

Office of Planning and Zoning (OPZ) Analysis of Written Testimony on Draft Green Infrastructure Plan

Written testimony was submitted to the Anne Arundel County Planning Advisory Board by the public on the draft Green Infrastructure Master Plan between November 10 and November 28, 2021. This table lists the comments (or excerpts key points from lengthy letters) and provides analysis to support Planning Advisory Board consideration and recommendations.

Name / Organization	Testimony	OPZ Analysis
Darby Hull	<p>I spoke at the November 10 event and I think you said I could send my photos of the pollution problems in Odenton via email. Please see Google link below. I've put them in a powerpoint presentation. Please let me know if I should send it through another file format. I've been taking these since April 2020. I also included about 3 photos of the local wildlife around here that will likely be impacted by the continuing development in this area. Some of the trash photos I have are near the large number of acres that I believe are slated to be developed for the town center project. Other photos are around the townhouses and apartments that are already in this community. For areas that are already developed I think the County really needs to consider stronger signs and fines to deter littering. Perhaps the signs could mention how littering impacts wildlife. I think the signs need to be on the affected piece of land as opposed to a remote website or mailing that people might not see. I've tried to pick up some of the trash around here but it seems never ending. I think the development plans also need to do a better job of figuring out how to protect wildlife (possibly relocate animals) in this area and preserve older trees. I routinely see dead animals on the road around here after they've been hit by cars including fawns and ducklings. I think they increasingly have nowhere left to go.</p> <p>Thank you for putting the plan together!</p>	Thank you for your comment. This information on trash and littering has been shared with relevant County departments.
Marilee Tortorelli Maryland Building Industry Association Comment 1	<p>1. The Green Infrastructure Masterplan (the Plan) notes (Pg. 35): Major regional trails were included in the 2002 Greenways Master Plan, but were not fully integrated into and considered as part of the Greenways Network map. The 2021 Green Infrastructure Network incorporates trails as well as protected land adjacent to trails. In most cases, these corridors may not meet the 200-foot wide threshold; however, the trails serve as a critical recreational and transportation connection. The Green Infrastructure Network incorporates County trails including the B&A, WB&A, BWI, South Shore, and Broadneck trails and the Colonial Annapolis Maritime Route. It also includes national and regional trails and routes.</p> <p>Of importance the Plan references that the trails are incorporated into the Network as well as protected land adjacent to the trails, but upon inspection of the Green Infrastructure Map it becomes apparent that the included adjacent lands are not all protected (see #2 below for further discussion). While it is understood that trail systems are an important asset to the Green Infrastructure Network given the recreational, public health, and open space benefits they provide, the extent of the network should be limited to the trail right-of-way only. In addition, the trail systems should be mapped as a dead-end extension of the system, thereby not allowing for the expansion of other adjacent areas that would otherwise not be included within the system (i.e. they should not be utilized as Critical Connections).</p>	The trail corridors will be reviewed.
Marilee Tortorelli Maryland Building Industry Association Comment 2	<p>2. The Plan, on page 34-35, states the methodology that was utilized to prepare the 2021 Green Infrastructure Map. The Plan utilizes several feature layers to expand upon the 2002 Greenways Map, including forested areas adjacent to any of the mentioned feature layers (trail systems, floodplain, FIDS habitat, etc.). This results in large expanses of land being placed within the network without a calculation of the worth of this land both from a development and ecological standpoint. Placing adjacent forested areas (as shown on the attached exhibit) creates expansive areas within the network that may be perceived as being worthy of preservation, but such areas may be more worthy of development or other use based upon their location, zoning, etc. Adjacent forested areas that do not meet criteria of being FIDS habitat, floodplain, wetlands, or other sensitive environmental features or DNR priority areas should be removed from the network.</p>	The Green Infrastructure Network map is based on conservation biology and landscape ecology principles supported by scientific research on the value of connected habitats. Adjacent forested areas have important ecological value. The plan does not prohibit development in those areas. It does not change zoning or development regulations.
Marilee Tortorelli	3. The revised version of the Plan makes several strong suggestions that the Plan does not create regulatory	County staff have strengthened language in the plan to address this

