

Dear County Executive Kittleman and Howard County Council:

I understand that CB52-2015 was recently introduced to repeal Howard County's Watershed Protection and Restoration fee.

I'm deeply concerned that removing the fee would undermine our county's Watershed Protection and Restoration Program and erode our ability to meet the requirements of our federal MS4 (Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System) permit. Removing the fee is a bad choice that could jeopardize Howard County's water quality and a future of fishable, swimmable rivers and streams.

Several analyses done by the County over the past several years point to the need for this fee.

Our 2012 Phase II County Watershed Implementation Plan (WIP) suggests that such a fee would be the most fiscally prudent and reliable way to fund our stormwater management program. This assessment predates the state mandate for a county fee that was removed in the last session of the Maryland General Assembly. State mandates aside, I still believe that the fee is the most reliable and fiscally prudent way to address our stormwater management needs and requirements.

Recent County budget shortfalls indicate that finding dollars in the County General Fund will not be as simple and painless as the County Executive's financial assurance plan suggests. The need to fulfill the requirements of our MS4 permit may mean that other county public services get short shrift, and that is not a choice that I as a citizen and voter want to see us make. Better to keep the dedicated funding provided by the fee in place so that clean-up efforts don't have to compete with other priorities for County funds.

I have not yet heard a compelling argument for CB52-2015 that overrides the significant tide of the County's own evidence in support of maintaining our Watershed Protection and Restoration Fee.

And, perhaps most significant for me as a citizen, since the advent of the Watershed Protection and Restoration Fee, I'm seeing the money I've contributed going into the ground, getting important work done. The stream restorations, tree plantings, infrastructure repairs and upgrades, and other projects already being done using dedicated funds from the fee have put us on the path towards safe, fishable, swimmable water in our local rivers and streams. I want to see that critical work continue apace, without being put at risk by budget uncertainties.

I hope that you will see the fiscal prudence of having a dedicated stormwater remediation fee available to help fund the important work of cleaning up polluted runoff in our county.

Please vote "no" on CB52-2015, and keep our Watershed Protection and Restoration Fee in place.

Thank you.

Peter Katan
2510 kensington gdns unit 304
unit 304
ellicott city, MD 21043

Vote NO on CB52-2015

Andrew Porter, P.E. [civildesign@comcast.net]
Sent: Friday, January 08, 2016 10:50 AM
To: CouncilMail

Dear County Executive Kittleman and Howard County Council:

I understand that CB52-2015 was recently introduced to repeal Howard County's Watershed Protection and Restoration fee.

I'm deeply concerned that removing the fee would undermine our county's Watershed Protection and Restoration Program and erode our ability to meet the requirements of our federal MS4 (Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System) permit. Removing the fee is a bad choice that could jeopardize Howard County's water quality and a future of fishable, swimmable rivers and streams.

Several analyses done by the County over the past several years point to the need for this fee.

Our 2012 Phase II County Watershed Implementation Plan (WIP) suggests that such a fee would be the most fiscally prudent and reliable way to fund our stormwater management program. This assessment predates the state mandate for a county fee that was removed in the last session of the Maryland General Assembly. State mandates aside, I still believe that the fee is the most reliable and fiscally prudent way to address our stormwater management needs and requirements.

Recent County budget shortfalls indicate that finding dollars in the County General Fund will not be as simple and painless as the County Executive's financial assurance plan suggests. The need to fulfill the requirements of our MS4 permit may mean that other county public services get short shrift, and that is not a choice that I as a citizen and voter want to see us make. Better to keep the dedicated funding provided by the fee in place so that clean-up efforts don't have to compete with other priorities for County funds.

I have not yet heard a compelling argument for CB52-2015 that overrides the significant tide of the County's own evidence in support of maintaining our Watershed Protection and Restoration Fee.

And, perhaps most significant for me as a citizen, since the advent of the Watershed Protection and Restoration Fee, I'm seeing the money I've contributed going into the ground, getting important work done. The stream restorations, tree plantings, infrastructure repairs and upgrades, and other projects already being done using dedicated funds from the fee have put us on the path towards safe, fishable, swimmable water in our local rivers and streams. I want to see that critical work continue apace, without being put at risk by budget uncertainties.

I hope that you will see the fiscal prudence of having a dedicated stormwater remediation fee available to help fund the important work of cleaning up polluted runoff in our county.

Please vote "no" on CB52-2015, and keep our Watershed Protection and Restoration Fee in place.

Thank you.

