

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip Code	Are you representing yourself?	If no, what organization or whom do you represent?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachments
Bill No. 59-26, as amended											
2026-10-04 13:47:08	Stacey	Davis	Glen Burnie	Maryland	21060	Yes		Bill No. 59-26: (As Amended) AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Ethics – Conflicts of Interest	Support	Its time to hold elected officials accountable for unethical behavior while in office and how conflicts of interest impact impartiality and how they support or damage a community.	
Bill No. 61-26, as amended											

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip Code	Are you representing yourself?	If no, what organization or whom do you represent?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachments
2026-09-22 11:12:59	Megan	Copeland	Friendship	MD	20758	Yes		Bill No. 61-26: (As Amended) – AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Zoning – Article 18 Update	Oppose	Good evening. My name is Megan Copeland. I am a resident of Anne Arundel County, a veteran, and the owner of Copeland Farmery, a small, family-operated farm here in our community. I am voicing my opinion because I am deeply concerned about the practical impact that Bill 61-26 could have on small farms, small businesses, and the families who are trying to build sustainable businesses in Anne Arundel County. I understand the purpose of modernizing a zoning code. I understand that the County has legitimate responsibilities related to safety, traffic, environmental protection, and neighboring property owners. But there is a significant difference between reasonable regulation and creating so many restrictions and layers of requirements that a small business can no longer realistically operate or grow. For a family farm, agriculture today is not simply planting a crop and selling it at harvest. Small farms survive by diversifying. We grow food. We sell directly to our community. We educate people about agriculture. We look for ways to add value to what we produce. We find ways to bring customers onto the farm and create additional revenue streams because farming itself is extraordinarily difficult and unpredictable. A crop can fail. A greenhouse can be damaged. Weather can destroy an entire season's investment. Input costs increase. Labor is expensive. Markets fluctuate. Diversification is not a luxury for a small farm. It is often what allows the farm to remain a farm. That is why I am concerned about provisions in Bill 61-26 that impose minimum acreage requirements and additional conditions on agritourism and farm events. The amended bill, for example, establishes a three-acre minimum for agritourism and places significant conditions on farm and agricultural heritage site events, including acreage requirements, attendance limits, event-frequency limits, hours, and duration. (Anne Arundel County Government) Those requirements may look reasonable when viewed on paper. But I would ask the Council to consider what they look like from the perspective of an actual family farm. A farm is not a corporation with a planning department, a compliance officer, and unlimited resources to navigate a complicated permitting process. It is a family. It is people working early in the morning, working weekends, repairing equipment, growing food, caring for animals, paying employees, rebuilding structures, and trying to make the numbers work. Every additional permit, restriction, application, hearing, engineering requirement, acreage threshold, or limitation creates another potential barrier to that farm's ability to generate income. And when those barriers accumulate, they disproportionately affect the smallest operators. The same concern extends beyond agriculture. The bill also changes the regulatory framework for home occupations and other small businesses. The amended language places limits on where and how home occupations may operate, including a 25% floor-area limitation and a limit of one nonresident employee. (Anne Arundel County Government) Again, I ask the Council to think about the person behind that	

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip Code	Are you representing yourself?	If no, what organization or whom do you represent?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachments
2026-09-22 12:00:33	Gladys	Springsteel	Havre De Grace	MD	21078	Yes		Bill No. 61-26: (As Amended) – AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Zoning – Article 18 Update	Oppose	So many people lost their jobs during COVID. Opening a food truck was a positive solution to creating a steady livelihood for ourselves. We support non-profits, fire & ambulance dept, churches, etc because we donate portions of sales or flat fees that go into these amazing organizations. We follow all rules, laws, codes, and give back so much to our communities. We employ so many people and pay our taxes like everyone else. Please do not let this bill pass. Let us contrinue to operate as we have. Thank you.	
2026-09-22 14:15:28	Theresa	Sabotka	Arnold	MD	21012	Yes		Bill No. 61-26: (As Amended) – AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Zoning – Article 18 Update	Oppose		
2026-09-23 11:03:01	Cindy	Caporlette	Arnold	MD	21012	Yes		Bill No. 61-26: (As Amended) – AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Zoning – Article 18 Update	Oppose		
2026-09-23 11:35:56	Karen	Lista	Gambrills	MD	21054	Yes		Bill No. 61-26: (As Amended) – AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Zoning – Article 18 Update	Oppose	I support small businesses like the food trucks. This bill would cause hardship for the businesses and loss to the community.	
2026-09-30 14:08:32	JAIME	SMILOWITZ	Arnold	MD	21012	Yes		Bill No. 61-26: (As Amended) – AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Zoning – Article 18 Update	Oppose	Please see attached my testimony for Bill 61-26. Thank you!	https://www.aacounty.org/system/files/webform/cc_legislative_testimony/108104/food-truck-letter.docx
2026-10-01 11:14:54	Meagan	Borgerson	Arnold	MD	21012-2149	Yes		Bill No. 61-26: (As Amended) – AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Zoning – Article 18 Update	Support	I support the proposed Article 18 update, with the inclusion of an amendment to § 18-11-106, that would require a setback of 500 ft. for any high-volume gasoline fueling station from a sensitive property, including residentially-zoned properties.	https://www.aacounty.org/system/files/webform/cc_legislative_testimony/108201/aaco-county-code-proposed-amendment-re-fueling-stations.docx

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip Code	Are you representing yourself?	If no, what organization or whom do you represent?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachments
2026-10-01 17:46:50	Ray	Weber	SEVERN	MD	21144	Yes		Bill No. 61-26: (As Amended) – AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Zoning – Article 18 Update	Support	All, Having read the bills there are obvious conflicts between them and special concerns for particular areas within AACo specifically for Parole Town Center, Odenton Town Center and the BWI Mixed Use Overlay Areas of the county. Since the two bills need to co-exist they need to reference each other as to their areas of jurisdiction. 1.Bill 71-26 needs to state on page 1 that this is specific for the Parole, Odenton and BWI portions of the county and amends the Zoning – Article 18 only in regards to these specific jurisdictions. Otherwise, if not specified in 71-26 the regulations within Zoning – Article 18 rule. This 71-26 probably should also be entitled Article 18 – Amendment 1. 2.Bill 61-26 needs to state on page 2, before the definitions, that this Zoning - Article 18 is amended for specific jurisdictions within Parole, Odenton and BWI from the general provisions to more specific regulations. If not specified in that amendment, then the general regulations of Zoning - Article 18 remain in full effect. 3.The Bill 71-26 uses the term Maximum NET density within the tables for example in R1 District One dwelling unit per 40,000 SQUARE FEET which should be clarified throughout the tables in both 71-26 and 61-26. It is reality that there are exceptions entering into such areas (SE, C) that exceed this on a case-by-case basis, but the intent is to keep urban sprawl to a minimum in the less dense areas of the county. Thus, for example in an R-2 (two dwelling units per acre) district both 71-26 and 61-26 both bulk regulation tables should read as follows: Maximum NET densityOne dwelling unit per 20,000 square feet (half-acre) 4.Although there are obvious exceptions: townhouse; semi-detached, duplex, multi family, accessory dwelling unit (ADU), apartment, cottage home already existing within some lower density zoned regions. The 71-26 on page 6 does set a limit of these to be no more than 10% of the total dwelling units (in any district). This same statement needs to be added to 61-26 and clarified in both documents to be applicable to RA, RLD, R1, R2, R5 and R10. The intention as Mr. Volke states in 71-26 is Neighborhood Preservation and Environmental Protection which is accomplished by minimizing urban sprawl. Once the threshold to R15 or R22 is reached you already have urban sprawl. Now that both documents are on the agenda for the county council at the same time, you will likely see other areas that need to be clarified so the primary Zoning - Article 18 and the Article 18 - Amendment 1 can co-exist without conflict. For example, perhaps the BWI/Fort Meade Growth Area and Glen Burnie Sustainable Community Overlay area specific regions should be in stand-alone Amendments also to reduce confusion within the more widely applicable Zoning – Article 18..... Thank you for your attention to this important matter!!! Ray Weber 276-698-0350 (cell)	
2026-10-02 14:14:35	Catherine	Kirk Robins	Linthicum Height	Maryland	21090	No	Fello	Bill No. 61-26: (As Amended) – AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Zoning – Article 18 Update	No position		https://www.aacounty.org/system/files/webform/cc_legislative_testimony/108371/fello-61-26-signed-10.5.26.pdf

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip Code	Are you representing yourself?	If no, what organization or whom do you represent?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachments
2026-10-02 20:37:03	Devon	Dahlin	Severna Park	MD	21146	Yes		Bill No. 61-26: (As Amended) – AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Zoning – Article 18 Update	Oppose	I oppose the proposed food truck restrictions because they could make it significantly harder for small, locally owned food businesses to operate and grow in our community. Food trucks provide convenient dining options, bring variety to local neighborhoods, and give entrepreneurs an opportunity to build a business without the costs of a traditional restaurant. I believe the county should work with food truck owners to create reasonable regulations that address legitimate concerns without unnecessarily limiting when and where these small businesses can operate. Thank you.	
2026-10-04 15:03:05	Stacey	Davis	Glen Burnie	Maryland	21060	Yes		Bill No. 61-26: (As Amended) – AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Zoning – Article 18 Update	Oppose	This bill has way too many issues bundled and as it stands mostly puts undo financial stress and stress on the communities and constituents. I have no problem mandating shelter for all types of privately held animals. Definitions need to be simple and not all encompassing. I may be misunderstood as this may be specific to Junkyards, however, if not then Section 18-17-104 is too broad as this would mean residents would be unable to keep their boat trailers or other such personal trailers (not business related) on their personal private property which causes an undo burden on storage and ability to function and this exception can easily be manipulated by legal entities to suit their needs. In reference to 18-16-305 - this should be applicable not just to private citizens seeking development but also commercial/residential builders. If we want to be serious about protecting the Patapsco/Chesapeake Bay and smartly maintaining county infrastructure then the quality of schools, roadways, utilities must take priority over property tax income from developments. Section 18-11-142 should exempt existing race tracks from residential set backs from communities built after the race track was already established. Residents moving into communities near existing race tracks should have to sign a form stating they understand the noise from adjoining race track. I am assuming this would apply only to new facilities which are next to impossible to establish in the county anyway. 18-11-114 - Why are we specifically targeting one brand? This seems illegal. I oppose the entire bill at this time. These items should be brought about to the residents of the community in a open and timely matter and possibly voted on.	
2026-10-04 22:02:28	Joseph	Everett	Severn	MD	21144	Yes		Bill No. 61-26: (As Amended) – AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Zoning – Article 18 Update	Oppose	Bill 61-26 is so large, that I was unable to completely read and understand all the complexities within it. As such, this bill should not be approved until an adequate review time period can be established. The CE says county residents had 13 months to review. The legislative summary report says 225 comments were received, of those 105 were by county staff. AA county population is 603k+. This massive change was not adequately advertised to the public. 120 public comments out of 603,000 county residents. No one knew about it.	https://www.aacounty.org/system/files/webform/cc_legislative_testimony/108540/county-bill-61-26-comments.pdf
2026-10-04 22:32:46	Stephen	Clarke	Pasadena	MD	21122-4000	Yes		Bill No. 61-26: (As Amended) – AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Zoning – Article 18 Update	Oppose	I oppose the bill as written specifically as it relates to food trucks at dispensaries. Food trucks are a wonderful family offering and have no place at dispensaries since young children would be present. Although it is against the law to consume cannabis on dispensary property food trucks encourage lingering on the property and the incidence of cannabis use on the property is very likely. Additionally there are plenty of alternative locations for food trucks to provide their service. I would also like to add that as I have observed multiple votes by the council members over the past 5-6 months I am very discouraged by the party line voting record. Please vote in a way that is best for the community as represented by the community testimony and not on strict party line as I have observed.	

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip Code	Are you representing yourself?	If no, what organization or whom do you represent?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachments
2026-10-04 22:44:18	Barb	Clarke	Pasadena	MD	21122	Yes		Bill No. 61-26: (As Amended) – AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Zoning – Article 18 Update	Oppose	I am opposed to food trucks ever being allowed on parking lots of cannabis dispensaries. These trucks are family friendly with lots of minors who have no place on the grounds of dispensaries. Please don't vote party lines as has been the case regarding dispensaries. We need common sense voting not political posturing	
2026-10-04 23:30:11	Kerin	Funez	Hanover	MD	21076	Yes		Bill No. 61-26: (As Amended) – AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Zoning – Article 18 Update	Oppose	I am a local food truck owner and strongly oppose Bill No. 61-26 as amended. Food trucks are small businesses that provide affordable food, create jobs, and contribute to the local economy. I believe the proposed changes could create unnecessary restrictions and make it more difficult for small, locally owned food businesses to operate and grow. I respectfully ask the County Council to oppose Bill No. 61-26 and protect opportunities for local food truck businesses. Thank you for your consideration.	
2026-10-05 1:19:33	Richard	Turner	Lothian	MD	20711	Yes		Bill No. 61-26: (As Amended) – AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Zoning – Article 18 Update	Support	Dear Councilmembers, Please support amendments to Bill 61-26 put forth by locally owned businesses of Anne Arundel County, specifically pertaining to agriculture and farming. My family has lived and worked our farm for 5 generations and it's very important to our way of life and our future generations to come here in South County. I appreciate your support in this matter. Respectfully, Richard Turner	
2026-10-05 2:41:32	Anna	Chaney	Lothian	MD	20711	Yes		Bill No. 61-26: (As Amended) – AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Zoning – Article 18 Update	Oppose		https://www.aacounty.org/system/files/webform/cc_legislative_testimony/108550/bill-61-26-10.4.2026.docx
2026-10-05 6:14:24	Teresa	Tidwell	Churchton	MD	20733-9655	Yes		Bill No. 61-26: (As Amended) – AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Zoning – Article 18 Update	Support	Dear Councilmembers, Please support amendments to Bill 61-26 put forth by locally owned businesses of Anne Arundel County, specifically pertaining to Honey's Harvest Farms, Rustic Ridge Farm 365, Morris Hill Farm, AZTK Food Truck and other AA County Food Trucks. I appreciate your support in this matter. Respectfully, Teresa Tidwell, Churchton, MD	
2026-10-05 6:36:56	Patty	Biddinger	Pasadena	MD	21122	Yes		Bill No. 61-26: (As Amended) – AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Zoning – Article 18 Update	Oppose	I'm against the Food Trucks allowing to be at the dispensaries to sell food as the dispensaries are selling their wares. Mine concerns are the parking, noise, the loitering and public consumption of the clients from the dispensaries.	
2026-10-05 7:43:35	sherry	schiller	Galesville	MD	20765	Yes		Bill No. 61-26: (As Amended) – AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Zoning – Article 18 Update	Oppose	Dear Councilmembers, Please support amendments to Bill 61-26 put forth by locally owned businesses of Anne Arundel County, specifically pertaining to agriculture and maritime. I appreciate your support in this matter. Respectfully, Sherry Schiller, Ph.D.	
2026-10-05 9:13:46	Karis	DeHaven	Millersville	Maryland	21108	Yes		Bill No. 61-26: (As Amended) – AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Zoning – Article 18 Update	No position	Please support the amendments put forth by the farming industry, as these will help businesses that I both support and work for in Anne Arundel County. Thank you for working with our small and family owned and operated businesses.	
2026-10-05 9:58:47	ELIZABETH	Rosborg	Arnold	MD	21012-2584	Yes		Bill No. 61-26: (As Amended) – AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Zoning – Article 18 Update	Oppose	You as members of the County Council are elected to represent your constituents. You are not listening to us. With over 100 people to sign up to testify and over 100 amendments, this bill needs to be WITHDRAWN. Stop and get it right, don't tell us you will come back and fix any problems, but it doesn't happen. We are trying to tell you there are problems with this proposed legislation - WITHDRAW IT !!	

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip Code	Are you representing yourself?	If no, what organization or whom do you represent?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachments
2026-10-05 10:15:14	Hannah	Thompson	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		Bill No. 61-26: (As Amended) – AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Zoning – Article 18 Update	No position	Dear Councilmembers, As a food-focused small, woman-owned business, I kindly ask you to please support amendments to Bill 61-26 put forth by locally owned businesses of Anne Arundel County, specifically pertaining to agriculture and food businesses. As someone who is invested in and relies on the local food system to provide fresh, healthy meals to private chef clients in Anne Arundel County, as well as to sustain myself and my family financially, the success of agriculture and small food business is extremely important for me and those I serve. I ask that you please make thoughtful and deliberate actions when concerning these industries, and take great consideration for the ripple effect any legislation will have on many of Anne Arundel County's residents and small businesses. Please listen to the voices of those who live and work in these industries and who provide us with the vibrant food culture we all get to benefit from and so desperately need access to. I appreciate your support in this matter. Respectfully, Chef Hannah Thompson, Registered Dietitian	
2026-10-05 11:00:04	Krystal	Ruth	DAVIDSONVILLE	MD	21035-2517	Yes		Bill No. 61-26: (As Amended) – AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Zoning – Article 18 Update	Oppose	OPPOSE Bill 61-26 Remarks: I am a resident of Anne Arundel County and the owner of a dog training business in the County. I am asking the Council to remove the "trained defense dog" definition and all related language from Bill 61-26, and to support Amendment 123. The proposed language targets and restricts legitimate dog training activities rather than addressing the actual misconduct the legislation is intended to prevent. There is an important difference between responsible dog training and the irresponsible use or handling of a dog. Private dog trainers, working-dog professionals, and dog-sport participants are an important part of our community. They provide valuable training, education, and services to dog owners throughout the County and help promote responsible dog ownership. The County should address specific dangerous or abusive conduct, not broadly prohibit or restrict legitimate training activities. I urge the Council to remove the "trained defense dog" language from Bill 61-26, support Amendment 123, and restore the County Code to its current language. Thank you for your consideration. -Krys Ruth	
Bill No. 63-26, as amended											
2026-09-29 11:25:19	Murphy	Cissel	Annapolis	MD	21403	Yes		Bill No. 63-26: (As Amended) AN ORDINANCE concerning: Zoning – Data Storage Center	Support	Please remove any and all tax breaks, reductions, etc. and impose severe tax increases and penalties on data centers. Do not allow any further development of data centers in the county and strongly encourage those in operation to shut down.	

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip Code	Are you representing yourself?	If no, what organization or whom do you represent?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachments
2026-09-29 16:43:29	Sara	Westrick	ANNAPOLIS	MD	21401	No	AARP Maryland	Bill No. 63-26: (As Amended) AN ORDINANCE concerning: Zoning – Data Storage Center	Support		https://www.aacounty.org/system/files/webform/cc_legislative_testimony/107985/bill-no-63-26-amended-data-storage-center-october-2026-aarp-md.pdf
2026-09-29 19:55:05	Brenda	Cintron	Hanover	MD	21076	Yes		Bill No. 63-26: (As Amended) AN ORDINANCE concerning: Zoning – Data Storage Center	Support	POSITION: SUPPORT BILL 63-26 AS AMENDED, BUT WITH STRONGER PROTECTIONS See attached testimony. I want to be absolutely clear: my support is for stopping new data center development not for bringing more data centers to Anne Arundel County. For many residents, this has become about more than zoning. Unchecked data center expansion is beginning to feel less like innovation and more like corporate greed. Ordinary families being asked to absorb the consequences of an economy increasingly shaped by enormous technology companies and extraordinarily wealthy interests. Working, middle, and upper middle class families are already struggling with housing, food, utilities, insurance, and necessities. We worry about our environment, our neighborhoods, our livelihoods, and our children's futures. Meanwhile, AI, autonomous vehicles, robotics, and automation are advancing rapidly. Families are asking what happens to college students entering the workforce and to people already struggling to make ends meet through jobs such as Uber, Lyft, DoorDash, and other work automation may change. That is the real anxiety I hear from neighbors, friends, and family. I support the moratorium, but grandfathering must be narrowed. Filing paperwork should not be enough. Protect existing communities. Stop data centers! Give residents a meaningful voice. Do not shift environmental, infrastructure, utility, or economic costs onto families. Innovation matters, but so do the people who already live here. Our livelihoods, our children's futures, and our communities are at stake.	https://www.aacounty.org/system/files/webform/cc_legislative_testimony/108009/october-5-testimony-bills-63-26-and-67-26.pdf
2026-10-04 12:51:24	Robert	Atkins	Annapolis	MD	21401-6412	Yes		Bill No. 63-26: (As Amended) AN ORDINANCE concerning: Zoning – Data Storage Center	Oppose	Banning consideration of data centers for 18 months is wrong for the county, state, and country. Considering such high paying job creatators as data centers with proper regulation and control is the correct path for Anne Arundel County. We already have effective rules on power, water, noise, and environmental impact. Use them!	
2026-10-04 15:07:12	Stacey	Davis	Glen Burnie	Maryland	21060	Yes		Bill No. 63-26: (As Amended) AN ORDINANCE concerning: Zoning – Data Storage Center	Support	Data centers should have to pay for their own electric, provide real and expected provisions for water sourcing and recycling and those that live within a 10 mile radius should have a minimum 20% real reduction in their residential property taxes.	
Bill No. 65-26, as amended											
2026-10-04 15:08:00	Stacey	Davis	Glen Burnie	Maryland	21060	Yes		Bill No. 65-26: (As Amended) AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Ethics – Campaign Contribution Disclosure and Comprehensive Zoning Integrity Act	Support		
Bill No. 66-26											
2026-10-04 15:09:37	Stacey	Davis	Glen Burnie	Maryland	21060	Yes		Bill No. 66-26: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Ethics – Enforcement	Support	If we don't start making elected officials accountable with real impact then why should the public trust the local government system to prioritize the people they service before their own desires and needs.	
Bill No. 68-26											

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip Code	Are you representing yourself?	If no, what organization or whom do you represent?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachments
2026-10-04 15:16:15	Stacey	Davis	Glen Burnie	Maryland	21060	Yes		Bill No. 68-26: AN EMERGENCY ORDINANCE concerning: Capital Budget and Program – Town Center to Reece Road and Culvert Invert Paving Capital Projects – Transfer of Appropriations	Oppose		
Bill No. 69-26											
2026-10-04 15:14:09	Stacey	Davis	Glen Burnie	Maryland	21060	Yes		Bill No. 69-26: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Personnel – Positions in the Classified Service – Positions in the Exempt Service – Public Ethics – Financial Disclosure – Health Department – Police Department	Oppose	Income paid to these positions is the taxpayer dollar. The County Council should be a part of the decision making process for any and all changes to pay and benefits for county employees exempt or non-exempt	
Bill No. 70-26											
2026-10-02 10:56:13	Catherine	Vieweg Taylor	Pasadena	MD	21122	Yes		Bill No. 70-26: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Boards, Commissions, and Similar Bodies – Subdivision and Development – Concept Plan	Oppose	I share the concerns detailed by the Growth Action Network and the Arnold Preservation Council. This bill should not pass in its current form.	
2026-10-04 20:32:04	Britt	Griswold	Annapolis	MD	21409	Yes		Bill No. 70-26: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Boards, Commissions, and Similar Bodies – Subdivision and Development – Concept Plan	Oppose	I am writing to express serious concerns about the Concept Plan process proposed in Bill 70-26. As currently written, the bill lacks the requirements and timelines necessary to ensure a predictable, transparent, and meaningful review process for applicants, the County, and the public. 1. The review and public-comment sequence should be changed. As drafted, OPZ could issue its report on a final plan before the community meeting occurs and before the public-comment period has concluded. This means public input may not be available in time to inform OPZ's review. A similar problem exists for proposed modifications if the community meeting occurs before complete engineering information is available. Requested legislative change: Amend the bill to require that the community meeting and public-comment period occur before OPZ issues its written report, and require that complete information supporting any proposed modification be available before public review of that modification. 2. The bill should establish specific Concept Plan submission requirements. The bill currently provides only general descriptions of what a Concept Plan must contain. This leaves applicants, the Council, and the public without a clear understanding of what information will be submitted and reviewed. Requested legislative change: Add to the bill, or incorporate by explicit reference to a legally established checklist, the specific contents and attachments required for a Concept Plan, including engineering, environmental, stormwater, resource-mapping, conservation, and modification information. 3. The bill should establish County review deadlines. The proposed process does not establish deadlines for completeness review, identification of deficiencies, OPZ/I&P review, or written feedback. Without those deadlines, the new process could create uncertainty or additional delay. Requested legislative change: Add specific deadlines for every stage of the Concept Plan process, including: (1) submission of required materials; (2) County determination of completeness and identification of deficiencies; (3) OPZ/I&P review; and (4) issuance of written comments or recommendations. I urge OPZ and the Council to make these legislative changes before Bill 70-26 advances. And a exceptionally concerned about the item one, the review sequence timeline needed to get the public proper time to provide proposal feedback to proposals.	

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip Code	Are you representing yourself?	If no, what organization or whom do you represent?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachments
2026-10-05 9:54:52	Elizabeth	Rosborg	Arnold	MD	21012-2584	Yes		Bill No. 70-26: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Boards, Commissions, and Similar Bodies – Subdivision and Development – Concept Plan	Oppose	I understand the intention of Bill 70-26 HOWEVER, the opportunity for constituents to get involved has been taken out of the equation. Public comments could be submitted too late for consideration. The checklist is not codified and could change with each OPZ director. There is no requirement for changes between Concept Plan and Final Plan to be communicated to the community. The name of the bill is misleading and not titled correctly. The introduction of a Concept Plan has nothing to do with Boards & Commission and is not limited to the Odenton Town Center. The administration has not been forthcoming with this bill and it should be withdraw, amended and introduced as its own stand alone bill.	
Bill No. 71-26											

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip Code	Are you representing yourself?	If no, what organization or whom do you represent?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachments
2026-10-01 17:45:37	Ray	Weber	SEVERN	MD	21144	Yes		Bill No. 71-26: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Neighborhood Preservation and Environmental Protection Act	Support	All, Having read the bills there are obvious conflicts between them and special concerns for particular areas within AACo specifically for Parole Town Center, Odenton Town Center and the BWI Mixed Use Overlay Areas of the county. Since the two bills need to co-exist they need to reference each other as to their areas of jurisdiction. 1.Bill 71-26 needs to state on page 1 that this is specific for the Parole, Odenton and BWI portions of the county and amends the Zoning – Article 18 only in regards to these specific jurisdictions. Otherwise, if not specified in 71-26 the regulations within Zoning – Article 18 rule. This 71-26 probably should also be entitled Article 18 – Amendment 1. 2.Bill 61-26 needs to state on page 2, before the definitions, that this Zoning - Article 18 is amended for specific jurisdictions within Parole, Odenton and BWI from the general provisions to more specific regulations. If not specified in that amendment, then the general regulations of Zoning - Article 18 remain in full effect. 3.The Bill 71-26 uses the term Maximum NET density within the tables for example in R1 District One dwelling unit per 40,000 SQUARE FEET which should be clarified throughout the tables in both 71-26 and 61-26. It is reality that there are exceptions entering into such areas (SE, C) that exceed this on a case-by-case basis, but the intent is to keep urban sprawl to a minimum in the less dense areas of the county. Thus, for example in an R-2 (two dwelling units per acre) district both 71-26 and 61-26 both bulk regulation tables should read as follows: Maximum NET densityOne dwelling unit per 20,000 square feet (half-acre) 4.Although there are obvious exceptions: townhouse; semi-detached, duplex, multi family, accessory dwelling unit (ADU), apartment, cottage home already existing within some lower density zoned regions. The 71-26 on page 6 does set a limit of these to be no more than 10% of the total dwelling units (in any district). This same statement needs to be added to 61-26 and clarified in both documents to be applicable to RA, RLD, R1, R2, R5 and R10. The intention as Mr. Volke states in 71-26 is Neighborhood Preservation and Environmental Protection which is accomplished by minimizing urban sprawl. Once the threshold to R15 or R22 is reached you already have urban sprawl. Now that both documents are on the agenda for the county council at the same time, you will likely see other areas that need to be clarified so the primary Zoning - Article 18 and the Article 18 - Amendment 1 can co-exist without conflict. For example, perhaps the BWI/Fort Meade Growth Area and Glen Burnie Sustainable Community Overlay area specific regions should be in stand-alone Amendments also to reduce confusion within the more widely applicable Zoning – Article 18..... Thank you for your attention to this important matter!!! Ray Weber 276-698-0350 (cell)	
2026-10-03 18:55:26	Suzanne	Gerakines	Crofton	Maryland	21114-1411	Yes		Bill No. 71-26: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Neighborhood Preservation and Environmental Protection Act	Oppose	Dear County Council of Anne Arundel County, It has been so nice not having plastic bags lining the sides of our roads and trees. Anne Arundel County has improved our property values by decreasing the plastic litter along our roads and in our wilderness. The 10 cents/bag charges encourages our population to be responsible citizens by using reusable shopping bags of all types.	
2026-10-04 15:27:29	Stacey	Davis	Glen Burnie	Maryland	21060	Yes		Bill No. 71-26: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Neighborhood Preservation and Environmental Protection Act	Support		

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip Code	Are you representing yourself?	If no, what organization or whom do you represent?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachments
2026-10-05 6:21:46	Niecy	Chambers	Annapolis	MD	21401	No	League of Women Voters of Anne Arundel County	Bill No. 71-26: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Neighborhood Preservation and Environmental Protection Act	Oppose		https://www.aacounty.org/system/files/webform/cc_legislative_testimony/108557/71-26-lwvaac-testimony-10-5-26.pdf
2026-10-05 7:22:23	William	Seale	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		Bill No. 71-26: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Neighborhood Preservation and Environmental Protection Act	Oppose	Requirement for a fence around pool that has electric cover is beyond stupid. No risk to public or residents.	
2026-10-05 9:05:13	Jamie	Hurman-Cougne	Pasadena	Maryland	21122	Yes		Bill No. 71-26: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Neighborhood Preservation and Environmental Protection Act	Support	Dear Councilmembers, I am writing you today in support of Bill 71-26. As members of the County Council, one of your most important responsibilities is protecting Anne Arundel County, our land, our resources, our communities, and most importantly, our people. We cannot simply build more homes, put more cars on our roads, add more students to our schools, and place greater demands on our public safety and emergency services without addressing the infrastructure that supports them. Many of our schools are already at or near capacity. Our roads are already congested. Residents regularly experience traffic backups on roads that were never designed to accommodate the amount of development and population they serve today. I know you all hear about Mountain Road all the time, but if you have never driven it during rush hour, you'll never fully understand. And every new development creates additional demands, not just on roads and schools, but on fire and EMS services, police, water and sewer systems, stormwater management, recreation facilities, and the environmental resources that make Anne Arundel County such a desirable place to live. Housing is important. Affordability is important. But neither of those goals requires us to abandon responsible land-use planning. Bill 71-26 takes an important step toward restoring balance. Requiring additional open space, considering the actual developable acreage when determining density, and reconsidering some of the density increases adopted in 2024 are reasonable measures. And, that balance is what most of your constituency wants. Growth should follow infrastructure, not the other way around. Before we dramatically increase density, we should be able to answer some very basic questions: Can the schools handle the additional students? Can the roads handle the additional vehicles? Can our fire and EMS departments maintain acceptable response times? Can our water, sewer and stormwater infrastructure accommodate the additional demand? And what are we permanently giving up in open space and environmental resources to accommodate that growth? Once land is developed, we don't get it back. Anne Arundel County will continue to grow. The question isn't whether we grow. The question is whether we grow responsibly. Our residents deserve thoughtful planning that considers what our communities will look like five, ten and twenty years from now, not development first and infrastructure later. Not voting against a smart growth bill just because of petty partisan politics. Please protect the communities that are already here while planning responsibly for the people who will call Anne Arundel County home in the future. I respectfully ask you to support Bill 71-26.	

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip Code	Are you representing yourself?	If no, what organization or whom do you represent?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachments
Bill No. 72-26											
2026-10-05 10:24:17	Cathleen	Doyel	ANNAPOLIS	Maryland	21409-5871	Yes		Bill No. 72-26: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Construction and Property Maintenance Codes – International Swimming Pool and Spa Code – Barrier Requirements	Support	I am a District 5 resident and the mother of a three-year-old. I first became concerned about this issue when my son was 19 months old. Our backyard neighbors installed a swimming pool without a fence. When I started looking into the County's requirements, I was surprised to learn that a powered safety cover can qualify as an alternative to a physical barrier. As a parent with a young child, that raised a lot of questions for me. What happens when the pool is being used and the cover is open? What happens if there is a power outage or the system isn't working? I also learned that there are certain weather circumstances (such as snow like we had last winter) where these covers need to remain open. Further, the code, as it stands only requires that a power cover be present - not that it actually be used. I have spent considerable time researching how other Maryland counties address pool barriers, and the requirements vary significantly. Some counties require physical barriers, while others have exceptions similar to Anne Arundel County. I also found jurisdictions where, when the side of a house is used as one of the sides of the pool barrier, an additional physical barrier is still required rather than allowing the house itself to be the only protection. Because our neighbors' pool is directly behind our home, we have felt that we need to install a fence on our own property for our son's safety. We don't have a pool, yet we faced a \$20,000 expense to create a physical barrier between our property and the neighboring pool to keep our son safe. I understand that a fence cannot eliminate every risk, but I believe it is reasonable for the County to reconsider whether a powered cover should be treated as an adequate substitute for a physical barrier around a residential pool. Thank you for considering my perspective on Bill 72-26.	
Bill No. 74-26											
2026-09-24 19:20:22	Annette	Sanders	Linthicum	MD	21090	Yes		Bill No. 74-26: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Miscellaneous Provisions – Repeal of Paper and Reusable Bags Fee Requirement	Oppose	I oppose this bill because I believe it will weaken our current paper bag regulations. It is such a pleasure to drive down the road and not see our trees tangled up in plastic bags. While there is still considerable littering, it is noticeably less since people had to pay for bags. I take re-useable bags with me. I do not want to pay because others can't be bothered or don't care about our environment. Plastic bags are not recyclable and lay in our landfills for many years. Why would this even be a consideration.	
2026-09-24 20:49:56	Robin	Dax	Odenton	MD	21113	Yes		Bill No. 74-26: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Miscellaneous Provisions – Repeal of Paper and Reusable Bags Fee Requirement	Oppose	Removing the 10-cent bag fee would have two negative consequences. First, the customers who use reusable bags will end up paying for the minority who use paper bags! How? Because if stores are required to give out paper bags "for free," retailers will likely be passing that cost along to all consumers via higher prices on our groceries! Secondly, human nature defaults to the easiest, most convenient way to accomplish a task. More customers will choose a paper bag because it is easier than bringing their own bags to the store. Paper comes from trees, and we need to protect our remaining forests. Recycling paper pollutes our waterways.	

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip Code	Are you representing yourself?	If no, what organization or whom do you represent?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachments
2026-09-24 22:36:24	Peter	McGraw	Severna Park	MD	21146	Yes		Bill No. 74-26: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Miscellaneous Provisions – Repeal of Paper and Reusable Bags Fee Requirement	Oppose	I don't agree with removing the charge using single use bags. There have been visible improvement to out local roadways, wild areas and water by removing the majority of these bags from use. Any step back will negatively impact our life. Reusable bags are inexpensive, easy to carry and only take a little thought to remember. The 10 cent cost of you forgot is only a reminder. I don't support this change and will vote against that support it.	
2026-09-25 10:53:11	William	Yates	Lothian	MD	20711	Yes		Bill No. 74-26: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Miscellaneous Provisions – Repeal of Paper and Reusable Bags Fee Requirement	Oppose	I oppose changes to the Paper and Reusable bag ordinance. To continue to encourage the use of reusable bags or not needing a bag helps reduce additional waste/recycle stream and the need for cutting forests for more paper.	
2026-09-25 11:22:21	Pamela	McGregor	Millersville	MD	21108	Yes		Bill No. 74-26: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Miscellaneous Provisions – Repeal of Paper and Reusable Bags Fee Requirement	Oppose	I oppose the repeal of 10 cents for a paper bag fee. My family has been using our own carry bags before Maryland instituted this fee. My parents lived in Calif. and we saw the light. It's NOT HARD to have reusable bags in your car or even in your purse. Using carry bags/ reusable bags overwhelmingly helps the environment. Should you decide to stop this fee, you will be passing the cost of paper bags ON ME! Stores will no absorb this cost.	
2026-09-25 12:02:10	Carol Ann	Jones	LOTHIAN	MD	20711	Yes		Bill No. 74-26: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Miscellaneous Provisions – Repeal of Paper and Reusable Bags Fee Requirement	Oppose	I carry bags and use the paper for 10 cents when I need to. With all the rises in cost for most everything that the administration has put on consumers for no other reason than his ego and vanity, this is pittance. I see most people using reusable with no complaints. Why undermine the law that makes for a better use of resources and reduces plastic use and litter? Another vanity bill maybe?	
2026-09-26 15:34:36	Sylvia	Oliva	Annapolis	MD	21401	Yes		Bill No. 74-26: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Miscellaneous Provisions – Repeal of Paper and Reusable Bags Fee Requirement	Support	I want to defend the Reusable Bag Bill. Everyone should know that it is essential to our life that we take care of our Earth. This is one small but very effective way to do it. It will mean that fewer trees will be cut down to make paper bags--and protecting trees are a great way to decrease our carbon footprint. And the very small charge of ten cents. for a paper bag, if we don't bring our own own reusable bag, is a good reminder to bring it next time.	
2026-09-28 11:12:06	Robert	Fuller	Severn	MD	21144	Yes		Bill No. 74-26: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Miscellaneous Provisions – Repeal of Paper and Reusable Bags Fee Requirement	Oppose	I urge you to vote against this bill that would weaken the County Bag Ban. The ban has been very successful in reducing litter and waste. Removing the fee would encourage the use of paper bags, resulting in more waste and possibly higher grocery prices - something we don't need these days!	
2026-09-28 11:19:24	connie & matthew	govern	annapolis	md	21401	Yes		Bill No. 74-26: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Miscellaneous Provisions – Repeal of Paper and Reusable Bags Fee Requirement	Oppose	We oppose the repeal of the bag bill. Since the bag bill was enacted we see less litter on the streets and plastic bags in our building's recycling, streets and water ways has all but disappeared. It has not been a burden to bring our own reusable bag shopping.	