**Office of Planning and Zoning (OPZ) Analysis of Written Testimony on
Draft Green Infrastructure Plan**

Name / Organization	Testimony	OPZ Analysis
Maryland Building Industry Association Comment 3	burden on lands within the proposed network. This is true, as the plan is only a guidance document. However, as stated on Page 23 of the Plan, Plan 2040 makes several references to the Green Infrastructure Master plan, many of these references are Goals with measurable benchmarks. One of these goals is NE3.2 which has a subgoal NE3.2(d). Goal NE3.2(d) states: Include mapped greenways in the areas listed as priority retention areas in the County's Forest Conservation Ordinance. If this goal were enacted the Greenway Infrastructure Network Map would instantly become a regulatory map. While it is understood that the Map in and of itself is not regulatory, it should be stated that the mapping holds great potential to have regulatory implications in the future if the County is to follow its recently passed general development plan (Plan 2040). This point should be taken into consideration when developing the Network Map to ensure development potential within the County is preserved in areas where it is needed and will help the County meet the development goals outlined within Plan 2040. The Plan also makes the recommendation that it be incorporated into Regional Planning (Pg. 54) which will include a review of land use and zoning. Although it is not explicitly stated, it is possible that lands within the Network could be perceived as good candidates for reasoning without consideration for other uses of the land.	concern. An evaluation of the Green Infrastructure Network relative to zoning is also provided in the plan to provide an assessment of development considerations. The vast majority of the Network (80%) is in OS, RA, and RLD zones. While land zoned for more intensive uses is included in the Network, development of property is not prohibited in the Network. The goals, policies and recommendations in the plan are not regulatory. Any recommendations that suggest a need for regulation will need County Council approval.
Marilee Tortorelli Maryland Building Industry Association Comment 4	4. The Plan sets a goal of preserving 30% of the land mass within the County by 2030 (Pg. 52). The goal appears to have been set without a full analysis of how such a goal could impact the County's current land use plan (Plan 2040) and current holding capacity for residential land use within the County (see Pg. 11 of Volume II of Plan 2040). While the purpose of a land preservation goal is understood, it should only be set after such an analysis has been completed to ensure that there are not conflicts between Plan 2040 and the Green Infrastructure Master Plan. The Plan itself recognizes this tension (see Pg. 44), yet it is not addressed within the Plan.	The preservation goal is consistent with Plan2040, particularly with Goals NE1, NE2, NE3, NE4, NE6, BE4 and HC6. The land conservation goal does not significantly impact the amount of development in the County. If achieved, it can help direct the development to the Targeted Development, Redevelopment, and Revitalization Areas identified in Plan2040.
Marilee Tortorelli Maryland Building Industry Association Comment 5	We appreciate the hard work that the Office of Planning & Zoning has put into this process. Thank you for your attention to our comments. We look forward to working with the county and PAB to finalize this document. If you have any questions about these comments or would like to discuss our position further, please do not hesitate to contact me, Kevin Haines – Vice Chair of Anne Arundel County MBIA, or Lori Graf, Chief Executive Office of Maryland Building Industry Association.	Thank you for your comments.
Advocates for Herring Bay Kathy Gramp and Stephen Marley	The Advocates for Herring Bay (AHB) appreciate the opportunity to offer our recommendations to the Planning Advisory Board on ways to ensure the successful implementation of Anne Arundel County's Green Infrastructure Master Plan. We fully support the county's goals for conserving an interconnected network of its most significant natural lands, but believe that achieving those goals will require three additional actions:	Thank you for your comments.
Advocates for Herring Bay Kathy Gramp and Stephen Marley Comment 1	1. Accelerating the pace of conservation. The county's plan envisions conserving 5,000 acres by 2030, a goal that should be achievable given that the county preserved a similar amount in the previous decade. At that rate, however, it would take several decades to conserve the remaining 25,000 acres that currently are unprotected, increasing the risk that much of that green infrastructure will be lost to development. AHB recommends raising the targets and developing strategies that will put the county on a path toward conserving all unprotected lands by 2040.	Thank you for your comment.
Advocates for Herring Bay Kathy Gramp and Stephen Marley Comment 2	2. Making ecosystem values part of the decision-making process. As noted in Appendix F of the PAB Draft, the Maryland Department of Natural Resources (DNR) has developed a scientifically based analytical tool for quantifying the economic value of the services provided by forests, wetlands, and other ecosystems, such as absorbing and filtering stormwater and air and water pollutants. ³ One way to reduce the risk of losing green infrastructure is to ensure that policymakers are aware of the economic value of its ecosystem services—which averages more than \$3,000 per acre per year— before they make land-use and budgetary	Thank you for your comment. This idea will be evaluated for future land use decisions.

**Office of Planning and Zoning (OPZ) Analysis of Written Testimony on
Draft Green Infrastructure Plan**

Name / Organization	Testimony	OPZ Analysis
	<p>decisions, especially decisions affecting unprotected lands.4 AHB recommends requiring the Office of Planning and Zoning or other appropriate staff to provide data on DNR's ecosystem services valuations to county policymakers prior to any decisions affecting acreage designated as green infrastructure.</p>	
<p>Advocates for Herring Bay Kathy Gramp and Stephen Marley Comment 3</p>	<p>3. Developing and testing new conservation tools. In our view, the county's conservation strategy should continue to focus on preserving land in perpetuity through easements and acquisitions. However, given the rising cost of land and limits on the pool of interested landowners, we believe the county needs a more diverse mix of strategies to meet the conservation challenges of the future.</p> <p>In exploring options, the county can draw on the experience of other programs. The federal government, for example, has experimented with the use of competitive auctions to award funding to landowners for achieving certain pollution reduction goals.5. Could something similar be done for conserving green infrastructure? Many property managers now rely on a mix of purchases and leases. Could the county increase the number of acres being protected in the near term by "leasing" ecosystem services for a fixed period of time (e.g., 20 or 30 years), which might appeal to landowners who are reluctant to enter into irrevocable contracts? Could the county boost interest in easements by offering owners a supplemental payment if traditional real estate appraisals result in a significant undervaluation relative to the value of the land's ecosystem services? Are there models from other jurisdictions on ways to spur the development of new green infrastructure in urbanized areas?</p> <p>While we need fresh approaches for ecosystem conservation, it is imperative that any new strategies undergo rigorous reviews before being adopted county-wide. Thus, AHB recommends that the county initiate a process for investigating and testing the effectiveness of alternative financial incentives. This process should include two core elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishing a technical advisory panel of scientific, legal, and financial experts to identify and evaluate options; and • Funding a small number of pilot programs, developed in consultation with the appropriate citizen advisory groups, to test new incentives that would be relevant for priority habitats (such as those in the Critical Area) and green spaces in urban areas. <p>Once that phase is completed, county staff and the advisory groups could submit recommendations to the County Executive and County Council on the merits of implementing new tools on a county-wide basis.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. More research and evaluation on alternative conservation tools such as those described will be conducted in the future.</p>
<p>Carmera Thomas</p>	<p>As a life-long resident and actively engaged conservation professional in Anne Arundel County, I offer comments on the Master Plan recommendations. Strategies 1- 5 offer recommended strategies for conservation and management. Each strategy offers basic information on how to implement the plan in five focus areas but what is lacking is community-based and led recommendations and action-oriented results. Below are my suggestions and comments for each strategy:</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p>
<p>Carmera Thomas Comment 1</p>	<p>Strategy 1: Organization and Outreach</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1.1- Active engagement with the public includes opportunities for community groups, private landowners and other members of the public to provide critical knowledge of the green infrastructure opportunities in each neighborhood. This means having more conversations and engagement events with public outreach events, meeting people where they are and actively listening to communities that have historically been left out of decision making and awareness efforts throughout the County. • 1.2- Partnerships are important for the coordination of conservation and management of land preservation and leveraging funding opportunities for various projects. • 1.3- As a member of the Citizen Environmental Commission, establishing a process for coordination is very important for sharing information and data. This committee and other community groups, agencies and organizations should be utilized to share information widely- especially to residents who aren't participants in 	<p>Those comments will be taken into consideration in implementation of the Plan.</p>

**Office of Planning and Zoning (OPZ) Analysis of Written Testimony on
Draft Green Infrastructure Plan**

Name / Organization	Testimony	OPZ Analysis
	<p>those named groups.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1.4- The dedicated team of conservation professionals within the County government should be a diverse group of leaders in conservation and also have some experience with equitable development and implementation. • 1.5- Preparation of annual implementation reports will not only serve as a reference for the public but also keep record of projects and management moving forward. It is important to keep records up to date and offer information that is clear and understandable by all audiences. 	
<p>Carmera Thomas Comment 2</p>	<p>Strategy 2: Stewardship and Planning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.1- Supporting stewardship of natural resources on private lands. Providing private property owners with resources and technical assistance takes partnership and commitment. It is the hope that all of the agencies and organizations listed, will not only work together but to also leverage funding resources in partnership, as well. • The action items (2.2-2.5) take the commitment and implementation of many departments and agencies. The management of data and development of new plans to manage trails and regional parks is important for safe and equitable transportation methods and access for all residents of Anne Arundel County. 	<p>Thank you. Action 2.1 will be amended to include "leveraging resources" with partners programs and organizations.</p>
<p>Carmera Thomas Comment 3</p>	<p>Strategy 3: Land Conservation and Enhancement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3.1- 3.7- Prioritizing green infrastructure in the development of capital projects and county planning is key for current and future projects and mitigation to past projects, when appropriate. The importance of green infrastructure on preservation, conservation is critical in preparing for impacts of climate change. Integrating green infrastructure in all projects is as important as equity being the lens through which Anne Arundel County government look through to ensure the safety and preparedness of our county for ALL watersheds and residents. 	<p>Thank you. Those comments will be taken into consideration in implementation of the Plan.</p>
<p>Carmera Thomas Comment 4</p>	<p>Strategy 4: Financing the Green Infrastructure Network</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4.1- This is more of an inquiry, more than a recommendation. How will the funds for the various projects be increased? What is the new funding source? The primary funding comes from the State of Maryland's Program Open Space grants, but an alternative is not named in this action 4.2-4.4- With the amount of development in this county, a recommendation would be to inquire with the various developers and business owners to sponsor conservation financing mechanisms. I am not suggesting a form of "greenwashing" or unethical choices, but the major contributors of development, lack of forests and land should have to pay for it. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Another idea is to utilize philanthropic funding opportunities leveraged through partnerships with non-profit organizations and community-based groups. o Currently, there is also funding through the American Recovery Funding for each state at the Federal level. Much of the funding is dedicated to capital improvement projects and green infrastructure. 	<p>Thank you. No new County funding source is recommended in the plan. Increased funding for land conservation may come from allocation of County budget resources and capitalizing on existing and new state and federal grant programs. Innovative financing mechanisms as those discussed in the comment will be explored as part of implementation of the Plan.</p>
<p>Carmera Thomas Comment 5</p>	<p>Strategy 5: Making Connections Beyond the Network</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5.1-5.3- Many of the urbanized communities that lack green space, natural stream corridors and green space are also overburdened by environmental stressors and lack other social, economic and environmental benefits. Supporting redevelopment, increased tree canopy and reforestation support healthy, vibrant communities. 5.4-5.5- Integrating social and economic benefits to develop green space and environmental benefits builds community capacity and creates more equitable and livable neighborhoods for residents that have historically been under-resourced and overlooked. Additional support should include: hiring, training, leadership development along with project development. Through meaningful engagement residents in urbanized areas are empowered and acknowledged throughout the entire planning, development and 	<p>Thank you. Those comments will be taken into consideration in implementation of the Plan.</p>

**Office of Planning and Zoning (OPZ) Analysis of Written Testimony on
Draft Green Infrastructure Plan**

Name / Organization	Testimony	OPZ Analysis
	implementation process.	
Carmera Thomas Comment 6	The Green Infrastructure Master Plan is a great step in acknowledging issues and addressing environmental and climate issues. Environmental and social issues are connected and to provide solutions it is inspiring to have a county engaging with decision-makers, stakeholders and residents to create opportunities for health and sustainable neighborhoods for ALL of Anne Arundel County.	Thank you for your comments.
Cindy Morgan	Mark and Cynthia Morgan 6274 Franklin Gibson Rd Tracy's Landing, Md 20779 Please opt out our property from the plan.	This property was removed from the Network based on comment submitted by the owner during the August - September comment period on the preliminary draft plan.
Gina Matthews	My comments are in regards to portions of several properties along Wright Road in Hanover, MD being incorrectly included in the 2021 Green Infrastructure Master Plan. The following six parcels have been incorrectly incorporated into the current 2021 Draft Green Infrastructure Master Plan [list omitted here for brevity]. These parcels are privately owned and have already received a recommendation from the AACO Office of Planning and Zoning to be rezoned from W-1 (Light Industrial) to Residential Medium Density as part of the Plan2040 General Development Plan.	The comment appears to confuse terms. Plan2040 made changes to Planned Land Use, not Zoning. The 2002 Greenways Master Plan includes the listed properties almost entirely in the Network. In consideration of the intent of the request, and the location of the properties, on the edge of the draft Green Infrastructure Network and only partially included, the Office of Planning and Zoning recommends removing the properties from the Network map. Note, this would not change zoning or development regulations, including compliance with the Forest Conservation Ordinance.
Jim Lyons Excerpt 1	I applaud the County's overall vision for the GI Plan to create an interconnected system of forests, parks, trails, farms, streams, wetlands, waterways, and watersheds that conserves plant and wildlife habitat, increases quality of life for residents, provides greater recreation and transportation options, improves water quality, enhances aesthetics, and reduces pollution for present and future generations.	Thank you for your comments.
Excerpt 2	I would also note in the citizen comments received that some expressed concern that the GI plan and its goals for expansion of conserved lands in the network will lead to "takings" of private lands in the future. This is simply not true as documented in the plan. It is important that the Planning Advisory Board (PAB), in forwarding its comments and recommendations to the County Council, correct this and other potential misimpressions of the GI Plan to help Council members in their deliberations regarding the Plan	Thank you for your comments.
Excerpt 3	Similarly, it is important that the PAB recognize and communicate to the Council in its transmittal letter and recommendations that while, for purposes of mapping existing green infrastructure and wooded landscapes, the GI Plan includes some private lands in the designated GI areas, the Plan "does not create any new regulations or requirements for private property owners and upholds their rights to steward their own land. The Plan is not regulatory. It does not change zoning or development regulations, or otherwise change or limit property rights. Further, the Green Infrastructure Master Plan does not grant or promote public access to privately owned land. Any potential acquisitions and conservation easements are voluntary and agreed to by willing landowners." GI Plan, page 16	Thank you for your comments.
Excerpt 4	In its recommendations to the Council, the PAB should take into consideration these opportunities for additional federal funding and program support to accelerate county efforts to acquire key lands identified in the GI Plan to further mitigate the impacts of climate change on the county's citizens, communities, businesses, and our environment.	Thank you for your comments.
Excerpt 5	This element of the GI Plan and ongoing efforts to increase the tree canopy in more urbanized landscapes, reforest natural stream corridors in more urbanized watersheds, and support redevelopment projects that	Thank you for your comments.

Office of Planning and Zoning (OPZ) Analysis of Written Testimony on Draft Green Infrastructure Plan

Name / Organization	Testimony	OPZ Analysis
	increase green space warrant strong support from the PAB and should continue to be an element of future development and redevelopment projects subject to review by the PAB.	
Karen and Robert Royer	<p>Our thoughts about the Green Infrastructure Plan: We'll believe it when (and if) we see it. What value does this well written plan have if it is never actually implemented? Does it have any authority behind it?</p> <p>We had the Small Area Plan in 2005 that designated the preservation of open space, wetlands and critical areas as important to the character of Severna Park and Arnold, but Planning and Zoning apparently took zero note of ANYTHING that was said in the plan and for 15 years we have watched as land in the critical area was clear cut, homes built on steep slopes, variance after variance granted for anything the builders wanted. Only adamant opposition in a few egregious cases of developer greed did the communities of Severna Park or Arnold hold on to what precious green space remains. Our quality of life has been degraded by wall to wall development in what were once very pleasant communities. We now deal with traffic gridlock on a daily basis, rivers and creeks with water quality that is unfit for humans or marine life, overcrowded schools and bulldozers still clearing the last of the trees. But don't worry, the Green Infrastructure Plans shows that Severna Park should be happy with the few trees in Kinder Park. Oh wow, what a generous offer of Green Infrastructure.</p> <p>Will this plan provide any relief to the constant approval of development in areas that can not accommodate one more home, business, road or automobile? We'll see.</p>	<p>Conservation of Green Infrastructure in the Severna Park and Arnold areas has included County acquisition of Spriggs Farm Park, land trust conservation easements in Nantucket on the Severn and Sullivans Cove, as well as development of the Broadneck Peninsula Trail. These investments complement restoration projects including the Cattail Creek restoration project that was championed by Berrywood community members. The draft Green Infrastructure Master Plan does not change zoning or development regulations. It does support voluntary conservation of natural areas, including lands in Severna Park adjacent to Kinder Park, the Cattail Creek Natural Areas, and along the B&A Trail among other locations. The commenters concerns about development regulations are recognized and have been partially addressed in reform of the Forest Conservation Ordinance passed by County Council in 2019 and Green Notices published by the Office of Planning and Zoning that refine and restrict the process for issuing modifications. Please note that variances are approved by the Administrative Hearing Officer, not the Office of Planning and Zoning.</p>
Nathan Steinmann	<p>Thank you for putting together the Green Infrastructure Master Plan. I continue to be concerned about the increasing loss of green spaces and tree canopy in the Crofton and Odenton parts of Anne Arundel County. In addition, I have seen a significant buildup in trash in these two areas (particularly Odenton) with the rise in development. Please look at ways to curb littering in Anne Arundel County (e.g. onsite signs not just information on a website or mailing). Also please take proactive measures to protect older trees and wildlife in Odenton and Crofton. As developers cut down the few remaining trees in this area the animals are left with nowhere but busy roads and usually end up as roadkill.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p>
Noreen Krispin	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to submit a comment. I appreciate also being able to attend the Zoom meeting for the Green Infrastructure Plan for Odenton, MD.</p> <p>My 1st comment: When choosing trees or tree like shrubs to plant please do NOT choose Crepe Myrtle. These tree like shrubs do not support any insect as noted by Doug Tallamy, entomologist at UDE & author, lecturer. Also please do not plant Sweet Gum trees. The seed pods, gum balls, as some people call them, cause falls & can get stuck in dogs' paws.</p> <p>My 2nd comment: Please do not allow mulch to be placed against the tree bark. This practice is widespread & results in trees dying over a number of years.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The Anne Arundel County Landscape Manual and requirements for compliance with the Forest Conservation Ordinance both address plant species and proper tree installation.</p>
Paul Christensen	<p>The value of Green Infrastructure must be protected. Appendix F of the draft Green Infrastructure Plan shows that the economic value of Ecosystem Services provided by our Green Infrastructure exceeds \$340 million/year. Consequently, this is a giant asset that must be protected from degradation.</p> <p>About 35% of the Network is privately owned and subject to the land use choices of the owner. The landowner controls an asset that has value both to himself and to the general public. There is risk to the public of an owner choosing to monetize his equity in the land through development, resulting in destruction of its ecosystem services. It is in the public's interest that property owners in search of an exit strategy be given attractive options of easements, sale of development rights or possible outright fee simple sale to the</p>	<p>Thank you. Those comments will be taken into consideration in implementation of the Plan.</p>

**Office of Planning and Zoning (OPZ) Analysis of Written Testimony on
Draft Green Infrastructure Plan**

Name / Organization	Testimony	OPZ Analysis
	<p>County. The Plan targets protection of an additional 5,000 acres of the Network over the next decade using County, State, and Federal funds. In the past, Green Infrastructure protection has suffered from insufficient funding and lack of effective outreach to landowners. The current plan should be augmented in two ways:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A target level of annual funding in the County budget that is adequate to achieve the 5000-acre goal should be specified. 2. Outreach efforts should also be detailed annually in a public report. 	
Roy Little	I think the plan looks good , the green infrastructure should be integrated into development as early as possible , thank you all for your efforts	Thank you for your comments.
Sierra Club Earl Bradley	<p>The Anne Arundel Group, Sierra Club urges the PAB to approve the Green Infrastructure master Plan. It is quite comprehensive with a very informative interactive map. There was plenty of opportunity for public review and comment. It contains a number of useful strategies for its implementation. I urge the County to coordinate its greenway and trail plans with those of the City of Annapolis including the Annapolis Neck Greenway noted in the Annapolis Neck Small Area Plan. Also, it would be useful if the first time an acronym is used, such as BWPR on page 15, that it was spelled out.</p>	Thank you for your comments.
Becky Sudnick	<p>I applaud this effort, however the acreage should be increased now instead of later. I own a home in Churchton, and am a co-owner of a home and property at Bristol (now Lothian); 20733 and 20711 near Jug Bay. I have submitted comments earlier, but:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Before Covid came along, there were people representing streams and walked our property at 1036 Upper Pindell Road. They said they would be contacting us about the condition of the stream that borders other properties. We know of one area that was used as a dump many many years ago, it is the out charge from the underground stream, and have had items wash down after extreme heavy rains. We have done our best to pull out what we can and take to the dump. We are still concerned about the old stuff. 2. We know of one neighbor who has done some cutting down of trees on the stream bank, this allows run off to increase. He also has parked vehicles facing our property there – (in order to shoot deer), we are concerned with leaking fluids running into the waters. 3. Another neighbor constantly shoots into our trees, not sure if he is using lead or steel shot. Holes in windows, all the lighting rod globes are shot off, a hole in the front room window, all the way through the house into and through the back wall and missed my sister and mom. Still an open police report on this. 4. BUT, when and if will the survey of the two streams on our property be done? And if any cleaning/clearing of manmade items, who will do this and pay for this? We have tried our best to keep them clean from people trespassing, police and department of natural resources personnel cannot get there fast enough to apprehend them. 5. The Waysons Corner/Bristol area needs a small police station presence. Can you work with the county and state to find funds to do this for us please? There is so much crime down here now, and route 4 is a corridor for fast getaways, and traffic is too fast. 6. Again, please increase your target acreage. <p>I am also very concerned for the expansion and protection of wildlife corridors and habitats.</p>	Thank you for your comments. Concerns regarding stream and trespassing have been forwarded to appropriate departments.
Tessa Whitmer	<p>To whom it may concern, Please be advised we live at 208 Kentucky Avenue, Pasadena, Maryland 21122 It has come to our attention that the county has proposed the Green Infrastructure Plan and this plan will</p>	This property is not located in the Network. It is adjacent to the County-owned Magothy Greenway Natural Area.

**Office of Planning and Zoning (OPZ) Analysis of Written Testimony on
Draft Green Infrastructure Plan**

Name / Organization	Testimony	OPZ Analysis
	<p>directly affect our property should the plan go through. Please take this correspondence as written objection to our property being included within this plan. Per the flyer attached to your email regarding comments, the plan is "Voluntary" with "Willing Property Owners". At this time, we are not willing to be a part of this plan. We feel this will inevitably decrease our use of the property we have purchased, as well as make re-sale of our property in the future extremely difficult. As explained in the plan we have reviewed, the plan is based upon a network of majority privately owned land that will essentially no longer be ours to determine what is appropriate use, however land we will still be paying taxes on. We cannot fathom those parameters on the land we own and love that we paid our hard earned money for at the settlement table. In the same vein, we cannot imagine going to sell our home and trying to explain to potential buyers that they will be bound to buying property they will also not have full control over, but will be paying for. Our land that backs to the line in which is being considered for the plan/easement is already very small. Our home sits back on our property and our backyard is very limited. We cannot imagine losing valuable space in our "backyard" as an easement that the county will control.</p> <p>Thank you for taking our comments and objections. Should you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact us.</p>	
Tony Karwoski	<p>The Crownsville Hospital Memorial Park should be an anchor for the plan as soon as it is transferred from the State to the county. No net loss of green space on the tract should be permitted under the Master Plan as a requirement, not a guideline. Also the park should be open to the public without fees and the county has an obligation to be transparent about any green space loss if the master plan is not followed. No net loss of green space should be an enforceable requirement of the Master Plan.</p>	Thank you for your comment.
Deborah Weller (Received on November 29, day after official closing of comment period)	<p>I apologize for sending comments late. I hope they can still be considered.</p> <p>ANNE ARUNDEL COUNTY GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE MASTER PLAN October 2021 Comments</p> <p>The plan is well written and has a number of excellent ideas. My concern is the implementation of these ideas. Do we have the political will to put in place the necessary legislation to implement these ideas?</p> <p>At a minimum, there is a strong need to integrate land protection and development planning with variance and special exemption requests and zoning changes. There is also a need to more strongly promote redevelopment of existing developed areas over clearing of forests and fields. Stronger incentives to developers should be considered to promote redevelopment.</p> <p>There needs to be a greater effort to preserve undeveloped areas during the development process through better site design and to require recreational areas that include a mix of amenities (playgrounds, athletic fields). The size and mix of amenities should be based on National Recreation and Park Association recommendations (https://www.nrpa.org/publications-research/ParkMetrics/). Recreational areas should be included during the preliminary plan and be the responsibility of the developer or a partnership with the County. One way to implement this would be to include such amenities within the adequate facilities requirements. This would require new regulations but it would be beneficial to the County, existing residents, and new residents. It would also reduce the need for the County to consume limited undeveloped areas for large "programed" athletic fields instead allowing those areas to be preserved as green space.</p> <p>If one goal is to protect farmland for agricultural jobs, agritourism, and local food production; then the county needs to stop approving land use and zoning changes that permit the conversion of agricultural and forest land to residential and commercial uses. It would be wonderful if the County could strengthen</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>The comments regarding integration of land conservation and development are addressed in Strategy 3, Action 3.2 in the draft Green Infrastructure Master Plan. Plan2040, the General Development Plan, also includes multiple policies and strategies on this issue.</p> <p>Regarding recreational areas in site development, County Code requires residential subdivisions to set aside open space and recreation areas (Article 17-6-111).</p> <p>These comments will be taken into consideration in implementation of the Green Infrastructure Master Plan.</p>

**Office of Planning and Zoning (OPZ) Analysis of Written Testimony on
Draft Green Infrastructure Plan**

Name / Organization	Testimony	OPZ Analysis
	protection within the agricultural zoning category. Finally, the County itself should stop buying up agricultural land to convert it to other uses, such as schools and athletic fields. Redevelopment options should be considered instead.	
Susan Ridgely (Received on November 29, day after official closing of comment period)	Please exclude the following properties owned by me. 827 Stevenson Road, Severn, MD 21144 137 Jennings Road, Severna Park, MD 21146	Neither of these properties are included in the Network. Property at 827 Stevenson Road was removed based on comment from this individual submitted in the August 12 - September 26 public review period.