Andrew Porter, P.E.
6123 Hlly Ridge Ct
Columbia, MD 21044

Vote NO on CB52-2015

Susan Imbach [susanimbach@comcast.net]
Sent: Friday, January 08, 2016 11:18 AM
To: CouncilMail

Dear County Executive Kittleman and Howard County Council:

I understand that CB52-2015 was recently introduced to repeal Howard County's Watershed Protection and Restoration fee.

I'm deeply concerned that removing the fee would undermine our county's Watershed Protection and Restoration Program and erode our ability to meet the requirements of our federal MS4 (Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System) permit. Removing the fee is a bad choice that could jeopardize Howard County's water quality and a future of fishable, swimmable rivers and streams.

Several analyses done by the County over the past several years point to the need for this fee.

Our 2012 Phase II County Watershed Implementation Plan (WIP) suggests that such a fee would be the most fiscally prudent and reliable way to fund our stormwater management program. This assessment predates the state mandate for a county fee that was removed in the last session of the Maryland General Assembly. State mandates aside, I still believe that the fee is the most reliable and fiscally prudent way to address our stormwater management needs and requirements.

Recent County budget shortfalls indicate that finding dollars in the County General Fund will not be as simple and painless as the County Executive's financial assurance plan suggests. The need to fulfill the requirements of our MS4 permit may mean that other county public services get short shrift, and that is not a choice that I as a citizen and voter want to see us make. Better to keep the dedicated funding provided by the fee in place so that clean-up efforts don't have to compete with other priorities for County funds.

I have not yet heard a compelling argument for CB52-2015 that overrides the significant tide of the County's own evidence in support of maintaining our Watershed Protection and Restoration Fee.

And, perhaps most significant for me as a citizen, since the advent of the Watershed Protection and Restoration Fee, I'm seeing the money I've contributed going into the ground, getting important work done. The stream restorations, tree plantings, infrastructure repairs and upgrades, and other projects already being done using dedicated funds from the fee have put us on the path towards safe, fishable, swimmable water in our local rivers and streams. I want to see that critical work continue apace, without being put at risk by budget uncertainties.

I hope that you will see the fiscal prudence of having a dedicated stormwater remediation fee available to help fund the important work of cleaning up polluted runoff in our county.

Please vote "no" on CB52-2015, and keep our Watershed Protection and Restoration Fee in place.

Thank you.

Susan Imbach
3894 Paul Mill Rd
Ellicott City, MD 21042

Vote NO on CB52-2015

Christine Hilton [cmhilton@verizon.net]
Sent: Friday, January 08, 2016 11:20 AM
To: CouncilMail

Dear County Executive Kittleman and Howard County Council:

I understand that CB52-2015 was recently introduced to repeal Howard County's Watershed Protection and Restoration fee.

I'm deeply concerned that removing the fee would undermine our county's Watershed Protection and Restoration Program and erode our ability to meet the requirements of our federal MS4 (Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System) permit. Removing the fee is a bad choice that could jeopardize Howard County's water quality and a future of fishable, swimmable rivers and streams.

Several analyses done by the County over the past several years point to the need for this fee.

Our 2012 Phase II County Watershed Implementation Plan (WIP) suggests that such a fee would be the most fiscally prudent and reliable way to fund our stormwater management program. This assessment predates the state mandate for a county fee that was removed in the last session of the Maryland General Assembly. State mandates aside, I still believe that the fee is the most reliable and fiscally prudent way to address our stormwater management needs and requirements.

Recent County budget shortfalls indicate that finding dollars in the County General Fund will not be as simple and painless as the County Executive's financial assurance plan suggests. The need to fulfill the requirements of our MS4 permit may mean that other county public services get short shrift, and that is not a choice that I as a citizen and voter want to see us make. Better to keep the dedicated funding provided by the fee in place so that clean-up efforts don't have to compete with other priorities for County funds.

I have not yet heard a compelling argument for CB52-2015 that overrides the significant tide of the County's own evidence in support of maintaining our Watershed Protection and Restoration Fee.

And, perhaps most significant for me as a citizen, since the advent of the Watershed Protection and Restoration Fee, I'm seeing the money I've contributed going into the ground, getting important work done. The stream restorations, tree plantings, infrastructure repairs and upgrades, and other projects already being done using dedicated funds from the fee have put us on the path towards safe, fishable, swimmable water in our local rivers and streams. I want to see that critical work continue apace, without being put at risk by budget uncertainties.

I hope that you will see the fiscal prudence of having a dedicated stormwater remediation fee available to help fund the important work of cleaning up polluted runoff in our county.

Please vote "no" on CB52-2015, and keep our Watershed Protection and Restoration Fee in place.

Thank you.

