

Frederick Master Plan is a significant time into the future and certainly does not justify carving out land now from the Sugarloaf Plan area. At this time the most rational thing to do is to leave the suggested cutout within the current Sugarloaf Plan boundary as conservation/agricultural zoning which will protect it from piecemeal development.

To more comprehensively consider the uncertain future of the I-270 corridor and the Urbana region, the boundary of the Sugarloaf Plan must be extended from the Montgomery County boundary to the Monocacy River with I-270 as its eastern border. This excludes the areas already zoned Commercial at the I-270/MD 80 interchange.

The Livable Frederick Master Plan prioritizes the areas in the County for growth on pages 39-45, **NOT** just page 45, as Mr. Dean suggests in his letter. Urbana is at the end of the line. The Livable Frederick Master Plan states:

“The Primary Growth Sector is composed of land in and around Frederick City, including the Frederick City Growth Area, the Ballenger Creek Community Growth Area, the South Frederick Community Growth Area, and lands along major infrastructure corridors in the southern portion of the county that connect to regional employment centers. These include the Eastalco Growth Area, the Brunswick Community Growth Area, the Point-of-Rocks Community Growth Area, and ***[finally!]*** the Urbana Community Growth Area, and the I-270 Growth Area.”(pg. 39)

The Livable Frederick Master Plan emphasizes “... major developed areas in the county that have significant access to infrastructure and services-areas where there is a high potential for development patterns that support multi-modal accessibility, and where a significant share of development may occur through infill and redevelopment strategies.” (pg. 39)

After the Central Districts of the City of Frederick, the South Frederick Triangle, and Ballenger Creek are listed for priority development, the existing multi-modal rail corridor areas come next including the Eastalco Growth Area, the Monocacy MARC Station, the Downtown Frederick Center, South Ballenger Creek, Brunswick, and Point of Rocks.

The area without transit and infrastructure logically comes last: the I-270 Corridor, including the Urbana Community Growth Area.

Development in the I-270 Corridor is based on the availability of rapid transit plus other intensive infrastructure. Any reasonable estimate of the availability of rapid transit, as envisioned in the Livable Frederick Master Plan, is decades or longer away. A few commuter buses on congested I-270 and MD 355 to the Urbana Park and Ride lots do not constitute “a practical and affordable transit line.”

Transit is certainly far into the future. The ongoing Montgomery County general plan update, “Strive 2050,” clearly suggests the developed area in Montgomery County ends at Clarksburg and is hardly transit serviceable. The Montgomery County agricultural preservation area and very large lot residential development borders Clarksburg and extends to the Frederick County line. A fair reading of both the “Strive 2050” draft General Plan and the draft “Corridor Forward 2040” transit plan (both alluded to in the Sugarloaf Plan) suggests that Montgomery County is not supportive of a continuation of the I-270 Technology Corridor beyond Clarksburg.

The Montgomery County “Corridor Forward-2040” draft transit plan suggests that the expansion of the MARC commuter rail to Frederick is much more likely than either a monorail or a Bus Rapid Transit in the I-270 Corridor. These are important considerations since any expansion of transit to Frederick from the Washington area must pass through Montgomery County.

The Governor’s Managed Lanes Study from I-495 to Frederick, including HOT lanes and Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), is currently underway. But with lukewarm support in the region and outright opposition from the Montgomery County Executive, and only a year left in the current Governor’s term, it is fair to say that the future of that study is questionable.

No multimodal transit development at the existing Urbana interchange or at possible future Parks Mill or Mott Road interchanges should be considered based on a study, like the Governor’s Managed Lanes Study, the continuation and outcomes

of which are so tenuous. At the very least any approval of multimodal-based development in Urbana should only take place once construction of a dedicated lane BRT to Frederick is approved and funded. This is decades into the future, similar to other promises of improvements in the I-270 Corridor.

Frederick County must prioritize planning and development as the Livable Frederick Plan outlines. Frederick County cannot support development in all the potential development areas at once.

Development in and around Frederick and along the existing rail corridors must receive priority.

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

From: [Steve Poteat](#)
To: [Council Members](#)
Subject: Additional Comments on the Sugarloaf Plan
Date: Monday, September 12, 2022 8:13:46 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Statement to Frederick County Planning Commission Support the Sugarloaf Rural Heritage Overlay Zoning District

After your many months of deliberation, the Planning Commission has finally reached the most important issue in the Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan, the Sugarloaf Rural Heritage Overlay Zoning District. This is where you rise above the myriad individual pieces of the plan and consider the plan as a whole. This is where you realize the whole is greater than the sum of its parts.

My family has had the privilege of living in the Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape for almost 70 years on the southeast side of the mountain. Five generations have had the opportunity to drink the pure water that flows from the forested mountain side, to enjoy the smell of freshly cut hay as we're stacking bales in the barn, to watch steam rising from the cows' backs in winter, to consume the fresh vegetables from our gardens, to observe the return of the black bear, wild turkeys, coyotes and white-tailed deer, to listen to the song birds, to be warmed by our wood stoves from oak beyond its prime, and to trace the red and gold sunsets over the top of the mountain as the seasons change. Yes, we, too, have enjoyed the views from the top of Sugarloaf Mountain as Sugarloaf's Gordon Strong noted in his will: "...*we incline to believe that, when anyone stands on the summit of the mountain, the sheer cliff hanging over the wild and wooded slopes below, looking out over the peaceful and lovely Frederick valley, and showing Catoctin and Blue Ridge rising to meet the lowering sun, for a moment at least he experiences an inspiration, a moral uplift.*" (Page 42)

The Overlay Zoning District is in your hands now. Starting with Gordon Strong, who wanted to preserve 10,000 acres, others - individuals, families, organizations and governments - have worked hard to preserve the essential heart and soul of the whole of the Sugarloaf region. Collectively they are preserving farmlands, privately managing forest lands, establishing private preservation easements, challenging incompatible and destructive land uses, acquiring wildlife management areas, and urging and advocating for the natural and logical open space preservation opportunities.

We and many of our neighbors will support you in the application of the Overlay Zoning District to the entire planning area. Some will question your action, but please don't forget that the Sugarloaf region is an irreplaceable and treasured landscape. To repeat, the whole is greater than the sum of the parts. The Overlay Zoning District is the capstone in this effort to protect and preserve its future.

As Gordon Strong said about the mountain: "*It will offer this beauty not only in intimate glimpses, but in long vistas, and in out-stretching views. From the summit of the mountain, these views have the character of being from the top of the world, over a varied and beautiful world below. If view and beauty have the quality of human inspiration, the outlook from the summit of Stronghold is inspiring.*" (Page 39)

Thank you for your efforts and for considering my comments.

Steve Poteat, Sugarloaf Mountain Road, February 23, 2022

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

From: [Steve Poteat](#)
To: [Council Members](#)
Subject: Comments on Sugarloaf Master Plan
Date: Monday, September 12, 2022 8:40:01 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

October 18, 2021

To: Frederick County Planning Commission

Cc: Frederick County Council
Frederick County Executive

From: Steve Poteat, Urbana District Resident
Member of Sugarloaf Plan Advisory Group

Subject: Comments on the Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan

Let's Preserve the Sugarloaf Triangle

The Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan is an opportunity to preserve and manage a landscape of unique geographic, historical and open space features in Frederick County as well as a large area of mid-Maryland. The logical boundary for this area must be I-270 on the east, to where it meets the Monocacy River, on the northwest to the Potomac River, and then following the Montgomery County Boundary to I-270. This triangular boundary makes sense for the Sugarloaf Region and the Livable Frederick Master Plan.

The Livable Frederick Master Plan suggests that at some point an Urbana Community Growth Area should be considered in the vicinity of the I-270/MD 80 interchange which could incorporate land on the west side of I-270. But this suggestion is premature, inconsistent and incompatible with the current Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan.

Decisions regarding land use and development, whether employment, residential or other, cannot be considered in isolation. All necessary public facilities must be planned and a reasonable funding plan must be identified. A variety of other factors, including changing employment, demographic, and environmental patterns and conditions must be integral to the decisions.

The Urbana Community Growth Area as envisioned in the Livable Frederick Plan would include high density, multi-use development served by multi-modal transit stations. This Growth Area also presumes high density development radiating northward from Montgomery County along the I-270 corridor served by mass transit. It is important to recall that the Livable Frederick Master Plan states on page 45 that the Urbana Community Growth Area, which would be part of the Interstate Corridor, “emphasizes transit-oriented, mixed-use development to be served by a practical and affordable transit line (e.g. , Bus Rapid Transit, Transit-way)...”

The Demise of the I-270 Technology Corridor

This is not happening. On the west side of I-270 there is an 18-mile gap in development between Germantown and Frederick with only a discount retail mall and a jail in Clarksburg. Why, you may ask. A primary reason is that the west side has no interconnected transportation network like MD 355 on the east side. But more importantly, it appears that the heyday of the I-270 Technology Corridor is over, made obsolete by the technologies it was intended to promote. The engine for economic growth in Frederick County is not the I-270 Technology Corridor coming from the south but the robust economic development radiating from Frederick City.

In addition, in the context of changing work and commuting patterns, the shift in employment destinations and cores away from Washington and Baltimore, and the shift from bricks and mortar workplaces to remote, online work from home, the future need for two new I-270 interchanges near Urbana at Park Mills Road and Mott Road is far from certain.

This is not the time to set aside properties for a future Urbana Community Growth Area on the west side of I-270 as has been suggested by some Urbana developers. These developers have provided a good product on the east side of I-270 and have clearly made enormous profits. But now is not the time to urbanize the west side, especially without the public transit additions presumed in the Livable Frederick Plan.

This is the time to maximize the preservation efforts of the Sugarloaf Triangle on the west side of I-270 as part of the Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan.

It may be appropriate to undertake an Urbana Community Growth Area but the time frame is probably 25 years or more in the future based on our region's experience in planning and constructing "practical and affordable transit lines." If the "practical and affordable transit lines" and other necessary infrastructure become available and affordable in the future, we also will have an opportunity to review other changes in society, many as a result of lessons from the Covid 19 pandemic. These changes will include housing choices, education including better use of broadband, the economy, climate and especially employment patterns.

In fact, climate change will be one of the most important factors supporting the preservation and protection of the Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape and other similar areas.

Who knew that Covid 19 would empty the traffic on I-270, or cause 75% of area workers to work from home and not waste their time and energy commuting the various stretches of the I-270 corridor to brick and mortar workplaces. While much pre-pandemic traffic has returned to I-270, workers have had a chance to consider their work/life alternatives, and they are realizing that two hours-plus spent on the road commuting could be better used in personal, family, and community improvement activities. Real changes are already taking place in the "workplace."

The Lack of Practical and Affordable Transit Lines

If and when the "practical and affordable transit lines" are available, we will need to apply the "development staging principles" as outlined in the Livable Frederick Master Plan, page 66. Principle #1, Development Staging indicates that there needs to be "coordination of development with public infrastructure at the comprehensive planning stage....Significant infrastructure needs - including but not limited to schools, roads, water and sewer service, parks, and public safety facilities - shall be identified in the appropriate long range planning documents." And Principle #2, Funding for Infrastructure Improvements, states that "...Both the County and the land development community are responsible for providing the funding necessary for infrastructure improvements in Community Growth Areas."

In other words, development, whether employment, residential or other, cannot be considered in isolation, but all necessary public facilities must be planned

and a reasonable funding plan must be identified. Significant further development, whether residential, or employment or other, cannot be considered in the Sugarloaf Triangle for an Urbana Community Growth Area, especially for the west side of I-270, due to a lack of transportation and other public infrastructure, especially “practical and affordable transit lines.”

The Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Plan notes on page 40 that “For nearly 50 years, Frederick County’s Comprehensive Plans have identified the development potential along the I-270 Corridor as a major component of the County’s future growth.” But the Plan also notes that only a little over 1,000 jobs have materialized in the area between the Montgomery County line and the fringes of Urbana during those 50 years. Despite developers’ best efforts only Kite Pharma has suggested 200-400 jobs in Urbana and the two existing data centers employ only a few dozen people. The swift employment growth promised in the I-270 Corridor from Montgomery County north to Urbana has not materialized. Employment prospects have been so sparse for a major Urbana developer that five years ago he convinced the County to rezone hundreds of acres of employment-zoned land on the east side of I-270 to residential. This situation is reminiscent of the planner’s aphorism, “you can zone it gold mines but it don’t make it so.”

The Impact of the Pandemic

The concept of the I-270 Corridor is changing right before our eyes, and even since the adoption of the Livable Frederick Master Plan in 2019 before the Pandemic. The Pandemic has changed our world. Did we ever expect to see the traffic on

I-270 reduced to a trickle as a large part of the economy went on-line? Did we ever expect to see so much of our economy go on-line so quickly? Did we realize our work force could be so flexible or experience so many resignations as people seek jobs that better support their lives and lifestyles? While some pre-pandemic traffic will return, this will be a temporary phenomenon as many people make permanent work/life adjustments to work primarily from home and avoid two or more hours of commuting time. Many of the brick and mortar employment centers of the I-270 corridor will become a thing of the past.

The Rise of Frederick City

Frederick City is now the central hub of the County’s economic base as we

have less dependence on the I-270 and I-70 Corridors for transportation and employment. As the Livable Frederick Plan notes on page 79, “Intra-commuters” already comprise 46% of commutes, “in-commuters” another 21%, and “out-commuters” just 33% of commutes. We can expect that 33% to significantly reduce over time as more workers adopt online alternatives. The pandemic reduced those “out-commutes” dramatically. This trend has been growing, is supported by the fact that in Frederick County even eight years ago 70% of adults already had broadband at home. That percentage has and will increase as significant public funding becomes available to support further broadband expansion.

As patterns of employment growth in Frederick County continue to shift away from roadway corridors to other places, a logical pattern is developing, growing out from the Frederick City core. The County and State are planning transportation improvements logically where they should - to expand US 15 through and around the city to support that growth. While the State is also suggesting a study of HOV/HOT lanes from I-495 to Frederick, note this is only a study.

Based on past experience, transit to Frederick along the I-270 Corridor, those “practical and affordable transit lines,” are likely a long way off, at least 25-50 years in light of competing transportation needs around the State. The best transit bet for the foreseeable future is upgrading the MARC rail system. The idea stated in the Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan that “future public and private investments in our mobility may encourage the placement of multi-modal transit centers, compact transit-oriented villages, or growth of Urbana’s existing biological and information technology hub along the I-270 corridor” must be placed far into the future. Neither current conditions and infrastructure nor those in the foreseeable future support the withholding of land on the west side of I-270 from the Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan for “placement of multi-modal transit centers and transit-oriented villages” or any other forms of intensive development.

Indefinite Deferral of the Urbana Community Growth Area

Given these rapidly evolving economic, employment, climate and other changes, it is more important than ever to support the preservation of the Sugarloaf Triangle and the logical organic growth of Frederick City. The concept of an Urbana Community Growth Area on the west side of I-270 and exemption of lands on the west side of I-270 from the Sugarloaf Overlay Zone

as a set-aside for some kind of transit-dependent development are premature. All of the Sugarloaf Triangle area west of I-270, including the Urbana interchange at Route 80, should be included or restored to the Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan.

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

From: [Steve Poteat](#)
To: [Council Members](#)
Subject: Comments on Sugarloaf Master Plan
Date: Monday, September 12, 2022 8:38:12 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Testimony on the Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan in support of the proposed Overlay Zone by Steve and Blanca Poteat of Sugarloaf Mountain Road, August 31, 2022

Need for Better Forest Protection – Ode to Trees

We have undertaken three harvest cuts of our 50 acres of woods on Sugarloaf Mountain Road over the past 40 years. During that time we have harvested almost 1,500 trees equaling about 625,000 board feet of lumber. