

MEMORANDUM

September 25, 2018

TO: Transportation, Infrastructure, Energy and Environment Committee

FROM: Amanda Mihill, Legislative Attorney *A. Mihill*

SUBJECT: Expedited Bill 24-18, Forest Conservation – Amendments

PURPOSE: Worksession – Committee to make recommendations on Bill

Those expected to attend the worksession include:

- Mark Pfefferle, Chief, Development Applications and Regulatory Coordination, Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC)
- Christina Sorrento, Associate General Counsel, M-NCPPC

Expedited Bill 24-18, Forest Conservation – Amendments, sponsored by Lead Sponsor Council President Riemer at the request of the Planning Board, was introduced on June 19. A public hearing was held on July 10 at which there were no speakers. To Council staff's knowledge, the Council has not received correspondence on Bill 24-18.

Bill 24-18 would exempt from the requirement to submit a Forest Conservation Plan a modification to an existing non-residential developed property if the pending development application does not propose residential uses; exempt from the requirement to submit a Forest Conservation Plan a modification to an existing residential development property if the pending development application does not propose new buildings or parking facilities; exempt from the requirement to submit a Forest Conservation Plan certain demolition projects under certain circumstances; and remove ability to pay as a factor for consideration when assessing an administrative penalty.

The Planning Board, which is requesting this bill, provided a very comprehensive staff report detailing the reasons for each legislative change in the bill (©8-13). Council staff has highlighted those changes below:

- Bill 24-18 would redefine the word “tract” to mirror the Forest Conservation regulations (©2, lines 5-12). This will ensure that there is no ambiguity between the law and the regulations.
- Existing law exempts certain modifications to non-residential developed property from submitting a forest conservation plan. Bill 24-18 would add language clarifying that an

owner only qualifies for this exemption if the pending development application does not propose any residential uses (©3, lines 30-31). As Planning staff note, it was never the intent to create an exemption from the forest conservation law that would allow for a chance in use from non-residential to residential.

- Existing law exempts certain modifications to residential developed property from submitting a forest conservation plan. This exemption was added to the forest conservation law by Bill 26-17, which the Council enacted in November 2017. Bill 24-18 would limit this exemption to properties in which the pending development application does not propose new buildings or parking facilities and allow properties located in special protection area to qualify for this exemption (©3, lines 34-36 and 42-43). As Planning staff note, the purpose of this exemption was to allow existing residentially developed properties to be exempt from submitting a forest conservation plan if the proposed improvements did not modify the existing building.
- Bill 24-18 would allow property owners to demolish an existing structure to do so without having to submit a forest conservation plan if the property will be returned to natural conditions and topography and no development will occur within the next 5 years (©4, lines 59-73).
- Existing law requires the Planning Board/Planning Director to consider a violator's ability to pay when assessing a fine associated with the violation of the Forest Conservation Law. Bill 24-18 would remove this as a factor for the Board/Director's consideration (©5, line 91). Planning staff urges the removal of this factor because it is difficult for the Department to assess a person's financial health, information that a person submits may become public, and using this as a factor has made it difficult for the Department to assess what it believes to be penalties proportionate to the extent of the violation of the law.

This language was added to the forest conservation law by Expedited Bill 27-05. According to the staff packet at the time, this language was recommended by the C&O Canal Stewardship Task Force which had been convened by then-Congressman Van Hollen. The goal was that it would be an added deterrent – that is, the affluent violator would expect to pay a higher penalty. The Planning staff memorandum indicates that this language has not had the effect it originally was intended to have.

Council staff recommendation: enact Bill 24-18.

This packet contains:

Expedited Bill 24-18
Legislative Request Report
Planning Board memorandum
Fiscal and Economic Impact statement

Circle #

1
6
7
14

Expedited Bill No. 24-18
Concerning: Forest Conservation --
Amendments
Revised: 6/13/2018 Draft No. 1
Introduced: June 19, 2018
Expires: December 19, 2019
Enacted: _____
Executive: _____
Effective: _____
Sunset Date: None
Ch. _____, Laws of Mont. Co. _____

COUNTY COUNCIL FOR MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MARYLAND

Lead Sponsor: Council President at the request of the Planning Board

AN EXPEDITED ACT to:

- (1) exempt from the requirement to submit a Forest Conservation Plan a modification to an existing non-residential developed property if the pending development application does not propose residential uses;
- (2) exempt from the requirements to submit a Forest Conservation Plan a modification to an existing residential development property if the pending development application does not propose new buildings or parking facilities;
- (3) exempt from the requirement to submit a Forest Conservation Plan certain demolition projects under certain circumstances;
- (4) remove ability to pay as a factor for consideration when assessing an administrative penalty; and
- (5) generally amend the Forest Conservation Law.

By amending

Montgomery County Code
Chapter 22A, Forest Conservation – Trees
Sections 22A-3, 22A-5, and 22A-16

Boldface	<i>Heading or defined term.</i>
<u>Underlining</u>	<i>Added to existing law by original bill.</i>
[Single boldface brackets]	<i>Deleted from existing law by original bill.</i>
<u>Double underlining</u>	<i>Added by amendment.</i>
[[Double boldface brackets]]	<i>Deleted from existing law or the bill by amendment.</i>
* * *	<i>Existing law unaffected by bill.</i>

The County Council for Montgomery County, Maryland approves the following Act:

1 **Sec. 1. Sections 22A-3, 22A-5, and 22A-16 are amended as follows:**

2 **22A-3. Definitions.**

3 In this Chapter, the following terms have the meanings indicated:

4 * * *

5 *Tract* means [the property subject to a development application or sediment
6 control permit, as described by deed or record plat.]

7 (a) The property subject to a development application or a sediment control
8 permit, the boundaries of which are described by deed or record plat;

9 (b) The entire property subject to a development application or a sediment
10 control permit if it is developed as a single project; or

11 (c) The length and width of the right-of-way or the limits of disturbance,
12 whichever is greater, for a linear project.

13 * * *

14 **22A-5. Exemptions.**

15 The requirements of Article II do not apply to:

16 * * *

17 (t) a modification to an existing:

18 (1) non-residential developed property if:

19 (A) no more than 5,000 square feet of forest is ever cleared at
20 one time or cumulatively after an exemption is issued;

21 (B) the modification does not result in the cutting, clearing, or
22 grading of any forest in a stream buffer or forest located on
23 property in a special protection area which must submit a
24 water quality plan;

25 (C) the modification does not require approval of a preliminary
26 or administrative subdivision plan; [and]

(D) the modification does not increase the developed area by more than 50%, and the existing development is retained; [or] and

(E) the pending development application does not propose any residential uses; or

(2) residential developed property if:

(A) forest is not impacted or cleared;

(B) the modification is not located in a stream buffer [or located on property in a special protection area which must submit a water quality plan];

(C) the modification does not require approval of a preliminary or administrative subdivision plan;

(D) the modification does not increase the developed area by more than 50%; [and]

(E) the existing structure is not modified; and

(F) the pending development application does not propose any new buildings or parking facilities.

* * *

(v) a stream restoration project for which the applicant for a sediment control permit has:

(1) executed a binding maintenance agreement of at least 5 years with the affected property owner or owners;

(2) agreed to replace every tree removed and plant the new trees before the end of the first planting season after final stabilization; and

(3) confirmed that the tract is not included in a previously approved forest conservation plan; [and]

(w) cutting or clearing any tree by an existing airport operating with all applicable permits to comply with applicable provisions of any federal law or regulation governing the obstruction of navigable airspace if the Federal Aviation Administration has determined that the tree creates a hazard to aviation[.]; and

(x) the project is for the demolition of an existing structure if:

- (1) there is no proposed future development and existing impervious surfaces are substantially removed from the tract of land;
- (2) the site is returned to natural topography;
- (3) the property will not be used for a parking lot, material or equipment storage, or used as a recreational playing field;
- (4) trees and groundcover will be planted so that all disturbed areas are immediately stabilized;
- (5) no forest or specimen trees are removed;
- (6) a tree save plan is submitted to protect existing forest and trees;
- (7) the property is not already subject to Article II of this Chapter; and
- (8) a Declaration of Intent is filed with the Planning Director stating that the property will not be the subject of additional development activities under this Chapter within 5 years of demolition of the existing structure.

22A-16. Penalties and other remedies.

* * *

(d) *Administrative civil penalty*

* * *

- (2) In determining the amount of the civil administrative penalty, or the extent of an administrative order issued by the Planning

Director under Section 22A-17, the Planning Board or Planning
Director must consider:

- (A) the willfulness of the violations;
- (B) the damage or injury to tree resources;
- (C) the cost of corrective action or restoration;
- (D) any adverse impact on water quality;
- (E) the extent to which the current violation is part of a recurrent
pattern of the same or similar type of violation committed
by the violator;
- (F) any economic benefit accrued to the violator or any other
person as a result of the violation; and
- (G) [the violator's ability to pay; and]
- [(H)] any other relevant factors.

Sec. 2. Expedited Effective Date.

The Council declares that this legislation is necessary for the immediate
protection of the public interest. This Act takes effect on the date that it becomes law.

Approved:

Hans D. Riemer, President, County Council

Date

Approved:

Isiah Leggett, County Executive

Date

This is a correct copy of Council action.

Megan Davey Limarzi, Esq., Clerk of the Council

Date

LEGISLATIVE REQUEST REPORT

Expedited Bill 24-18
Forest Conservation - Amendments

DESCRIPTION:	Expedited Bill 24-18 includes minor changes to the Forest Conservation Law to clarify sections of the law by using a consistent definition of "tract" between the law and regulation, further clarify the modification to existing development property exemption from submitting a forest conservation plan, create a new exemption from submitting a forest conservation plan for property owners that demolish existing structures and return the land to natural conditions, and remove the ability to pay factor as one factor that must be considered in determining an administrative civil penalty.
PROBLEM:	Property owners that wish to demolish existing structures and return the land to natural conditions may be required to obtain a forest conservation plan even though the proposed activity diminishes impervious surfaces and storm water runoff. The ability to pay in assessing an administrative civil penalty is difficult for this includes obtaining confidential financial information from individual homeowners which can be disclosed during public hearings.
GOALS AND OBJECTIVES:	To update the code for consistency, protect an individual's financial information, and remove a burden on activities that are environmental beneficial.
COORDINATION:	Planning Department
FISCAL IMPACT:	To be requested
ECONOMIC IMPACT:	To be requested
EVALUATION:	To be requested.
EXPERIENCE ELSEWHERE:	To be researched.
SOURCE OF INFORMATION:	Mark Pfefferle, M-NCPPC
APPLICATION WITHIN MUNICIPALITIES:	To be researched.
PENALTIES:	Penalties for violations of the Forest Conservation law are in Chapter 22A-16.

Bill



MONTGOMERY COUNTY PLANNING BOARD
THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

AM
cc
min
ML
JZ

May 29, 2018

The Honorable Hans Riemer
President, Montgomery County Council
100 Maryland Avenue
Rockville, MD 20850

Dear Mr. Riemer:

At its regularly scheduled meeting on May 24, 2018, the Montgomery County Planning Board recommended, by a 5-0 vote, to transmit an **expedited bill** to the County Council for changes to Chapter 22A of the County Code (Forest Conservation Law). Changes are needed to the Forest Conservation Law to clarify sections of the law and to create an exemption from submitting a forest conservation plan for property owners who wish to demolish existing buildings, remove impervious surfaces, and restore the topography to natural conditions. The proposed changes are the following:

1. A modification to the definition of "tract" so that the definition is the same as the one used in the forest conservation regulations.
2. Further clarifying the modification to existing developed properties exemption from submitting a forest conservation plan so that the current use is maintained and no new residential uses are added to a property.
3. Creating a new exemption from submitting a forest conservation plan for property owners who wish to demolish an existing structure, return the land to natural conditions and topography, remove impervious surfaces, and stabilize the land can be exempt from submitting a forest conservation plan.
4. Remove the "ability to pay" factor as an item the Planning Board must consider in assessing an administrative civil penalty.

Enclosed is a complete copy of the proposed amendment that the Planning Board would like to be introduced as an expedited bill and a copy of the staff report dated May 18, 2018. Members of the Planning Board and Staff of the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission are available to assist the Council in its review of the proposed legislation.

Sincerely,


Casey Anderson
Chair

Cc: Amanda Mihill
Mark Pfefferle

Attachment

RECEIVED
MONTGOMERY COUNTY
PLANNING BOARD
JUN 1 11 39 AM '18



MONTGOMERY COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

MCPB

Item No. 7

Date: 5/24/2018

Forest Conservation Law Amendments - Modifications

MP

Mark Pfefferle, Chief, DARC, Mark.Pfefferle@montgomeryplanning.org, 301-495-4730

Completed: 5/16/18

SUMMARY

Minor changes to Chapter 22A of the Montgomery County Code (the Forest Conservation Law) are currently needed to clarify sections of the law and to create an exemption from submitting a forest conservation plan for property owners that wish to demolish existing buildings, remove impervious surfaces, and restore the topography to natural conditions. The proposed changes are the following:

1. A modification to the definition of "tract" so that the definition is the same as the one used in the forest conservation regulations.
2. Further clarifying the modification to existing developed properties exemption from submitting a forest conservation plan so that the current use is maintained and no additional uses are included.
3. Creating a new exemption from submitting a forest conservation plan where property owners who wish to demolish an existing structure, return the land to natural conditions and topography, remove impervious surfaces, and stabilize the land can be exempt from submitting a forest conservation plan.
4. Remove the "ability to pay" factor as an item the Planning Board must consider in assessing an administrative civil penalty.

Staff requests the Planning Board to approve the recommended changes and transmit the proposed changes to Chapter 22A of the County code to the Montgomery County Council President for introductions as an expedited bill. The proposed changes are included in Attachment A.

PROPOSED CHANGES

Below is a more detailed discussion of the proposed changes to the Forest Conservation Law by Section:

Section 22A-3. Definitions

Proposal. Lines 7 through 12 of the proposal is to revise the "Tract" definition in the Forest Conservation Law to make it consistent with the Forest Conservation Regulations.

Analysis. The proposed definition ensures the definitions are consistent between the forest conservation law and the regulations. The definition in the regulations is clearer and any ambiguity is removed between the law and regulations if the definitions are identical.

Section 22A-5. Exemptions. (t)(1) Modification to an existing non-residential developed property:

Proposal. Line 23 adds the word "forest" before "located on a property in a special protection area which must submit a water quality plan".

Analysis. Clarifies that applicants can qualify for an exemption from submitting a forest conservation plan as a modification to an existing non-residential property if they do not remove any forest on a property required to submit a special protection area water quality plan. Under the existing forest conservation law, owners of development applications that were required to submit a special protection area water quality plan could not qualify for this exemption. Staff does not believe the original intent was to disqualify a property from qualifying for this exemption if they were required to obtain a special protection area water quality plan. Staff does believe the original intent was to disqualify an applicant from using this exemption if they were removing forest on a property required to obtain a special protection area water quality plan. Even if a property is exempt from submitting a forest conservation plan, development activities subject to a special protection area water quality plan are still required to plant unforested portions of the stream buffer under the "Environmental Guidelines: Guidelines for Environmental Management of Development in Montgomery County".

Proposal. Line 32 adds the phrase "the pending development application does not propose any residential uses".

Analysis. The purpose of this additional language is to clarify that to qualify for this exemption from submitting a forest conservation plan that the entire property must continue to be a non-residentially developed property and that a portion of the property cannot be converted to residential use. It was never staff's intent to create an exemption that would allow for a change in use from non-residential use to residential.

Section 22A-5. Exemptions. (t)(2) Modification to an existing residential developed property.

Proposal. Lines 38 and 39 of the proposed amendment deletes the phrase “or located on property in a special protection area which must submit a water quality plan”.

Proposal. Lines 48 and 49 of the proposed amendment clarifies that the development application does not proposed any new buildings or parking facilities.

Analysis. Exemption 22A-5(t)(2) was recently added to the forest conservation law and became effective on February 26, 2018. The purpose of this exemption was to allow existing residentially developed properties to be exempt from submitting a forest conservation plan if the proposed improvements did not modify the existing residential building. Since the exemption prohibits the removal of any forest staff does not believe the phrase “or located on a property in a special protection area which must submit a water quality plan” is necessary. It was never staff’s intent to exclude development applications that required a special protection area water quality plan from qualifying for this exemption. The addition of lines 48 and 49 prohibiting the construction of new buildings or parking facilities further lessens the reason that a special protection area water quality plan would be needed. An example of a project approved with this exemption includes an older condominium complex, of approximately 10 acres, that wanted to address drainage issues. The application did not include any changes to the buildings but required a sediment control permit to install stormwater management devices where none previously existed and therefore the exemption from submitting a forest conservation plan was granted.

Section 22A-5. Exemptions. (x) Demolition of an existing structure

Proposal. Lines 52 through 65 creates a new exemption from submitting a forest conservation plan that allows property owners to demolish existing structures and return the land to natural conditions by removing impervious surfaces and restore natural topography.

Analysis. The proposed amendment creates an exemption that is restrictive and is not intended to facilitate future development. The regulated activity associated with this exemption would be a sediment control permit that is required for the demolition of an existing structure. The restrictions include the following:

- No future development is proposed and once the structure is removed, impervious surfaces such as sidewalks, driveways, etc are removed. The restriction does not require the removal of all impervious surfaces; therefore, an entrance and driveway onto the property for the use of the property owner could be retained.
- The land is returned to natural topography. This restriction requires that the applicant not leave any unnatural depressions, such as a basement, once the above ground

- structure is demolished. It also requires that if a retaining wall is removed that the land be graded to natural topography, and stabilized, so future erosion does not occur.
- The property will not be used for a parking lot, material or equipment storage, or used as a recreational playing field. These features do not require a permit other than a sediment control permit. This restriction is necessary to ensure the land is restored to natural conditions.
 - No forest or specimen trees will be removed. Demolition of an existing structure should not require the removal of any forest. Under Section 22A-6(b) of the forest conservation law, if the only reason why a development activity is not exempt from submitting a forest conservation plan is because a specimen tree is being removed, it can still qualify for the exemption but it requires a tree save plan and potential mitigation for the loss of the specimen tree. Section 22A-6(b) would apply in this instance as well and mitigation could be requested if warranted.
 - A tree save plan must be submitted to protect existing trees and forest. Under the forest conservation law, the tree save provision is only required if a specimen tree is removed. This provision requires a tree save plan be submitted with any property owner requesting use of this exemption and allows for the protection of existing forest and tree resources both on and off the subject property.
 - The property is not already subject to a forest conservation plan. This restriction is necessary to reaffirm to applicants that once a property is subject to Article II of the forest conservation law that it cannot be exempt from Article II in the future. In those cases, the property must comply with the already approved forest conservation plan. The structure to be demolished was probably within the limits of disturbance on the already approved forest conservation plan and the property owner would need to comply with the previously approved limits of disturbance.
 - The last restriction is that the applicant files a Declaration of Intent that the property will not be subject to additional regulatory activities within 5 years. This does not prevent property owners from applying for a new regulated activity for the property but that regulated activity would need to comply with Section 22A.00.01.12(D) of the forest conservation regulations.

Section 22A-16(d) Penalties and other remedies.

Proposal. The proposal is to remove the “violator’s ability to pay”, Line 82, as a factor that the Planning Board must consider in assessing a civil administrative penalty in a forest conservation law enforcement case.

Analysis. This factor was added to the forest conservation law in 2005 by Expedited Bill No. 27-05, which became effective on December 16, 2005. At the same time, the County Council

increased the maximum civil administrative penalty from three dollars a square foot to nine dollars a square foot.¹

Staff believes the "ability to pay" factor should be removed for three major reasons: (1) it is extremely difficult for the Department to access enough information to accurately determine a person's current financial health; (2) when a property owner does provide the Department with personal financial information, that information may be made public; and (3) the factor has historically made it difficult for the Department to assess more than the statutory minimum penalty, even in cases of extreme environmental harm.

Staff's first concern is that the "ability to pay" factor places a burden on the Department to present sufficient evidence for the Planning Board or a court to determine that a person has the resources to pay the assessed penalty. Without the cooperation of the alleged violator, however, the Department is limited to doing so with publicly-available information, such as property tax assessments and documents in the land records. These records do not present a complete financial picture, and many alleged violators counter this evidence with often unsubstantiated claims of other financial hardships, which the Department has no ability to disprove.

Staff's second concern is that in certain past cases, property owners have provided the Department, perhaps inadvertently, with highly sensitive personal information in attempting to demonstrate a lack of ability to pay financial penalties. Because enforcement hearings are public, and because the Department's records are subject to the Maryland Public Information Act, Staff is concerned that such information may not be adequately protected from public release in the Department's custody.

Finally, the ability to pay factor often prevents the Department from assessing what it believes to be penalties commensurate with the extent of the forest conservation law violation. When, as is typically the case, the Department has limited evidence of an individual's financial resources, it is more likely to assess a lower penalty. This minimizes the risk that the Department will be expected to have conducted a thorough financial analysis to support its penalty, something it does not have the information or resources to do. However, Staff believes this frustrates the Council's intent to give the Planning Department and Board the ability to assess substantial financial penalties in particularly egregious cases.

¹ . The County Council resolution required the Planning Board to reassess the maximum civil administrative penalty every two years based on the Consumer Price Index for the Washington-Baltimore area. The current maximum civil administrative penalty is \$11.05 a square foot.

CONCLUSION

Staff recommends the Planning Board approve transmittal of the proposed changes to Chapter 22A of the County Code to the President of the Montgomery County Council for introduction as an expedited bill. Staff requests the bill be expedited because it will clarify a problem with the existing forest conservation law and allow for environmentally beneficial projects that demolish structures and return the land to its natural topography to be exempt from submitting a forest conservation plan. There are numerous projects of this type currently in the pipeline, both from public and private entities, and time is of the essence to allow the work to move forward.

Attachment:

A. Proposed changes to Chapter 22A of the County Code



ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND

MEMORANDUM

August 7, 2018

TO: Hans Riemer, President, County Council

FROM: Jennifer A. Hughes, Director, Office of Management and Budget
Alexandre A. Espinosa, Director, Department of Finance

SUBJECT: FEIS for Bill 24-18, Forest Conservation - Amendments

*modified for
KSH for AG*

Please find attached the fiscal and economic impact statements for the above-referenced legislation.

JAH:fz

cc: Bonnie Kirkland, Assistant Chief Administrative Officer
Lisa Austin, Offices of the County Executive
Joy Nurmi, Special Assistant to the County Executive
Patrick Lacefield, Director, Public Information Office
David Platt, Department of Finance
Dennis Hetman, Department of Finance
Trevor Lobaugh, Office of Management and Budget
Felicia Zhang, Office of Management and Budget

Fiscal Impact Statement
Council Bill 24-18 Forest Conservation- Amendments

1. Legislative Summary.

This bill includes minor changes to the County's Forest Conservation Law to clarify sections of the law by using a consistent definition of "tract" between the law and regulation, further clarify the modification to existing development property exemption from submitting a forest conservation plan, create a new exemption from submitting a forest conservation plan for property owners that demolish existing structures and return the land to natural conditions, and remove the ability to pay factor as one factor that must be considered in determining an administrative civil penalty.

2. An estimate of changes in County revenues and expenditures regardless of whether the revenues or expenditures are assumed in the recommended or approved budget. Includes source of information, assumptions, and methodologies used.

This bill would not have a measurable impact on the County government or the Planning Department, either as a result of administrative requirements associated with the implementation of the provisions of the bill, or as a result of its application to County projects.

3. Revenue and expenditure estimates covering at least the next 6 fiscal years.

Not applicable

4. An actuarial analysis through the entire amortization period for each bill that would affect retiree pension or group insurance costs.

Not applicable

5. An estimate of expenditures related to County's information technology (IT) systems, including Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) systems.

Not applicable

6. Later actions that may affect future revenue and expenditures if the bill authorizes future spending.

Not applicable

7. An estimate of the staff time needed to implement the bill.

Not applicable

8. An explanation of how the addition of new staff responsibilities would affect other duties.

Not applicable

9. An estimate of costs when an additional appropriation is needed.

Not applicable

10. A description of any variable that could affect revenue and cost estimates.

Not applicable

11. Ranges of revenue or expenditures that are uncertain or difficult to project.

Not applicable


12. If a bill is likely to have no fiscal impact, why that is the case.

The bill would alter the provisions of the Forest Conservation Law that apply to very narrowly defined types of development activity; such activities are not the type of development undertaken by the County. Forest Conservation Plan applications and fees will still be required.

13. Other fiscal impacts or comments.

14. The following contributed to and concurred with this analysis:

Stan Edwards, Department of Environmental Protection
Mark Pfefferle, Montgomery County Planning Department
Barbara Suter, Department of Permitting Services
Trevor Lobaugh, Office of Management and Budget


Jennifer A. Hughes, Director
Office of Management and Budget

7/25/18
Date

Economic Impact Statement
Bill 24-18 Forest Conservation - Amendments

Background:

Bill 24-18 would exempt from the requirement to submit a Forest Conservation Plan a modification to an existing non-residential developed property if the pending development application does not propose residential uses; exempt from the requirement to submit a Forest Conservation Plan a modification to an existing residential development property if the pending development application does not propose new buildings or parking facilities; exempt from the requirement to submit a Forest Conservation Plan certain demolition projects under certain circumstances; and remove ability to pay as a factor for consideration when assessing an administrative penalty.

1. The sources of information, assumptions, and methodologies used.

- Montgomery County Planning Department, The Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission; Forest Conservation Law Amendments – Modifications Analysis 5/24/2018

According to the Montgomery County Planning Department, there are currently three private sector properties and two to three public sector projects eligible for the proposed exemption from submitting a forest conservation plan.

2. A description of any variable that could affect the economic impact estimates.

As noted in the fiscal impact statement for the bill, the legislation would alter the provisions of the Forest Conservation Law that apply to very narrowly defined types of development activity and such activities are not the type of development undertaken by the County. Forest Conservation Plan applications and fees will still be required. There are no variables that could affect the economic impact estimates from this legislation.

3. The Bill's positive or negative effect, if any on employment, spending, savings, investment, incomes, and property values in the County.

The legislation is not anticipated to have any measurable effect on employment, spending, savings, investment, incomes, or property values in the County as the bill addresses the demolition of existing structures to return land to natural conditions in a small group of narrowly defined types of development activity.

4. If a Bill is likely to have no economic impact, why is that the case?


Please see paragraph 3.

5. The following contributed to or concurred with this analysis:

David Platt, Dennis Hetman – Department of Finance.



Alexandre Espinosa, Director
Department of Finance



Date