Christine Hilton
5330 Debbie Court
Ellicott City, MD 21043

Vote NO on CB52-2015

Frank Lombardi [ftlombardi@aol.com]
Sent: Friday, January 08, 2016 8:54 PM
To: CouncilMail

Dear County Executive Kittleman and Howard County Council:

I understand that CB52-2015 was recently introduced to repeal Howard County's Watershed Protection and Restoration fee.

I'm deeply concerned that removing the fee would undermine our county's Watershed Protection and Restoration Program and erode our ability to meet the requirements of our federal MS4 (Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System) permit. Removing the fee is a bad choice that could jeopardize Howard County's water quality and a future of fishable, swimmable rivers and streams.

Several analyses done by the County over the past several years point to the need for this fee.

Our 2012 Phase II County Watershed Implementation Plan (WIP) suggests that such a fee would be the most fiscally prudent and reliable way to fund our stormwater management program. This assessment predates the state mandate for a county fee that was removed in the last session of the Maryland General Assembly. State mandates aside, I still believe that the fee is the most reliable and fiscally prudent way to address our stormwater management needs and requirements.

Recent County budget shortfalls indicate that finding dollars in the County General Fund will not be as simple and painless as the County Executive's financial assurance plan suggests. The need to fulfill the requirements of our MS4 permit may mean that other county public services get short shrift, and that is not a choice that I as a citizen and voter want to see us make. Better to keep the dedicated funding provided by the fee in place so that clean-up efforts don't have to compete with other priorities for County funds.

I have not yet heard a compelling argument for CB52-2015 that overrides the significant tide of the County's own evidence in support of maintaining our Watershed Protection and Restoration Fee.

And, perhaps most significant for me as a citizen, since the advent of the Watershed Protection and Restoration Fee, I'm seeing the money I've contributed going into the ground, getting important work done. The stream restorations, tree plantings, infrastructure repairs and upgrades, and other projects already being done using dedicated funds from the fee have put us on the path towards safe, fishable, swimmable water in our local rivers and streams. I want to see that critical work continue apace, without being put at risk by budget uncertainties.

I hope that you will see the fiscal prudence of having a dedicated stormwater remediation fee available to help fund the important work of cleaning up polluted runoff in our county.

Please vote "no" on CB52-2015, and keep our Watershed Protection and Restoration Fee in place.

Thank you.

Frank Lombardi
11726 Lightfall Court
Columbia, MD 21044

Vote NO on CB52-2015

Karlton Kim [karltonkim@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, January 08, 2016 8:47 PM
To: CouncilMail

Dear County Executive Kittleman and Howard County Council:

I understand that CB52-2015 was recently introduced to repeal Howard County's Watershed Protection and Restoration fee.

I'm deeply concerned that removing the fee would undermine our county's Watershed Protection and Restoration Program and erode our ability to meet the requirements of our federal MS4 (Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System) permit. Removing the fee is a bad choice that could jeopardize Howard County's water quality and a future of fishable, swimmable rivers and streams.

Several analyses done by the County over the past several years point to the need for this fee.

Our 2012 Phase II County Watershed Implementation Plan (WIP) suggests that such a fee would be the most fiscally prudent and reliable way to fund our stormwater management program. This assessment predates the state mandate for a county fee that was removed in the last session of the Maryland General Assembly. State mandates aside, I still believe that the fee is the most reliable and fiscally prudent way to address our stormwater management needs and requirements.

Recent County budget shortfalls indicate that finding dollars in the County General Fund will not be as simple and painless as the County Executive's financial assurance plan suggests. The need to fulfill the requirements of our MS4 permit may mean that other county public services get short shrift, and that is not a choice that I as a citizen and voter want to see us make. Better to keep the dedicated funding provided by the fee in place so that clean-up efforts don't have to compete with other priorities for County funds.

I have not yet heard a compelling argument for CB52-2015 that overrides the significant tide of the County's own evidence in support of maintaining our Watershed Protection and Restoration Fee.

And, perhaps most significant for me as a citizen, since the advent of the Watershed Protection and Restoration Fee, I'm seeing the money I've contributed going into the ground, getting important work done. The stream restorations, tree plantings, infrastructure repairs and upgrades, and other projects already being done using dedicated funds from the fee have put us on the path towards safe, fishable, swimmable water in our local rivers and streams. I want to see that critical work continue apace, without being put at risk by budget uncertainties.

I hope that you will see the fiscal prudence of having a dedicated stormwater remediation fee available to help fund the important work of cleaning up polluted runoff in our county.

Please vote "no" on CB52-2015, and keep our Watershed Protection and Restoration Fee in place.

Thank you.

