

## **Dolan, Mary**

---

**From:** Planning Commission  
**Sent:** Thursday, November 18, 2021 2:03 PM  
**To:** Rose Rosolino  
**Cc:** Brandt, Kimberly G.; Goodfellow, Tim  
**Subject:** RE: Keep Sugarloaf Sugarloaf

Good afternoon:

Thank you for taking the time to express your thoughts on the Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan.

Your comments will be shared with the Planning Commission for their consideration.

Karen L. James  
Administrative Specialist  
Division of Planning & Permitting  
Frederick County Government  
30 North Market Street  
Frederick, Maryland 21701  
301-600-1138

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Rose Rosolino <idinodude@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 16, 2021 2:54 PM  
**To:** Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@FrederickCountyMD.gov>; Council Members <CouncilMembers@FrederickCountyMD.gov>  
**Subject:** Keep Sugarloaf Sugarloaf

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

My name is Rose and I live right near sugarloaf. Please keep it unindustrialized and do not support the commercialization bill. We love our home as it is and do not want it upended. Thank you,

Rose Rosolino

**Dolan, Mary**

---

**From:** Planning Commission  
**Sent:** Thursday, November 18, 2021 2:05 PM  
**To:** James Gunsallus  
**Cc:** Brandt, Kimberly G.; Goodfellow, Tim  
**Subject:** RE: Observations of FCG Planning Commission Meetings - Treasured Sugarloaf

Good afternoon:

Thank you for taking the time to express your thoughts on the Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan.

Your comments will be shared with the Planning Commission for their consideration.

Karen L. James  
Administrative Specialist  
Division of Planning & Permitting  
Frederick County Government  
30 North Market Street  
Frederick, Maryland 21701  
301-600-1138

---

**From:** James Gunsallus <gunsaljm@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 17, 2021 8:36 AM  
**To:** Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@FrederickCountyMD.gov>  
**Cc:** Council Members <CouncilMembers@FrederickCountyMD.gov>  
**Subject:** Observations of FCG Planning Commission Meetings - Treasured Sugarloaf  
**Importance:** High

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Planning Commission and County Council Members,

I have watched all the meetings to date on the Sugarloaf Plan in their entirety. I was very pleased with Mr. Goodfellow's last presentation on Wednesday, 11/10/21. I find it hard to believe any of the Planning Commissioners would ignore any of the facts of the history of the I-270 border, or the logic behind the intent of the long-standing preservation of the Sugarloaf area versus the development to the East of I-270. I was also pleased to hear Tim's findings on the Corridors issues, that he was in touch with the state of Maryland about. There is no plan or funding in place for any of the Natelli properties or I-270 in regards to a future interchange at Park Mills Road.

Ms. Sepe was against the border remaining at I-270. I heard no reason why she thought that. She did redirect the topic to a different border area in the Southwest, previously explained in detail to her, by Mr. Goodfellow in a previous meeting. She continually states she wants to be clear, but then admits she hasn't read or doesn't understand all the documents available to her. I've been retired since August 1<sup>st</sup> and I have read and researched hundreds of pages and many websites since this began, in regards to this subject. If I can understand it, and I make the time to do it, is there something I'm unaware of that prevents the Commission from doing the same? It seems to me comments and questions from the Commissioners, at times, show a lack of working knowledge within the documents of study, specifically the LFMP and Corridors Plans.

Mr. Bowie made a very disturbing statement he would not support any plan that doesn't include development on the West side of I-270. He also stated he did not attend one of the previous meetings, when Mr. Hicks made the motion to put the Thurston Road boundary back to I-270 temporarily. The motion to move the Thurston Road area boundary back to the I-270 boundary as admitted by Mr. Hicks during that meeting, was only due to the media barrage that shed light on the Commissioners lack of attentiveness to the residents' concerns. Ms. Sepe was not in favor of the motion. Mr. Bowie further stated he would not have voted in favor of that either. Is there no regard for what the residents might think or want on the subject? We as stakeholders were under the impression that a fair and balanced process is being followed? Are these comments and concerns falling on deaf ears? It's our expectation that all documents, comments, written or otherwise are being reviewed by all Commissioners, without predetermined decisions being made.

Based on current information and findings, the border of I-270 from the Montgomery County line all the way to the Monocacy River shouldn't need any adjustment for at least 20 years, if at all. I don't understand why the rush to change it now, an established border since it was built. Is there some underlying plan Mr. Natelli may have for his properties he wouldn't achieve if the border remained along I-270, and what is his plan? We as stakeholders demand to know. All of the facts have me believing there is no need for the northern boundary to follow MD80, or the Thurston Road cut-out to exist for decades, if ever. The Thematic Plan on page 40 of the LFMP does show MD80 eventually being connected to US15 sometime in the future. I'm sure that would be based on growth, which should remain at a minimum within the preservation area of Sugarloaf, if the Sugarloaf Plan is adopted with the original proposed border along the I-270 corridor. If MD80 was to become the new boundary, there wouldn't be any "buffer-zone" for the residents along that route and I believe would ruin lives to the point of people being chased off their properties. I-270 provides that "buffer-zone" now and has since it was built. It's easy to see on the Thematic Plan, the change to MD80 would have it as the bisecting roadway between the two Secondary Growth areas of Buckeystown and Adamstown, on the way to the Primary Growth area of the Eastalco property, with a primary growth project of a Multi-Modal Place on the CSX/MARC Rail System adjacent to the Eastalco property. One doesn't need a "crystal ball" to see that MD80 would have to be more than the existing two lanes to support all the new traffic and commerce transportation that would occur. So much for the peaceful preservation of the area! How do you think this will affect the lives of the residents along that route? I would like to know if any of this property along this proposed route is even in a plan to be acquired by anyone at this point to support such a huge undertaking? Reading what is posted on quantumloophole.com, of which Mr. Natelli is a board member and Jan Gardner being quoted on this website about the \$100 million dollar investment by said company, provides no plan, start of any plan or completion dates of any plan. All of this which is decades in the future! Mr. Natelli doesn't live here. It's not HIS community. He is a landowner, but only for the prospect of profit! I hear Ms. Sepe making comments about the Thematic Plan in regards to the Park Mills interchange, to not move the northern boundary back to I-270. I don't hear her making comments about the future of MD80 and how it will affect the lives of the residents along that route, not to mention their property values. I did hear her state how the Commission has to be vigilant in their decisions because of how they will affect the residents and their properties. You can't have it both ways! Is there a genuine concern for the quality of life of the residents and their properties? Why has there not been a motion to move the line back to I-270 in the North? This is not the first misdirection or use of "whataboutisms" when discussing issues with the Sugarloaf Plan. I've noticed more than once, direct contradictions to previous statements made.

Last week, there was a lot of discussion about what the Commissions' rules actually are. I find it frustrating to listen to this and was concerned that appointed officials don't know their own rules. Or at least have the rules in front of them for reference at every meeting. Part of my job responsibilities for the last 44 years were to read for understanding, author, review, edit for correctness and execute hundreds of company procedures, tens of thousands of pages, in the nuclear field for a huge variety of functions in the industry. Our charter was to cause no harm to workers, plant equipment or the public. Our procedures were required to be in our crew possession at all times and able to be quickly referenced during the work at hand. My job depended on me knowing and being able to follow, reference and abide by these documents at all times without hesitation. If myself or any other member of my crew was in doubt, it was all of our responsibilities to STOP immediately until complete understanding was in place. We were not permitted to use the words, "I think". Those are words of doubt! I'm sure the Commissioners rebuttal of this will be that you did stop and not proceed in the face of uncertainty. My observation of this was that you actually fumbled around for over

40 minutes in an attempt to verify what the "rule" actually was, something you all should be aware of, or easily able to quickly reference. At least twice I heard Commissioner Sowell attempt to get everyone back on subject with the business at hand, if you as a Commission were going to actually be a benefit in this endeavor to the residents and landowners. It's obvious to me, as a group, there are those of you, who are definitely not as well versed in the documentation as we the stakeholders would expect. Please make sure these comments are "in the record", just like the meeting minutes and videos are, which can verify my observations.

It is clear to me if someone wanted to be wrapped-up in the hustle-bustle of the East side and all its' development, they have the option to move there. Likewise, those who would prefer the serenity of the country-style environment, without the traffic, chaos and loud noise associated with a developed area, can relocate themselves to the West side. We can all make our own choices. We are concerned some members of the Planning Commission don't appreciate this. If the Commission and/or the County Council chooses to not recognize the I-270 corridor as that which allows the separation of two different lifestyles, one of these lifestyles will be lost forever. As the chipping away occurs over the future decades it eventually becomes unrecognizable as two different sources of those lifestyles with the inherent attributes that made them so appealing in the first place. Only one will survive. Hence, one eventually being totally absorbed or consumed by the other. If the Planning Commission and/or the County Council does not uphold the natural border of the I-270 corridor from the Montgomery County line to the Monocacy River as the permanent border, then they will have removed the choice of the people to enjoy the pleasures and love of the lifestyle that currently exists on the West side.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions you may have.

Regards,  
Jim & Pandora Gunsallus  
3350 Park Mills Road  
412-498-3076

## Dolan, Mary

---

**From:** Planning Commission  
**Sent:** Thursday, November 18, 2021 2:04 PM  
**To:** Maureen Heavner  
**Cc:** Brandt, Kimberly G.; Goodfellow, Tim  
**Subject:** RE: Preserve Sugarloaf Mountain

Good afternoon:

Thank you for taking the time to express your thoughts on the Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan.

Your comments will be shared with the Planning Commission for their consideration.

Karen L. James  
Administrative Specialist  
Division of Planning & Permitting  
Frederick County Government  
30 North Market Street  
Frederick, Maryland 21701  
301-600-1138

---

**From:** Maureen Heavner <moheavner@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 16, 2021 4:51 PM  
**To:** Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@FrederickCountyMD.gov>  
**Subject:** Preserve Sugarloaf Mountain

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Hello,

I moved to the Sugarloaf area in December 1996 because it is rural and beautiful. If I wanted to live amongst commercial properties, industrial properties and huge housing developments, I would have invested in property elsewhere. I know how valuable this region is, especially the Urbana area which is being over-developed and has lost all the attractive things that Frederick County once offered. It is quickly becoming another Germantown with over population, both residential developments and businesses. With this increase come some high prices like, traffic and crime.

In the last 12 years we in the Sugarloaf Conservancy area have had to fight the power company and Old line Arsenal in efforts to keep the landscape, wild life and agricultural undisturbed. It has been exhausting wondering who is trying to backdoor some zoning change to suit their personal agenda or political career. We have had to deal with County Council members trying to be "good ole boys" and try to fast track changes for their friends and for large developers.

During the Covid shutdown thousand of people from around the county and beyond made daily trips to Sugarloaf Mountain to partake in it's beauty. Some days you couldn't even get within a mile of the entrance. Clearly, these area's need to stay intact for the recreational enjoyment of our County. Green space is getting harder and harder to find in Frederick without having to travel 40

minutes away. I'm sure you wouldn't want this happening in your back yard. Especially when you've invested in 25 years in the peace and tranquility of your home.

Best regards,  
Maureen Heavner  
8603 Burnt Hickory Circle  
Frederick, MD 21704  
301-788-8341

**Dolan, Mary**

---

**From:** Planning Commission  
**Sent:** Friday, November 19, 2021 7:28 AM  
**To:** Sarina Mamoon  
**Cc:** Brandt, Kimberly G.; Goodfellow, Tim  
**Subject:** RE: PRESERVE SUGARLOAF MOUNTAIN

Good morning:

Thank you for taking the time to express your thoughts on the Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan.

Your comments will be shared with the Planning Commission for their consideration.

Karen L. James  
Administrative Specialist  
Division of Planning & Permitting  
Frederick County Government  
30 North Market Street  
Frederick, Maryland 21701  
301-600-1138

---

**From:** Sarina Mamoon <sarina.mamoon@icloud.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, November 18, 2021 8:45 PM  
**To:** Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@FrederickCountyMD.gov>  
**Subject:** PRESERVE SUGARLOAF MOUNTAIN

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

PRESERVE SUGARLOAF MOUNTAIN

We, the undersigned, support the open, public, and transparent development of a comprehensive plan for the Sugarloaf region. This plan should have the purpose of preserving the character of Sugarloaf Mountain, its surrounding area, and the precious natural resources of the region. We believe that the Sugarloaf plan should preserve the current character and use of the Sugarloaf area, including all the area to the west of I-270 from the Monocacy Battlefield National Park to the Montgomery County line. Preserving current land use includes continuing the commercial activities already in existence in the vicinity of the I-270 / Rt. 80 interchange.

We, the undersigned, oppose the attempted de facto creation of additional commercial and industrial activity to the west of I-270 at Thurston Rd. We call on the Planning Commission and County Council to keep the plan boundary adjacent to the I-270 / Rt 80 interchange at its initial location along I-270.

We, the undersigned, support the long held delineation where intensive residential, commercial and industrial development is limited to the east of I-270 and the bucolic character of agricultural and conservation lands are preserved to the west of I-270. The Sugarloaf planning area should include the lands between I-270 and Route 80 from Urbana to the Monocacy Battlefield. Inclusion of these areas will further protect and meet the county's long-range vision for the preservation and protection of the natural resources and rural landscape of the Sugarloaf Area and the vicinity of the nearby Monocacy Battlefield National Park.

---

The Sugarloaf Alliance represents a broad range of stakeholders in the Sugarloaf region. The Alliance's mission is to protect the unique natural and historical aspects of the Sugarloaf Mountain area and its environment through education and initiatives in support of watersheds, streams, meadows, forests, and historic sites. Working with volunteers, civic groups, and local, state, and federal agencies, the organization's primary goal is to preserve the unique character and serenity of the area for future generations. Sugarloaf Alliance is a 501(c)(3) organization.



**Dolan, Mary**

---

**From:** Planning Commission  
**Sent:** Monday, November 29, 2021 7:39 AM  
**To:** Laura Eisenhuth  
**Cc:** Brandt, Kimberly G.; Goodfellow, Tim  
**Subject:** RE: Protect Sugarloaf

Good morning:

Thank you for taking the time to express your thoughts on the Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan.

Your comments will be shared with the Planning Commission for their consideration.

Karen L. James  
Administrative Specialist  
Division of Planning & Permitting  
Frederick County Government  
30 North Market Street  
Frederick, Maryland 21701  
301-600-1138

---

**From:** Laura Eisenhuth <le9035@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, November 26, 2021 6:34 PM  
**To:** Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@FrederickCountyMD.gov>  
**Cc:** Council Members <CouncilMembers@FrederickCountyMD.gov>  
**Subject:** Protect Sugarloaf

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Planning Commission and Council Members,

I oppose the attempted de facto creation of additional commercial and industrial activity to the west of I-270 at Thurston Rd.

Please keep Sugarloaf area persevered. Protecting our lands keeps Frederick County's charm and enhances the environment for residents and tourists.

Signed,

Laura Eisenhuth

Ballenger Creek Homeowner

## Dolan, Mary

---

**From:** Planning Commission  
**Sent:** Friday, November 19, 2021 2:08 PM  
**To:** SHARON DOOLEY  
**Cc:** Brandt, Kimberly G.; Goodfellow, Tim  
**Subject:** RE: Sugarloaf Conservation

Good afternoon:

Thank you for taking the time to express your thoughts on the Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan.

Your comments will be shared with the Planning Commission for their consideration.

Karen L. James  
Administrative Specialist  
Division of Planning & Permitting  
Frederick County Government  
30 North Market Street  
Frederick, Maryland 21701  
301-600-1138

---

**From:** SHARON DOOLEY <sharondooley@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Friday, November 19, 2021 11:58 AM  
**To:** Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@FrederickCountyMD.gov>  
**Subject:** Sugarloaf Conservation

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Sharon Kay Dooley  
6250 Glen Valley Terrace, Unit B  
Frederick MD 21701

November 19, 2021

Members of The Frederick County Planning Commission: (by email)

I moved to Frederick County in 2019 after many decades of living in Montgomery County. While there, I was an advocate for the Agricultural Reserve, the Ten Mile Creek, and its watershed, as well as for the protection of lands surrounding Sugarloaf Mountain. I spoke out against the proposed meg-church that would have abutted Sugarloaf on the Frederick side of the county several years ago. Sadly, now we see development threatening those protected areas once again.

I look at Urbana and see a community that has developed according to a planned model. I think Mr. Natelli has channeled his vision well there. However, I take exception to the ideas he and others have espoused that would throw away over fifty years of careful planning to limit development in that area to land east of 270 and, instead cross over the highway and build.. There are, as I understand it, still

many acres of land on the east side, zoned for growth, but not yet utilized. (And, admittedly, I am new here, but that is my sense of the issue.)

Planners rightly decided long ago to restrict water and sewer and, consequently, development west of the highway. Only a few short miles away is Sugarloaf Mountain, its watershed and the conservation area, long protected. In Montgomery County, we fought long and hard against encroachment on the reserve, or as some called it, death by a thousand cuts—you know, just a bit here now and then more, later. Any development in these areas will damage forests and negatively impact watersheds and natural habitats.

This county has protected these lands for over fifty years. Please continue to protect them for fifty more or even for a century, so my grandchildren and others can continue to enjoy what nature has given us.

Thank you for consideration of my views.

Sharon Kay Dooley

[sharondooley@comcast.net](mailto:sharondooley@comcast.net)

301-704-3953

## Dolan, Mary

---

**From:** Planning Commission  
**Sent:** Monday, November 29, 2021 1:17 PM  
**To:** Suzanne Sella  
**Cc:** Brandt, Kimberly G.; Goodfellow, Tim  
**Subject:** RE: Sugarloaf Mountain project

Good afternoon:

Thank you for taking the time to express your thoughts on the Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan.

Your comments will be shared with the Planning Commission for their consideration.

Karen L. James  
Administrative Specialist  
Division of Planning & Permitting  
Frederick County Government  
30 North Market Street  
Frederick, Maryland 21701  
301-600-1138

---

**From:** Suzanne Sella <thesellas@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, November 29, 2021 11:58 AM  
**To:** Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@FrederickCountyMD.gov>  
**Subject:** Sugarloaf Mountain project

**[EXTERNAL EMAIL]**

Dear Commissioners, I am in support of the changes as explained to me by the Sugarloaf Alliance. There should be no more development to surrounding areas such as Peters Road, especially. There is a little gem of peace and tranquility here. One day I was riding back there on Peters Rd and I came upon a young man relaxing on a folding chair in the middle of Bennett Creek. I stopped and asked if he was fishing. He said no, he was a recently discharged Marine and was just enjoying the safety and peacefulness of the water, birds, and no traffic! I rode on. Please don't ruin this area with development and more car traffic. Thank you.

Suzanne Sella  
formally a resident of 119 Lynn St. Frederick.  
240-529-6760

## Dolan, Mary

---

**From:** Planning Commission  
**Sent:** Thursday, November 18, 2021 2:06 PM  
**To:** kristen morrison  
**Cc:** Brandt, Kimberly G.; Goodfellow, Tim  
**Subject:** RE: Sugarloaf Mt

Good afternoon:

Thank you for taking the time to express your thoughts on the Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan.

Your comments will be shared with the Planning Commission for their consideration.

Karen L. James  
Administrative Specialist  
Division of Planning & Permitting  
Frederick County Government  
30 North Market Street  
Frederick, Maryland 21701  
301-600-1138

---

**From:** kristen morrison <gallery.east1@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 17, 2021 2:42 PM  
**To:** Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@FrederickCountyMD.gov>  
**Subject:** Sugarloaf Mt

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

My name is Kristen Morrison and I live at 1820 Mt Ephraim Road  
Adamstown, MD 21710

Many thanks to the Planning Commission and to everyone who has participated in the drafting of the Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Plan. Sugarloaf Mountain is and always has been an integral part of my life. I can't imagine having more urban sprawl and what that degradation would do to our farm lands, the view shed, our pristine water ways and the fragile ecosystem that this unfettered growth would bring to our beloved mountain area. So much has already been lost and I sincerely ask the Planning Board to please keep these environments and the surrounding areas up to Monocacy Battlefield protected by placing a permanent protective boundary line at 270 from the Monocacy Battlefield to the Montgomery County Line. Hold the Line!

Kristen Morrison  
1820 Mt Ephraim Road  
Adamstown, MD 21710

## Dolan, Mary

---

**From:** Planning Commission  
**Sent:** Thursday, November 18, 2021 2:04 PM  
**To:** Sasha Carrera  
**Cc:** Brandt, Kimberly G.; Goodfellow, Tim  
**Subject:** RE: Sugarloaf Plan

Good afternoon:

Thank you for taking the time to express your thoughts on the Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan.

Your comments will be shared with the Planning Commission for their consideration.

Karen L. James  
Administrative Specialist  
Division of Planning & Permitting  
Frederick County Government  
30 North Market Street  
Frederick, Maryland 21701  
301-600-1138

---

**From:** Sasha Carrera <sasha.carrera@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 16, 2021 4:17 PM  
**To:** Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@FrederickCountyMD.gov>  
**Subject:** Sugarloaf Plan

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Dear Frederick County Planning Commission,

I have been advised to send letters to you, rather than the County Council until after you've made your recommendation. However, I fear we will have quite a battle on our hands and pre-emptive noise will be useful. That said, I submit this letter to you in advance of my submission to the Council.

This month, more than 100 world leaders pledged to end deforestation at the COP26, because they recognize the imperative for creating a greener earth. Why, then, would Frederick County endanger the very "treasured" area, west of I-270 by opening it up to development? We all know that once one developer's foot is in the door, more will follow, and this slippery slope will become acres of development of one kind or another.

Buildings, both residential and commercial, are responsible for 40% of U.S. carbon emissions. (Environmental Land Energy Study Institute). Moreover, they use approximately 40% of our national total energy plus another 8-11% for their construction (U.S. Energy Information Administration). Why would you undermine this plan that purports to protect and preserve our land and our ecology by opening it up to potential development? Destroying our green areas, killing vegetation and trees first wipes out the Earth's natural system of cleaning the air and cooling the earth. Then covering the land with concrete and asphalt throws toxic chemicals into the air (released in catastrophic amounts as the climate warms) and traps that heat in the Earth so that it stays warmer for longer. (Report from 2020 study published in *Science Advances* as reported by CNBC Sept. 2,

2020.) In addition, the lack of vegetation prevents rainwater from being filtered through the soil and instead runs straight into our waterways -- along with all the contaminants it picks up along the way -- posing one of the most harmful sources of pollution to the Chesapeake Bay Watershed (Chesapeake Bay Foundation). This is the antithesis of the COP26 recommendations for saving our planet. If anything, you should be expanding the protected area the entire length of I-270, which, for at least half a century has always been the understanding for this area and the tacit contract between the county and its residents.

Since before 1970, I-270 has been the dividing line to ensure the protection of this unique, natural environment: Bennett's Creek corridor, Sugarloaf Mountain and the Monocacy River. As Tim Goodfellow elucidated in his Planning Commission Report of 11/10/21, every single plan since 1970 has included this demarcation to preserve this area, because until now, it has been *truly* treasured for its historical and environmental significance.

By disrespecting the traditional I-270 boundary, you risk all 17,600 acres proposed for the Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Plan for one non-resident developer's interest in 490 acres. By reinstating the original I-270 boundary to include Hope Hill all the way to the Monocacy, you preserve the important and all-too-often overlooked history of the Black and African American families in this area and you preserve the environmental and aesthetic integrity of the historic Monocacy Battlefield. Respecting the traditional I-270 boundary honors not only the land, but those who have cared for it in the past as well as generations to come who will enjoy its history, its beauty and who will rely on its role in healing the planet. Certainly, a healthier way to grow the county would be in revitalizing and rebuilding areas already ruined by concrete and asphalt (e.g., the languishing Golden Mile) or by using the 15,000 acres east of I-270 already designated for development.

Sincerely,  
Alexandra Carrera

*Be gentle, breathe deep, drink a glass of water.*

*Thespian* Season 1 & 2

<https://www.youtube.com/c/ThespianSeries>

[imdb.me/sashacarrera](https://www.imdb.com/name/nm1031144/)

## Dolan, Mary

---

**From:** Mary Posey <mllposey@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 16, 2021 11:47 AM  
**To:** Planning Commission  
**Cc:** Brandt, Kimberly G.; Goodfellow, Tim; Keegan-Ayer, MC; Blue, Michael; Dacey, Phil; Hagen, Kai; Donald, Jerry; McKay, Steve; Fitzwater, Jessica; Gardner, Jan; Jenkins, Chuck (Sheriff); Winslow Burhans; Miller Bob (Frederick); Tim@wfmd.com; Frank Mitchell - WFMD; City Desk; tbaratko@newspost.com  
**Subject:** Re: We have a "process" problem and it's not Kai Hagen...

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Greetings,

I would like to have some guidance regarding public comment and our Planning Commission. As you wrote, Ms. James, my comments "will be shared with the Planning Commission for their consideration". How will my comments be shared? I have reviewed the FCG website here ---

> <https://www.frederickcountymd.gov/8046/Sugarloaf-Area-Plan>

I do not see my comments included in the link titled "Public Comments as of November 9, 2021". When will my emails appear on the website?

Also, my experience with the County Council has been helpful in that not only are LIVE virtual public comments accepted, one can leave a pre-recorded message that is played during public comment time. I appreciate that - it makes up just a little bit for the sad reality that Winchester Hall is still closed for citizens to come in and give public comments.

I had to leave town last Wed, Nov 10 but saw the Planning Commission meeting in the morning where it was announced that one could call ahead to leave public comment - and so I did. When I returned home and was able to catch the LIVE public comments, my recorded comment was not played. I kept waiting and waiting but it was never played.

Is it the intent of the Planning Commission to only play LIVE public comments



during that portion of the meeting? If that is the case, I believe it should be announced that you can leave a recorded public comment BUT it will not be played aloud. Had I known that you would not play recorded comments, I would have called in during the LIVE portion (I was happy I made it back in time to hear the LIVE comments). Any chance my public comment was *purposefully* not played because at this point, nothing would surprise me about the "process".

This issue is too important to force citizens into a virtual public comment participation practice. At the very least, you should open the first floor hearing room for the **Public Hearing** hosted by the Planning Commission on the Sugarloaf draft plan. You could require people to present a vaccination card - heck, require folks to have THREE vaccine doses. Require masks - this isn't rocket science! Limit the room to 50 people. Why on earth would you continue to box out the public?

Look to the central office and our BoE - they open their meetings for folks and require the limited number of participants to wear a mask. I'm not suggesting anything outlandish here! I've been to the Lincoln Theater for a concert and I'm heading to one at the 930 Club later this month - both packed house concerts with masks and vaccine cards required. I went to the Laver Cup in Boston at TD Gardens for an entire weekend at the end of September - a packed house with masks and vaccine cards required. Easy Peasy! But I can't walk into Winchester Hall and give 3 minutes of public comment. Heck, require the citizens to LEAVE THE HEARING ROOM once they have given public comment!

Our County Executive has said for decades the public process and public hearings are "Democracy in Action". Now all we have is Darkness in Action and Silence in Action. This is a Disgrace in Action and there is ZERO respect for the citizens of this county keeping everyone locked out of the building.

Mary Posey

On Wed, Nov 10, 2021 at 10:22 AM Mary Posey <[mllposey@gmail.com](mailto:mllposey@gmail.com)> wrote:

Much appreciated. It is a pleasure to be a part of the process.

Best,  
Mary Posey

On Wed, Nov 10, 2021 at 7:35 AM Planning Commission <[PlanningCommission@frederickcountymd.gov](mailto:PlanningCommission@frederickcountymd.gov)> wrote:

Good morning:

Thank you for taking the time to express your thoughts on the Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan.

Your comments will be shared with the Planning Commission for their consideration.

Karen L. James

Administrative Specialist

Division of Planning & Permitting

Frederick County Government

30 North Market Street

Frederick, Maryland 21701

301-600-1138

---

**From:** Mary Posey <[mllposey@gmail.com](mailto:mllposey@gmail.com)>

**Sent:** Tuesday, November 9, 2021 3:31 PM

**To:** Planning Commission <[PlanningCommission@FrederickCountyMD.gov](mailto:PlanningCommission@FrederickCountyMD.gov)>

**Cc:** Keegan-Ayer, MC <[MCKeegan-Ayer@FrederickCountyMD.gov](mailto:MCKeegan-Ayer@FrederickCountyMD.gov)>; Blue, Michael <[MBLue@FrederickCountyMD.gov](mailto:MBLue@FrederickCountyMD.gov)>; Dacey, Phil <[PDacey@FrederickCountyMD.gov](mailto:PDacey@FrederickCountyMD.gov)>; Hagen, Kai <[KHagen@FrederickCountyMD.gov](mailto:KHagen@FrederickCountyMD.gov)>; Donald, Jerry <[JDonald@FrederickCountyMD.gov](mailto:JDonald@FrederickCountyMD.gov)>; McKay, Steve <[SMcKay@FrederickCountyMD.gov](mailto:SMcKay@FrederickCountyMD.gov)>; Fitzwater, Jessica <[JFitzwater@FrederickCountyMD.gov](mailto:JFitzwater@FrederickCountyMD.gov)>; Gardner, Jan <[JGardner@FrederickCountyMD.gov](mailto:JGardner@FrederickCountyMD.gov)>; Jenkins, Chuck (Sheriff) <[CJenkins@FrederickCountyMD.gov](mailto:CJenkins@FrederickCountyMD.gov)>; Winslow Burhans <[Winslow.burhans@burhanscabinetco.com](mailto:Winslow.burhans@burhanscabinetco.com)>; Miller Bob (Frederick) <[bob@wfmd.com](mailto:bob@wfmd.com)>; [Tim@wfmd.com](mailto:Tim@wfmd.com); Frank Mitchell - WFMD <[frank@wfmd.com](mailto:frank@wfmd.com)>; City Desk <[citydesk@newspost.com](mailto:citydesk@newspost.com)>; [tbaratko@newspost.com](mailto:tbaratko@newspost.com)

**Subject:** We have a "process" problem and it's not Kai Hagen...

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

[https://frederick.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?view\\_id=10&clip\\_id=8367](https://frederick.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?view_id=10&clip_id=8367)

Time mark 04:55-21:55

Greetings,

I've been reviewing some county meetings that I missed over the last several weeks. I listened with interest to the planning commissioners on Oct 20th - see link above and time marks. It pains me to come to the defense of Kai Hagen's involvement in this issue (he surely doesn't need my help) - but this goes way beyond Kai Hagen's voiced concerns even if he is a sitting council member.

So apparently during tomorrow's planning commission meeting, there will be a discussion on sending a letter to the county council basically asking them to stay out of the discussion for now re: the draft Sugarloaf plan. See agenda link below:

<https://www.frederickcountymd.gov/ArchiveCenter/ViewFile/Item/12867>

The act of Kai Hagen sending an email (as mentioned by Ms. Brandt during the 10/20 planning commission mtg) ruffled some feathers because the "process" involves the planning commission getting first dibs on an issue then it goes to the county council (believe, I know how it rolls).

One of the planning commissioners in the video link refers to the "Noise" from the public and I guess the dots are connected to blame Kai for alerting constituents that this is an issue to watch. The planning commission likely received a petition organized by Kai Hagen with over a 1000 signatures and these few citizen communications between 10/9 and 11/1 (see link below):

<https://www.frederickcountymd.gov/DocumentCenter/View/334397/Sugarloaf-Public-Comments-110121>

and the few citizen communications in the link above are "NOISE" ? Also, Ms. Brandt mentioned an email from Kai but I don't see it included in the document above - why is that? His communication IS part of the "process" so if his email was sent between 10/9 and 11/1, you've interfered with the process yourselves.

I would also like to note that one of the emails in the document above pertains to the difficulty in following this "process" because the public is denied access to Winchester Hall for public meetings. The situation is pathetic for citizens who wish to follow discussions and give public comments in person. I have been dropped from calls waiting in the queue, have heard all kinds of feedback while calling from my phone and most recently was put on hold for 5 minutes to give public comment because the "system was spinning" or so we were told. Open the building sooner than Jan 1st - PLEASE!!

Back to Kai Hagen, in all honesty, I could count on maybe 3 fingers the number of times I've agreed with his politics - that's fine - I still want to hear what he has to say. I want to hear what ALL of our elected reps have to say, "proces" be darned! I wish more of our council members were vocal on the Sugarloaf plan, be it on social media, in council member comments, calls into radio... but no, we have to follow a "process" and the people we vote into office are supposed to be quiet until it's their turn to speak?

The only reason I knew about waste to energy in early 2007 was because Kai Hagen brought it to the public's attention. Even IF Kai and I ended up on the

extreme opposite sides of the discussion, he's the reason I knew about it from the beginning. So I applaud him for letting the public know about the great vanishing trick that took place this year while entering Winchester Hall and still is forbidden to the citizens. Read on...

This document is sorely lacking when it comes to the "process".

<https://www.frederickcountymd.gov/DocumentCenter/View/334193/1026-CE-Memo-Sugarloaf-Process-and-Roles-102421?fbclid=IwAR3HfD780CUtGAsqND9-aN8FZCyWeJOHxRafx1G8lok6peKAYhO2TbEIAtM>

THIS is a significant part of the "process" that has both conservatives and liberals up in arms about the Sugarloaf plan - it has NOTHING to do with Kai Hagen except that he's the one who shed light on it and in his words from social media:

----> It does not mention the March draft that was pulled or the changes that were made during the roughly five months the release of the draft was delayed, presumably or primarily to make those changes.

Please note that while I was not pleased with the fact that the imminent release of the earlier draft (in early March) was delayed, for months, with no real explanation, AND I have been opposed to one significant change that occurred during that time (the removal of hundreds of acres from the planning area near the interchange of I270 and Route 80), until the draft was handed off to the Frederick County Planning Commission, those decisions were entirely within the legal process and the purview of the administration.

**Also this from Kai Hagen on social media:** More information:

1) Between the time that the Sugarloaf Stakeholders' Advisory Group last saw the draft plan and before the draft plan's publication (more than a year into the planning process) almost 500 acres of fields and forest west of I-270 at Thurston Road were removed from both the planning area and the conservation-focused overlay district.

2) Also west of I-270, there is a significant tract of farms and forest that was not included in the Sugarloaf planning area and the conservation-focused overlay district, despite Advisory Committee member comments that it should be included.

- The area is comprised of forests, farms, hills, and streams, and includes a thickly forested stretch on the east side of the Monocacy Scenic River.
- It is adjacent to Hope Hill, a historic African-American community built largely by formerly enslaved persons.
- It is adjacent to the scenic and popular Monocacy National Battlefield Park, where further encroaching development would severely compromise the view-shed and the park experience. All of the land on the west side of the battlefield park is intensively developed.
- The area is solidly connected to the current northwestern boundary of the Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan's planning area and the new, conservation-focused Sugarloaf Rural Heritage Overlay Zoning District. It is bordered by I-270 to the east, which is a line the county has informally recognized and respected, for decades, as a dividing line between the developed and developing landscape east of the highway, and the rural landscape, forests and farms west of the highway.

Thank you for your help in preserving this environmentally and historically important area of Frederick County. <-----

I suggest the planning commission spend very little time on a discussion tomorrow about a letter to the council that will basically say tell Kai Hagen to stay in his lane. I see that Kathy Mitchell is going to advise the planning commission on this letter. Please don't waste everyone's time.

If anyone is truly worried about the "process", maybe ask County Executive Jan Gardner to use one of her public information briefings on a Thursday (maybe this Thursday) to tell all of us what happened in the "process" when the draft was pulled in March for FIVE MONTHS only to be unveiled with 500 acres messed with! Who did that? Why did this happen? Explain that "process"! Maybe then all the NOISE will go away when citizens are told the truth.

It takes A LOT for conservatives and liberals alike to join together on an issue. You can clean this up now by telling all of us what really happened.

This county has had a lot of "process" problems under a Gardner administration through the years.

How about that "process" when the Gardner administration interfered with the New Market elections? I'm sure our New Market elected representatives are still stinging over that one. Does our county executive still give them the runaround on anything they would like to do for their constituents?

How about that "process" when the Gardner administration interfered with Frederick City's Northern Annexations?

How about that "process" when we all woke up one morning to a public information briefing that our Sheriff's Department was getting audited? No courtesy of a word to Sheriff Chuck beforehand....

How about that "process" with our Board of Health - yeah the one that's made up of 8 politicians and a doctor. We'll get a week's notice for a discussion re: a mask mandate if more magic covid numbers are reached.

Oh, and this - 20 years ago! Some "process", eh?

[https://www.fredericknewspost.com/archives/mosque-proponents-cry-foul/article\\_52048605-9083-5e23-bf44-5564b9a0d51c.html](https://www.fredericknewspost.com/archives/mosque-proponents-cry-foul/article_52048605-9083-5e23-bf44-5564b9a0d51c.html)

Yeah, we have a "process problem" alright, but it ain't Kai Hagen. The buck stops with our county executive on the case of the altered 500 acres that took place under a cloak of darkness in a locked-down Winchester Hall. Mary Posey