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip Code	Are you representing yourself?	If no, what organization or whom do you represent?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachments
2026-09-28 13:42:55	JoAnne	Zoller	Glen Burnie MD	MD	21061	Yes		Bill No. 74-26: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Miscellaneous Provisions – Repeal of Paper and Reusable Bags Fee Requirement	Oppose	I urge the County Council to DEFEAT Bill 74-26, which is a thinly veiled attempt to weaken the Reusable Bag Bill under the guise of easing the finances of taxpayers. Eliminating a 10-cent bag fee simply weakens the bill, as those taxpayers who are concerned about their wallet can join the 72% of us who regularly bring reusable bags to the grocery store. Eliminating the bag fee would weaken the very successful adoption of using reusable bags by shoppers under the Reusable Bag Bill legislation. First, it would shift the cost of paper bags to ALL consumers, who should not have to pick up the tab for shoppers who choose not to bring their own reusable bags. Second, it would result in more shoppers opting for the flimsy paper bags because human nature tends to choose the most convenient option. Paper comes from trees, which bring us clean air and clean water. Recycling paper fouls our waterways. So paper is not an environmentally friendly option. Please vote this frivolous bill down and lay this insidious tactic to rest forever!	
2026-09-29 21:11:14	Elvia	Thompson	Annapolis	MD	21401	No	Sierra Club Maryland Chapter, Anne Arundel Group	Bill No. 74-26: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Miscellaneous Provisions – Repeal of Paper and Reusable Bags Fee Requirement	Oppose	I strongly oppose a roll-back of the highly effective, environmentally significant Bring Your Own Bag Bill which already has the force of law. With so many serious assaults on the environment, this is no time to move backward, particularly on an practice that has already been adopted by Anne Arundel County residents. The requirement that a retailer charge just 10 cents for a paper bag reinforces the habit of bringing in reusable bags. This small charge shows that this is a practice that is important, and not insignificant Furthermore, in observing customers in retail establishments such as grocery stores, I see are very few people who request a paper bag. The habit of bringing your own bag is entrenched. If this legislation is enacted responsible customers, and the ones who request paper bags would end up shouldering the burden of the cost of paper bags anyway since retailers pass on their expenses to all customers. But the most important part of this legislation has to do with the environment. Why use up the resources from which paper bags are made when we already have the needed behavior change? Paper bags are made from trees, our most important resource, which bring us so many eco-services including oxygen and shade. These paper bags are often used only once while reusable bags are, well, reusable, many times over. The proposed legislation makes no sense and adds to the degradation of environmental policies that we see nationwide. Vote NO on this bill.	https://www.aacounty.org/system/files/webform/cc_legislative_testimony/108014/testimony-regarding-bill-no-74-26.docx
2026-10-01 18:20:26	Barbara	France	Annapolis	MD	21403-5730	Yes		Bill No. 74-26: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Miscellaneous Provisions – Repeal of Paper and Reusable Bags Fee Requirement	Support		

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip Code	Are you representing yourself?	If no, what organization or whom do you represent?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachments
2026-10-03 17:46:36	Kathy	Machan	Severna Park	MD	21146-3906	Yes		Bill No. 74-26: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Miscellaneous Provisions – Repeal of Paper and Reusable Bags Fee Requirement	Oppose	Removing the 10-cent bag fee would have two negative consequences. First, the customers who use reusable bags will end up paying for the minority who use paper bags! How? Because if stores are required to give out paper bags "for free," retailers will likely be passing that cost along to all consumers via higher prices on our groceries! Secondly, human nature defaults to the easiest, most convenient way to accomplish a task. More customers will choose a paper bag because it is easier than bringing their own bags to the store. Paper comes from trees which sequester carbon, and we need to protect our remaining forests. Processing paper pollutes our waterways.	
2026-10-03 18:36:25	Jayne	Roxey	Odenton	Maryland	21113	Yes		Bill No. 74-26: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Miscellaneous Provisions – Repeal of Paper and Reusable Bags Fee Requirement	Oppose	Dear Members of the Council, I am a resident of Anne Arundel County, and I urge you to vote against Bill 74-26. The 10-cent charge works because it changes a small daily habit. It is avoidable by bringing a bag, and it is enough to make people pause at the register and remember their reusable bags. Our county has spent more than two years building that habit. Making the charge optional removes the reminder, and I believe many shoppers will drift back to taking a new bag every trip. Paper bags are not free of environmental cost. They come from trees that would otherwise store carbon, and producing them pollutes waterways. The charge is also fair. Shoppers who bring their own bags pay nothing, and the money goes to the retailer to cover the bag, not to the county. If the charge is dropped, stores will likely recover those costs through higher grocery prices paid by everyone, including customers who never take a bag. County staff have noted that smaller retailers asked for this requirement so they would not have to absorb bag costs. This council rejected a similar repeal in December 2024, and nothing about the purpose of the law has changed. Please keep the requirement and vote no on Bill 74-26. Thank you. Jayne Roxey	
2026-10-03 18:55:49	Pamela	McGregor	Millersville	MD	21108	Yes		Bill No. 74-26: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Miscellaneous Provisions – Repeal of Paper and Reusable Bags Fee Requirement	Oppose	I really do not think that carrying reusable bags is too much to ask citizens. Many of mine came free from a variety of grocery stores. Some I have purchased over time. Each of our cars has atleast 4 bags so that we are prepared. Also, I carry a collapsible one in my purse. This 10 cents a bag complaint is incorrect thinking about what people can routinely accomplish if they aren't lazy.	

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip Code	Are you representing yourself?	If no, what organization or whom do you represent?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachments
2026-10-04 10:42:34	Anne	Pearson	Edgewater	MD	21037	Yes		Bill No. 74-26: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Miscellaneous Provisions – Repeal of Paper and Reusable Bags Fee Requirement	Oppose	October 5, 2026 Members of the Anne Arundel County Council, I ask your strong opposition to Bill 74-26, for a number of reasons: Our selfish, thoughtless decisions to serve our convenience, fail to consider their effects on the earth, the life of this planet and we are currently suffering the consequences. Fierce forest fires, floods, earth quakes, heat waves, Sunamis, hurricanes, tornados disrupt, displace and end the lives of thousands of people and the millions of species of life on which we depend. We must recognize the fact that we depend on healthy earth systems for our survival. To cut trees to make paper bags harms those systems, prevents the normal carbon sequestration trees provide; the process of making paper pollutes rivers. To end the charge for paper bags will cause retailers to add those costs to groceries whose costs are already too high for the average person. It is critical to our future, to examine our behaviors so that our choices reflect the fact that we belong to the earth and its ability to continue to provide for our health. We can certainly manage to carry with us canvas bags in which to carry our groceries! Thank you for your vote against Bill 74-26, a Bill that does not enhance our future. Anne Pearson Retired Director Alliance for Sustainable Communities 2041 Shore Drive Edgewater, MD 21037 207-752-6189	https://www.aacounty.org/system/files/webform/cc_legislative_testimony/108487/members-of-the-county-council.docx
2026-10-04 12:56:01	Robert	Atkins	Annapolis	MD	21401-6412	Yes		Bill No. 74-26: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Miscellaneous Provisions – Repeal of Paper and Reusable Bags Fee Requirement	Support	The current situation with bags is almost comical requiring a 10 cent charge for a bag. If McDonald's or Home Depot wants to include a bag for free with a purchase, let them.	

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip Code	Are you representing yourself?	If no, what organization or whom do you represent?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachments
2026-10-04 14:05:46	Nina	Fleureton	Millersville	Maryland	21108	Yes		Bill No. 74-26: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Miscellaneous Provisions – Repeal of Paper and Reusable Bags Fee Requirement	Oppose	Members of the Council, I urge you to oppose the repeal of the 10-cent paper bag charge in the Reusable Bag Bill. Let's start with scale. Ten cents is a very small amount, and it applies only when a customer chooses a paper bag. No one is required to pay it. Shoppers who bring their own bags pay nothing, and today roughly 72 percent of our residents do exactly that. This is a law that is working. It works because of how people behave. We default to whatever is easiest. Grabbing a free paper bag at the register takes no planning, while remembering a reusable bag takes a small habit change. A modest charge is the nudge that tips that daily decision. Remove it, and the convenient choice wins again. Paper bag use will climb, and the progress our county has made will erode. Repeal would also shift costs unfairly. Bags are not actually free. Retailers will recover the expense through higher grocery prices, meaning residents who bring reusable bags would end up subsidizing the minority who don't. The environmental stakes are real, too. Paper bags come from trees that sequester carbon, and we need to protect our remaining forests. Producing paper also pollutes our waterways, including the Chesapeake Bay watershed we all depend on. A dime is a small price for a policy that changes behavior, protects our environment, and keeps costs fair. I respectfully ask you to keep the bag fee in place. Thank you.	https://www.aacounty.org/system/files/webform/cc_legislative_testimony/108511/bill-no-74-26.pdf
2026-10-04 15:32:15	Stacey	Davis	Glen Burnie	Maryland	21060	Yes		Bill No. 74-26: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Miscellaneous Provisions – Repeal of Paper and Reusable Bags Fee Requirement	Support		
2026-10-04 16:04:35	Eileen	Klopfer	Severna Park	Maryland	21146	Yes		Bill No. 74-26: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Miscellaneous Provisions – Repeal of Paper and Reusable Bags Fee Requirement	Oppose	I firmly believe that repealing the 10 cent bag fee will weaken the Paper and Reusable Bag Bill. Folks will have less incentive to bring their own bags and use paper bags instead. We need more trees, among many other benefits, trees clean the air and provide the oxygen we need.	
2026-10-04 19:55:50	BERNIE	ROBINSON	GLEN BURNIE	MD	21061	No	Sierra Club, Anne Arundel Group	Bill No. 74-26: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Miscellaneous Provisions – Repeal of Paper and Reusable Bags Fee Requirement	Oppose	Bill 74-26 would result in 72% of citizens who responsibly use reusable bags or hand carry ing, to be burdened with the additional provider overhead it would cause. Individuals who behave responsibly will be paying the price, which is financially inequitable! It would also create an unlevel playing field for retailers as small retailers pay far more for paper bags than larger stores. Furthermore, paper bags are actually very bad for the environment. Trees are good for the environment, creating carbon sequestration while producing oxygen. The The entire process of cutting trees down, transporting timber, and badly polluting papermills to create the bags is horrendous. No other municipality in the entire state has eliminated a minimum paper bag fee. Remember, purchasing a paper bag is a choice, not a requirement. Choice is freedom, but eliminating the minimum fee would essentially be a mandate that would force all to pay more for their purchases in totality. That is clearly unfair! Please vote against this bill.	

Timestamp	First name	Last name	City	State	Zip Code	Are you representing yourself?	If no, what organization or whom do you represent?	Legislation	Position	Remarks	Attachments
2026-10-04 20:07:18	ARTHUR	ROBINSON	Glen Burnie	MD	21061-6305	Yes		This unwise bill would gut the intent of the reusable bag bill and its effectiveness. It would pass the burden of paying for paper bags to all people who are responsible and use a reusable bag or hand carry. Furthermore, it would increase the usage of paper bags greatly increasing more so over time as people take advantage of free paper bags but they're not free as everyone will pay for it a stores increase prices to cover the additional overhead. Additionally, The cutting down of trees in the process of transportation from power saws to polluting trucks to terribly polluting papermills. The primary sponsor of this bill to eliminate the \$0.10 minimum fee spoke about it being affordability issue. Well, currently 72% of County residents utilize reusable bags or hand carry. The elephant in the county, is the fact that most residents are paying hundreds if not thousands of dollars more now based upon illegal tariffs we have already suffered, in addition to the enormous cost of fuel this year caused by a needless war created by the MAGA president. If you really want to address affordability, I highly recommend pursuing the elimination of our president through impeachment. That will create great cost savings.			
2026-10-04 20:41:11	Shirley	Fuller	Severn	MD	21144	Yes		Bill No. 74-26: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Miscellaneous Provisions – Repeal of Paper and Reusable Bags Fee Requirement	Oppose		https://www.aacounty.org/system/files/webform/cc_legislative_testimony/108534/sf-s-bag-bill-testimony-for-oct-5-2026.docx
2026-10-05 10:48:11	Martin	Schroeder	Odenton	MD	21113	Yes		Bill No. 74-26: AN ORDINANCE concerning: Public Safety – Miscellaneous Provisions – Repeal of Paper and Reusable Bags Fee Requirement	Oppose	Introduction of this bill is an insult to the people of this state, the environment and common sense. In our country and in the state of Maryland, we are already living unsustainably, and now even more so with this outrageous bill. To protect our state's environment, our forests and to reduce pollution, reusable bags is an important part of the solution. The people of Maryland have a long-supported practices to encourage less waste of our resources in the state. We cannot continue to be a "throw-away" society. The citizens of Maryland are pulling together to affect positive change supporting all and rejecting this bill. The proposed bill is being introduced by special interest and has nothing to do with people's freedom.	
Resolution No. 32-26											
2026-10-04 15:36:25	Stacey	Davis	Glen Burnie	Maryland	21060	Yes		Resolution No. 32-26: RESOLUTION confirming the appointment of a County resident and a member of the classified service to serve on the Pension Oversight Commission for Anne Arundel County	Support		
Resolution No. 33-26											
2026-10-04 15:40:01	Stacey	Davis	Glen Burnie	Maryland	21060	Yes		Resolution No. 33-26: RESOLUTION approving submission of names for the Property Tax Assessment Appeal Board	Oppose	The two civilians recommended have extremely biased voting records that would not be in the best interests of county residents.	



Kaley Schultze <ccschu24@aacounty.org>

Constituent Feedback: Food Truck Legislation (Bill 61-26)

1 message

Michael Reilley [REDACTED]

Fri, Oct 2, 2026 at 10:26 AM

To: petersmith@aacounty.org, allison.pickard@aacounty.org, nathan.volke@aacounty.org, jhummer@aacounty.org, amanda.fiedler@aacounty.org, lisa.rodvien@aacounty.org, SLeadbetter@aacounty.org
Cc: ccschu24@aacounty.org

Dear Members of the Anne Arundel County Council,

I am writing to you as a resident of the Two Rivers community in Odenton to share my feedback regarding Bill 61-26 and its potential impact on local mobile food vendors.

While I understand the legislative goal is to formally codify food trucks into the county use chart, I am deeply concerned about the highly restrictive operational limits currently included in the text. Capping operations in residential or mixed-use areas to just three days per week and mandating an 8:00 p.m. closing time will severely hurt these small businesses, which provide beloved dining variety and build community ties in our neighborhoods.

I appreciate Council Chairwoman Hummer's recent comments expressing a willingness to amend the bill. I urge the full Council to actively collaborate with our local food truck operators to remove these restrictive caps and ensure Anne Arundel County remains welcoming to small business owners.

Sincerely,
Michael Reilley
Two Rivers Resident



Kaley Schultze <ccschu24@aacounty.org>

: October 5 Testimony-Bills 63-26 and 67-26: North County Residents Deserve Infrastructure Protection, Transparency, Housing Accountability, and a Real Voice in Our Future

1 message

Deb Cintron [REDACTED]

Tue, Sep 29, 2026 at 7:11 PM

To: CECS@aacounty.org, petersmith@aacounty.org, allison.pickard@aacounty.org, nathan.volke@aacounty.org, jhummer@aacounty.org, amanda.fiedler@aacounty.org, lisa.rodvien@aacounty.org, sleadbetter@aacounty.org, ccschu24@aacounty.org, [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Subject: October 5 Testimony-Bills 63-26 and 67-26: North County Residents Deserve Infrastructure Protection, Transparency, Housing Accountability, and a Real Voice in Our Future

To: County Executive Steuart Pittman; Councilmembers Julie Hummer, Peter Smith, Allison Pickard, Nathan Volke, Amanda Fiedler, Lisa Rodvien and Shannon Leadbetter; District 1 candidates Kelly M. Smith and Justin Sherlock; and County Executive candidates Allison M. Pickard and Dave Crawford

Dear County Executive Pittman, Members of the Anne Arundel County Council, and Candidates for County Executive and District 1:

My name is Brenda Cintron. I live in the Hanover/Harmans area and currently serve as President of the Harmans Ridge HOA. I mention my position because I hear the concerns of homeowners who have invested their savings, raised families, paid taxes, maintained their properties and built their lives in this part of Anne Arundel County. Unless separately authorized by my Board, these comments represent my personal views as a homeowner and HOA president rather than a formal resolution of the Harmans Ridge HOA.

I watched the September 21 County Council meeting from beginning to end, until approximately 11:30 p.m. I listened to the testimony, the amendments, the Council discussion and the votes. I did that because these decisions are not abstract to those of us who live here. They determine what may be built around our homes, what infrastructure we will have to live with, and what North County will look and feel like for decades.

I am not anti-technology. I am not anti-AI. I am not anti-cybersecurity, economic development or jobs. Anne Arundel County's proximity to Fort Meade, NSA, BWI and the Baltimore-Washington corridor unquestionably makes technology part of our economic future.

But supporting technology does not require accepting unlimited industrial-scale development wherever industry wants to put it.

National or regional demand for data infrastructure does not answer the local land-use question: *Where should it go, how much should be allowed, what protections should surround it, who pays for the infrastructure, and how close should it be allowed to come to existing neighborhoods?*

Bill 63-26: the moratorium needs stronger grandfathering protections

I appreciate that Bill 63-26 now acknowledges many of the very concerns residents have been raising. The amended bill itself states that modern data centers require significant amounts of **electricity, water and land**, may strain County resources and public infrastructure, can create **noise and compatibility issues with nearby residential and recreational uses**, and may outpace the County's infrastructure planning if regulations are inadequate. Those

are not statements from an anti-data-center organization; they are findings written into Anne Arundel County's own amended bill.

But I remain deeply concerned about Amendment 1's grandfathering language.

The amended bill would stop the County from accepting new data-center applications during the moratorium, which could last until January 31, 2028. However, it allows preliminary plans, site-development plans, sketch plans, modifications and final plans **filed before the moratorium begins to continue**, allows later applications associated with those plans to continue, and allows **future phases of an existing data center on adjacent or adjoining properties** to proceed.

That is much broader than what many residents would ordinarily understand when they hear the word "grandfathered."

My position is simple: filing paperwork should not be enough to lock a project into the old rules.

To the fullest extent legally permissible, I ask the Council to narrow grandfathering to projects that have received the necessary approvals and permits **and have begun substantial physical construction on the site** before the effective date. A speculative application, preliminary plan or paper filing should not give an applicant years of development rights while everyone else is supposedly subject to a moratorium.

I am particularly concerned about the provision allowing **future phases on adjacent or adjoining property**. A moratorium should not contain an exception large enough to allow an existing campus to keep spreading onto surrounding land while the County is telling residents that development is paused.

The proposed work group is a useful concept. It is required to examine siting, setbacks, screening, water consumption and water quality, electricity, noise, impact fees, decommissioning and other issues. But the ordinance provides seven Council appointments, four County Executive appointments, and several government ex-officio members. Residents living closest to potential facilities—including HOA and community-association representatives—should have a meaningful, designated voice in that process rather than merely being invited to comment after recommendations have been developed.

Virginia gives Anne Arundel an opportunity to learn before repeating its mistakes

I do not believe we should exaggerate what happened in Northern Virginia. Not every data center pollutes water, not every data center creates a noise problem, and data centers have produced substantial tax revenue there.

But Virginia's experience provides real evidence that Anne Arundel should take seriously.

Virginia's nonpartisan Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission concluded that data-center electricity demand will require substantial additional generation and transmission infrastructure. Under the Virginia scenarios it studied, a typical Dominion residential customer could face an estimated **\$14 to \$37 per month in additional generation and transmission-related costs by 2040, in constant dollars**. That is a Virginia projection—not a forecast for Maryland—but it demonstrates why Anne Arundel should demand an independent analysis of ratepayer and infrastructure consequences before approving widespread development.

Loudoun County now has nearly 200 operational data centers in its eastern area. Its own government says persistent **tonal and low-frequency noise complaints are among the most persistent data-center issues brought to County officials**. Data-center cooling systems, mechanical systems, transformers and generators can all contribute to noise. Backup diesel generators emit nitrogen oxides, particulate matter, carbon monoxide and other pollutants. Loudoun and Virginia have consequently moved toward stronger generator emissions standards, noise studies and additional siting controls.

Loudoun has now eliminated by-right data-center development and requires future proposals to go through a special-exception process with public review. That should tell Anne Arundel something: a jurisdiction with decades of data-center experience is adding more scrutiny, not less.

Bill 67-26 deserves much more explanation before October 5

I am also concerned about Bill 67-26, introduced by Councilmember Pete Smith.

For accuracy, Bill 67-26 does not replace the underlying R1 zoning on the affected properties. According to the County's own fiscal note, it would **expand the BWI Mixed Use Overlay Area to three additional lots that are currently zoned R1 residential**.

But calling it an "overlay" should not minimize what it does.

Under current County law, property inside the BWI Mixed Use Overlay retains the uses available under its underlying zoning **and gains additional permitted uses**, including multifamily dwellings, townhouses and stacked townhouses, hotels and motels, professional and general offices, restaurants, banks, car washes, pharmacies, package-goods stores and specialty retail.

For multifamily and townhouse development, the overlay can permit densities of up to **22 dwelling units per acre**, structures and parking covering as much as **75% of a site**, no minimum lot size, and multifamily buildings as high as **70 feet when additional setbacks are provided**.

Some of those uses can be beneficial. Mixed-use development can produce housing, services, employment and economic activity. But it can also significantly change traffic, density, stormwater runoff, sewer and water demand, lighting, deliveries, noise, emergency-service demand and the character of an area.

That is why residents deserve to know **why these particular three R1 properties are being added, who owns them, what development interest prompted the request, and what is reasonably anticipated to be built there**.

We are constantly being told that Anne Arundel County has an affordable-housing problem. The data support that statement. The County's 2025 Community Needs Assessment reported a median home price of **\$500,000 in November 2024**, compared with \$449,000 in 2022. Almost half of County renters were spending more than 30% of their income on rent in 2023, and median rent had risen to approximately **\$1,998**, nearly 19% above 2019.

So if adding these R1 parcels to the BWI Mixed Use Overlay is intended to create housing, I want a straightforward answer:

Where is the affordability requirement?

Increasing the number of units that can be built does not automatically mean those units will be affordable to teachers, first responders, young adults, seniors, County employees or working families.

Before Bill 67-26 receives final action, I want residents to see the parcels, anticipated uses, traffic analysis, water and sewer capacity, stormwater implications, school impacts if residential development is contemplated, noise implications and any commitments concerning housing affordability.

North County is not starting from a blank sheet of paper

Those of us living around Hanover, Harmans, BWI and Arundel Mills already absorb substantial regional infrastructure.

BWI Marshall handled more than **25 million passengers in 2025** and offers approximately **300 nonstop departures every day**. That airport is an important economic engine, but people who live nearby also experience the aircraft activity, road traffic and noise that accompany it.

We also live with Route 100, I-295, Arundel Mills, warehouse and commercial traffic, airport-related development and the Fort Meade/BWI growth corridor.

Then consider wastewater. Earlier this year, Anne Arundel County had to impose a temporary moratorium on new construction and land-use approvals in part of the Baltimore City Sewer Service Area because of peak-flow capacity limitations. The County lifted that moratorium in June only after additional capacity became available, including an arrangement with the Maryland Aviation Administration to use unused wastewater capacity from BWI Airport.

That does not mean our sewer system is currently failing. It does mean **infrastructure capacity is not a theoretical concern**.

Hanover also has an environmental history that should make cumulative environmental review important. Maryland Department of the Environment records document historical releases of

chlorinated volatile organic compounds and 1,4-dioxane into soil and groundwater from the former Kop-Flex facility at [7555/7565 Harmans Road](#), with remediation and groundwater monitoring conducted under State and federal oversight. I am not suggesting that our municipal drinking water is unsafe. I am saying our community has already lived with an environmental remediation legacy, and additional industrial-scale development should be evaluated cumulatively rather than as if every parcel existed in isolation.

Public safety and quality of life also deserve attention

I also want to be fair to our Police Department. Preliminary County data showed substantial reductions in numerous violent-crime categories during 2025, including citizen robberies, commercial robberies, carjackings and shootings. That progress deserves recognition.

At the same time, residents still experience serious incidents locally. In 2026 alone, County Police reported a robbery and assault incident at Arundel Mills following a shots-fired call in March, an armed commercial robbery at the Exxon on Arundel Mills Boulevard in April, and a June shooting on Charwood Road in Hanover involving multiple gunshot victims.

My point is not that crime is rising countywide—the County's own statistics do not support that statement. My point is that our elected leaders still need sustained attention on public safety and quality-of-life issues in **Hanover, Arundel Mills, Jessup, Brooklyn Park, Glen Burnie, Severn and throughout the County, including Pasadena**, rather than assuming economic development by itself solves those concerns.

Residents need adequate police, fire and EMS resources; safe roads; functioning sewer and water infrastructure; schools that can absorb growth; meaningful code enforcement; environmental protection; attainable housing; and traffic planning **before** additional high-intensity development is layered onto communities already carrying major regional infrastructure.

I am asking Councilmember Smith for transparency, not making an unsupported accusation

Councilmember Smith, during the September 21 discussion I heard you speak about your federal/cybersecurity or national-security experience in explaining why you see a need for data centers and why you consider Anne Arundel County wellpositioned for this industry.

Your official County biography states that you currently work as a **comptroller for the Department of Defense**.

I am **not alleging that you have a financial conflict of interest or that you have violated the County Ethics Law**. I do not have evidence to make that allegation.

However, when an elected official relies on outside federal or national-security professional experience as part of the justification for a local land-use position, residents are entitled to confidence that there is no actual or apparent conflict.

I therefore respectfully ask you to request written guidance from the Anne Arundel County Ethics Commission concerning your participation in data-center legislation, publicly disclose the Commission's conclusion, and **recuse yourself if the Ethics Commission determines that recusal is required**. The County itself

directs officials to seek Ethics Commission guidance when a potential conflict may exist.

That would resolve the question based on the law rather than speculation.

I am a lifelong Democratic voter, but my support should not be taken for granted

I also want Democratic officeholders and candidates to understand my disappointment.

I receive Democratic campaign messages telling voters that our local leaders will protect us from actions of the Trump administration and federal immigration enforcement, protect children from gun violence, address concerns involving Flock cameras, protect green spaces and waterways, make life affordable for families, and **"STOP new data centers."**

Those are serious commitments.

But when I look at what actually happened with Bill 63-26, the original legislation that would have imposed substantially broader restrictions on data centers was introduced by **Republican Councilmember Nathan Volke**. The amendment converting that approach into a temporary moratorium and work-group process was introduced by **Democratic Councilmember Julie Hummer at the request of Democratic County Executive Steuart Pittman**, and that amendment passed unanimously.

I cannot claim to know how each Democratic Councilmember would ultimately have voted had the original bill remained unchanged. Nobody can honestly establish that counterfactual.

But I **can** ask every current Councilmember and every candidate to tell residents clearly, in writing, what you support.

I am not interested in partisan credit when it comes to my neighborhood. If a Republican introduces a proposal that protects residents, I will acknowledge it. If a Democrat introduces one, I will acknowledge that too. I care about the substance of the legislation.

As a lifelong Democratic voter, I find the disconnect I currently perceive between some campaign messaging and the details of legislation disappointing. **My vote should not be treated as automatic simply because of party affiliation.**

I personally have not received a meaningful District 1 survey asking residents how we feel about data centers, the BWI overlay expansion, cumulative development, traffic, infrastructure capacity, affordability or these other land-use issues. Kelly Smith and Justin Sherlock, you are asking to represent District 1 next year. I want both of you engaging residents **now**, before Election Day, and explaining specifically what you would do.

The same applies to Allison Pickard and Dave Crawford as candidates for County Executive.

AI should be part of this conversation—but so should the people whose lives AI is changing

I also want our County leaders to be much more engaged with artificial intelligence.

AI will affect our college students, young adults entering the workforce, current employees, teachers, government workers, businesses and families. Many people are excited by the opportunity. Many are also anxious about whether the careers they trained for will still exist, whether entry-level jobs will disappear, how their personal information will be used, and whether they will have an opportunity to retrain as technology changes their work.

Maryland just announced a statewide AI framework focused specifically on **workers, communities and children**. It includes plans to bring businesses, labor and higher education together to address worker transition, prepare students for an AI-shaped economy, and provide training and transition support. Maryland Labor has committed **\$4 million in 2026 to AI-resilient workforce approaches**, and the State's AI strategy calls for student internships and training workers in ways intended to enhance rather than simply replace human workers.

Anne Arundel County should be participating actively in that future.

With Fort Meade, NSA, BWI, Anne Arundel Community College, our public schools and our technology employers, this County should be developing AI literacy, internships, apprenticeships, reskilling programs, career-transition assistance and clear rules for responsible governmental use of AI.

Our college students should not graduate into an AI-driven economy with anxiety and no pathway forward. Current employees should not simply be told to "adapt" without training and support.

And we should recognize an important distinction:

Being pro-AI and pro-cybersecurity does not require being pro-data-center-at-any-location.

We can embrace technology while still protecting residential communities.

What I am asking from each of you

1. **Strengthen Bill 63-26's grandfathering language.** To the fullest extent legally permissible, require necessary approvals and

substantial physical construction—not merely an application or preliminary plan—to qualify for grandfathering.

2. **Remove or significantly limit the automatic exception for future phases on adjacent or adjoining properties.** A moratorium should actually pause expansion while permanent rules are developed.
3. **Give residents and community associations a formal voice on the data-center work group,** particularly representatives from communities most likely to experience future data-center development.
4. Establish strong permanent standards addressing residential setbacks, low-frequency and nighttime noise, pre- and post-construction noise studies, generator emissions, water use, wastewater capacity, electric-grid impacts, who pays for transmission and substation infrastructure, traffic, fire/EMS needs, decommissioning, environmental monitoring and cumulative impacts.
5. **Before final action on Bill 67-26, explain the three R1 parcels publicly.** Identify the intended purpose of expanding the BWI Mixed Use Overlay, disclose what development is known or reasonably contemplated, show the traffic/sewer/water/stormwater implications, and explain what—if anything—the legislation will do to produce housing that is actually affordable.
6. **Councilmember Smith, obtain Ethics Commission guidance regarding participation in data-center matters,** disclose the conclusion publicly and recuse if the Ethics Commission concludes recusal is required.

7. **Kelly Smith, Justin Sherlock, Allison Pickard and Dave**

Crawford: publish your positions. Tell voters specifically where you stand on Bill 63-26's grandfathering provisions, data-center siting near residences, Bill 67-26, infrastructure-first development, utility costs, environmental protections and affordable housing. Conduct meaningful constituent surveys and public forums rather than assuming what residents want.

8. Develop a **County AI and workforce-readiness strategy** with Anne Arundel Community College, AACPS, workforce-development agencies, Fort Meade-area employers, organized labor and the business community so that our students and current workforce participate in the AI economy rather than simply experiencing its disruption.

I understand that elected officials must balance economic development, jobs, tax revenue, national-security needs, housing, environmental protection and residents' property rights. I do not expect every decision to go my way.

I do expect us to be heard.

North County is not vacant land on a planning map. Hanover and Harmans are communities where people already live. We already accommodate a major international airport, highways, Arundel Mills, substantial commercial and industrial activity, freight and commuter traffic, and the infrastructure associated with Fort Meade.

We have had enough of cumulative impacts being examined one project at a time while residents live with the combined result.

I want Anne Arundel County to succeed economically. I want Maryland to lead in AI, cybersecurity and innovation. I want our

children and college students to have extraordinary opportunities here.

But growth should improve the lives of the people who already live here—not simply ask them to absorb another burden.

We are watching the bills. We are watching the amendments. We are watching the exceptions and grandfathering provisions. We are watching the votes. And we will be watching whether campaign promises match governing decisions.

I respectfully ask each of you to respond to these concerns before the October 5 hearing.

Respectfully,

Brenda Cintron

President, Harmans Ridge HOA

Hanover/Harmans, Maryland

Submitted in my personal capacity as a homeowner and HOA president

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPad](#)

October 5, 2026

Anne Arundel County Council Chair Hummer and Councilmembers
44 Calvert Street
Annapolis, MD 21401

Dear Chair Hummer and Councilmembers,

The Anne Arundel County Agriculture Commission (the Commission) held an emergency meeting today, Monday October 5, 2026, at 10am at which time three amendments to Bill 61-26 were discussed pertaining to farming and agriculture in Anne Arundel County. These along with other potential amendments were previously discussed by the Legislative Committee of the Agriculture Commission on Saturday October 3, 2026, at 9:30am and the Legislative Committee made the recommendation to the Commission to support the aforementioned amendments.

The Commission voted in favor of the three amendments, and the Commission respectfully requests that the Council supports Amendment No.'s 111, 120, and 133 to be proposed by Councilmember Leadbetter as follows:

- **Amendment No. 111** On page 55 of the amended bill, in line 15, strike the openings brackets; and in the same line, strike “]] ALL”.
 - (This amendment maintains the location of manure storage and certain accessory structures be limited to only side and rear lot lines.)

NOTE: Amendment No. 111, by virtue of striking the brackets and ALL, the amendment effectively reverts back to the existing code as-is, which allows time for the Commission to gather feedback from the urban farms on lots of 40,000 square feet or less to provide information as to the impact of adding the front lot line to the set back requirement. With a smaller amount of space, all things associated with urban farming, including manure, are generally smaller in size. With time and feedback from the urban farmers, a future amendment to the code could provide conditions as needed for such storage. The Commission appreciates the time to discuss this need with urban farmers.

- **Amendment No. 120** On page 241 of the amended bill, in line 44, strike the opening brackets and strike from the closing brackets through and including “INFORMAL”; and in line 46, strike the opening brackets. On page 242, in line 19, strike from the

closing brackets through and including “THE”. (This amendment maintains the administrative orders process for zoning violations.)

NOTE: Amendment number 120 allows the Agriculture Commission to study this section of the code and collaborate with the Office of Planning and Zoning to clarify the process by which notice is served to a property owner of a property on which there may be an alleged zoning violation. While we heard today that the Office of Planning and Zoning does not make a regular practice of using the Administrative Order as a means for notification to a property owner, legislation was passed by the Council in the last three years that added in Section 18-17-202 clause (ii) on page 242, lines 12-14, which the Commission supported, and reads as follows:

(ii) An order for an alleged violation on property with an agricultural use 12 assessment or an approved soil and water quality plan from the Soil Conservation District 13 shall be sent by certified mail, in addition to any other method allowed by this section.

Amendment 120 reverts the code back to as-is, including paragraph (ii) as noted above, with respect to notification of Zoning Violations and serves as a basis on which to study the specific and clear methods of notification service, be it by Informal Letter or as may be otherwise specified in the code. The Commission appreciates the time to discuss this notification process and to collaborate with the Office of Planning and Zoning to ensure a clear process for delivery of alleged zoning violations to farms and farmers in a timely fashion.

- **Amendment No. 133** On page 38 of the amended bill, as revised, in line 39, after “UNIT” insert “OR AN AGRICULTURAL BUILDING”. (This amendment removes agricultural buildings from the calculation of total floor area for all accessory structures.)

NOTE: Amendment No. 133 will allow farms to continue using accessory structures and adding accessory structures within the limitations of the Anne Arundel County Building Code Section 105.2.1.14-1 that may be greater in square footage, collectively or individually, than the square footage of the principal structure. For reference, the principal structure could be the primary residence; it could be a barn. Without this amendment, Bill 61-26 would potentially prohibit the use of accessory structures on farms such as coops, greenhouses, and cold storage facilities.

We thank you very much for your support for these three amendments, as revised. The Anne Arundel Agriculture Commission supports the sections of Bill 61-26 pertaining to agriculture uses in the county, subject to the three recommendations for amendment as listed above.

We thank the Council, the Office of Planning and Zoning, the Administration, and the County Executive for your continued collaboration and support of agriculture in Anne Arundel County.

Should you have any questions, please email me, Anna Chaney, Chair of the Commission at anna@honeysharvest.com, Deana Tice, Vice Chair of the Commission, at enticementstables@msn.com and Brad Nordholm, Secretary of the Commission at brad@nordholm.us.

Respectfully,

Anna Chaney
Anne Arundel County Agriculture Commission, Chair

Written Opposing Testimony on Bill 61-26

Anne Arundel County Article 18 Update

Public Hearing: October 5, 2026 | Bill text reviewed: September 8 and 21, 2026 amendments

To: Chair and Members of the Anne Arundel County Council

Submitted by Dawn Hegarty

Riviera Beach Community, Northern Anne Arundel County resident & homeowner.

My name is Dawn Hegarty. I respectfully oppose Bill 61-26 as amended and ask for an unfavorable report unless the bill is revised to protect existing communities, public health, infrastructure, and natural resources. I support a clear zoning code, but this broad update allows uses and removes conservation protections without a clear review of cumulative effects on overburdened communities.

1. The bill expands the definition of a state-licensed medical clinic to include state-licensed behavioral health programs and changes the use from conditional to permitted in several commercial and mixed-use districts. It also removes existing clinic standards, including distances from homes, schools, other clinics, plasma centers, cannabis dispensaries, and transitional housing; arterial-road access; safeguards against traffic on local residential roads; and the bar on variances. I ask the Council to retain meaningful location safeguards and public review. Cannabis dispensaries are a separate zoning use and should remain clearly distinguished from behavioral health clinics.
2. Bill 61-26 also removes the Open Space Conservation Overlay as obsolete. The overlay identifies Forest Interior Dwelling Species habitat and sensitive areas such as wetlands, bogs, floodplains, streams, steep slopes, and buffers. Before removing it, the County should publish a parcel-level map and show that equally strong, enforceable protections will remain. **The purpose clause calls the overlay “obsolete” without defining that term or stating a test. It also repeatedly refers to “certain” terms, uses, districts, dates, and circumstances without identifying them in the summary.** What specific changes are meant, what evidence supports removing the overlay, and what enforceable protections replace it for each habitat and sensitive area it covers?
3. I do not see a clearly defined role for the County Department of Health or Environmental Health, or a requirement for cumulative review of existing pollution, health burdens, infrastructure capacity, stormwater, waterways and airshed. Please require coordination among Planning and Zoning, Health, Environmental Health, and Public Works, with written findings available to residents. Cancer and respiratory illness concerns deserve careful attention, while recognizing community health and the impacts to the surrounding area.
4. The County summary says some proposed changes address needs identified by **Growth Action Network, MBIA, NAIOP, and land-use attorneys**. These stakeholders represent different interests. Example: Separately, state witness records show MBIA and NAIOP

opposed the CHERISH THE COMMUNITY ACT HB1484/SB0978 bills., along with other environmental protection bills. **That does not prove improper influence over Bill 61-26, but it raises an appearance of concern and a policy conflict between development-industry priorities and community protection goals.** Please publish the stakeholder comments and meeting records and explain how affected and overburdened communities were and are included.

I ask the Council to:

Explain why the overlay is considered obsolete and retain it until equal or stronger protections are defined, identified, mapped, and shown to be enforceable.

Restore stronger location, traffic, and public-review safeguards for behavioral health clinics, and keep them distinct from licensed cannabis dispensaries.

Give The Department of Health and Environmental Health a defined review role and require review of cumulative health, pollution, infrastructure, stormwater, and watershed, along with airshed impacts. (Increased traffic)

Communities should not lose protections without a public review of health, environmental, safety and existing infrastructure impacts with clear safeguards to the existing neighborhoods and surrounding area.

Anne Arundel County residents are already struggling with the rising taxes, added tax to real property and utilities, along with additional taxes. Residents, & businesses, are the “Stakeholders of Anne Arundel County”. I am concerned that a relatively small number of “affordable” homes within a large development has a greater and unjustified burden to the open spaces, people and compromises the existing infrastructure.

Please issue an unfavorable report on Bill 61-26 in its current form.

Thank you.

Respectfully,
Dawn Hegarty