Karlton Kim
11052 Harding Road
Laurel, MD 20723

Vote NO on CB52-2015

Karlton Kim [karltonkim@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, January 08, 2016 8:47 PM
To: CouncilMail

Dear County Executive Kittleman and Howard County Council:

I understand that CB52-2015 was recently introduced to repeal Howard County's Watershed Protection and Restoration fee.

I'm deeply concerned that removing the fee would undermine our county's Watershed Protection and Restoration Program and erode our ability to meet the requirements of our federal MS4 (Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System) permit. Removing the fee is a bad choice that could jeopardize Howard County's water quality and a future of fishable, swimmable rivers and streams.

Several analyses done by the County over the past several years point to the need for this fee.

Our 2012 Phase II County Watershed Implementation Plan (WIP) suggests that such a fee would be the most fiscally prudent and reliable way to fund our stormwater management program. This assessment predates the state mandate for a county fee that was removed in the last session of the Maryland General Assembly. State mandates aside, I still believe that the fee is the most reliable and fiscally prudent way to address our stormwater management needs and requirements.

Recent County budget shortfalls indicate that finding dollars in the County General Fund will not be as simple and painless as the County Executive's financial assurance plan suggests. The need to fulfill the requirements of our MS4 permit may mean that other county public services get short shrift, and that is not a choice that I as a citizen and voter want to see us make. Better to keep the dedicated funding provided by the fee in place so that clean-up efforts don't have to compete with other priorities for County funds.

I have not yet heard a compelling argument for CB52-2015 that overrides the significant tide of the County's own evidence in support of maintaining our Watershed Protection and Restoration Fee.

And, perhaps most significant for me as a citizen, since the advent of the Watershed Protection and Restoration Fee, I'm seeing the money I've contributed going into the ground, getting important work done. The stream restorations, tree plantings, infrastructure repairs and upgrades, and other projects already being done using dedicated funds from the fee have put us on the path towards safe, fishable, swimmable water in our local rivers and streams. I want to see that critical work continue apace, without being put at risk by budget uncertainties.

I hope that you will see the fiscal prudence of having a dedicated stormwater remediation fee available to help fund the important work of cleaning up polluted runoff in our county.

Please vote "no" on CB52-2015, and keep our Watershed Protection and Restoration Fee in place.

Thank you.

Karlton Kim
11052 Harding Road
Laurel, MD 20723

Vote NO on CB52-2015

Rachel Hlavay [chlavay@comcast.net]
Sent: Friday, January 08, 2016 10:17 AM
To: CouncilMail

Dear County Executive Kittleman and Howard County Council:

I understand that CB52-2015 was recently introduced to repeal Howard County's Watershed Protection and Restoration fee.

I'm deeply concerned that removing the fee would undermine our county's Watershed Protection and Restoration Program and erode our ability to meet the requirements of our federal MS4 (Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System) permit. Removing the fee is a bad choice that could jeopardize Howard County's water quality and a future of fishable, swimmable rivers and streams.

Several analyses done by the County over the past several years point to the need for this fee.

Our 2012 Phase II County Watershed Implementation Plan (WIP) suggests that such a fee would be the most fiscally prudent and reliable way to fund our stormwater management program. This assessment predates the state mandate for a county fee that was removed in the last session of the Maryland General Assembly. State mandates aside, I still believe that the fee is the most reliable and fiscally prudent way to address our stormwater management needs and requirements.

Recent County budget shortfalls indicate that finding dollars in the County General Fund will not be as simple and painless as the County Executive's financial assurance plan suggests. The need to fulfill the requirements of our MS4 permit may mean that other county public services get short shrift, and that is not a choice that I as a citizen and voter want to see us make. Better to keep the dedicated funding provided by the fee in place so that clean-up efforts don't have to compete with other priorities for County funds.

I have not yet heard a compelling argument for CB52-2015 that overrides the significant tide of the County's own evidence in support of maintaining our Watershed Protection and Restoration Fee.

And, perhaps most significant for me as a citizen, since the advent of the Watershed Protection and Restoration Fee, I'm seeing the money I've contributed going into the ground, getting important work done. The stream restorations, tree plantings, infrastructure repairs and upgrades, and other projects already being done using dedicated funds from the fee have put us on the path towards safe, fishable, swimmable water in our local rivers and streams. I want to see that critical work continue apace, without being put at risk by budget uncertainties.

I hope that you will see the fiscal prudence of having a dedicated stormwater remediation fee available to help fund the important work of cleaning up polluted runoff in our county.

Please vote "no" on CB52-2015, and keep our Watershed Protection and Restoration Fee in place.

Thank you.

Rachel Hlavay
9722 Deep Smoke
9722 Deep Smoke
Columbia, MD 21403

Vote NO on CB52-2015

Charles Scudder [cescudder@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, January 08, 2016 10:23 AM
To: CouncilMail

Dear County Executive Kittleman and Howard County Council:

I understand that CB52-2015 was recently introduced to repeal Howard County's Watershed Protection and Restoration fee.

I'm deeply concerned that removing the fee would undermine our county's Watershed Protection and Restoration Program and erode our ability to meet the requirements of our federal MS4 (Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System) permit. Removing the fee is a bad choice that could jeopardize Howard County's water quality and a future of fishable, swimmable rivers and streams.

Several analyses done by the County over the past several years point to the need for this fee.

Our 2012 Phase II County Watershed Implementation Plan (WIP) suggests that such a fee would be the most fiscally prudent and reliable way to fund our stormwater management program. This assessment predates the state mandate for a county fee that was removed in the last session of the Maryland General Assembly. State mandates aside, I still believe that the fee is the most reliable and fiscally prudent way to address our stormwater management needs and requirements.

Recent County budget shortfalls indicate that finding dollars in the County General Fund will not be as simple and painless as the County Executive's financial assurance plan suggests. The need to fulfill the requirements of our MS4 permit may mean that other county public services get short shrift, and that is not a choice that I as a citizen and voter want to see us make. Better to keep the dedicated funding provided by the fee in place so that clean-up efforts don't have to compete with other priorities for County funds.

I have not yet heard a compelling argument for CB52-2015 that overrides the significant tide of the County's own evidence in support of maintaining our Watershed Protection and Restoration Fee.

And, perhaps most significant for me as a citizen, since the advent of the Watershed Protection and Restoration Fee, I'm seeing the money I've contributed going into the ground, getting important work done. The stream restorations, tree plantings, infrastructure repairs and upgrades, and other projects already being done using dedicated funds from the fee have put us on the path towards safe, fishable, swimmable water in our local rivers and streams. I want to see that critical work continue apace, without being put at risk by budget uncertainties.

I hope that you will see the fiscal prudence of having a dedicated stormwater remediation fee available to help fund the important work of cleaning up polluted runoff in our county.

Please vote "no" on CB52-2015, and keep our Watershed Protection and Restoration Fee in place.

Thank you.

Charles Scudder
9556 Wandering Way
Columbia, MD 21045

Vote NO on CB52-2015

Dave Dittman [davedittman@msn.com]
Sent: Friday, January 08, 2016 10:24 AM
To: CouncilMail

Dear County Executive Kittleman and Howard County Council:

I understand that CB52-2015 was recently introduced to repeal Howard County's Watershed Protection and Restoration fee.

I'm deeply concerned that removing the fee would undermine our county's Watershed Protection and Restoration Program and erode our ability to meet the requirements of our federal MS4 (Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System) permit. Removing the fee is a bad choice that could jeopardize Howard County's water quality and a future of fishable, swimmable rivers and streams.

Several analyses done by the County over the past several years point to the need for this fee.

Our 2012 Phase II County Watershed Implementation Plan (WIP) suggests that such a fee would be the most fiscally prudent and reliable way to fund our stormwater management program. This assessment predates the state mandate for a county fee that was removed in the last session of the Maryland General Assembly. State mandates aside, I still believe that the fee is the most reliable and fiscally prudent way to address our stormwater management needs and requirements.

Recent County budget shortfalls indicate that finding dollars in the County General Fund will not be as simple and painless as the County Executive's financial assurance plan suggests. The need to fulfill the requirements of our MS4 permit may mean that other county public services get short shrift, and that is not a choice that I as a citizen and voter want to see us make. Better to keep the dedicated funding provided by the fee in place so that clean-up efforts don't have to compete with other priorities for County funds.

I have not yet heard a compelling argument for CB52-2015 that overrides the significant tide of the County's own evidence in support of maintaining our Watershed Protection and Restoration Fee.

And, perhaps most significant for me as a citizen, since the advent of the Watershed Protection and Restoration Fee, I'm seeing the money I've contributed going into the ground, getting important work done. The stream restorations, tree plantings, infrastructure repairs and upgrades, and other projects already being done using dedicated funds from the fee have put us on the path towards safe, fishable, swimmable water in our local rivers and streams. I want to see that critical work continue apace, without being put at risk by budget uncertainties.

I hope that you will see the fiscal prudence of having a dedicated stormwater remediation fee available to help fund the important work of cleaning up polluted runoff in our county.

Please vote "no" on CB52-2015, and keep our Watershed Protection and Restoration Fee in place.

Thank you.

Dave Dittman
6318 Wimbledon Court
Elkridge, MD 21075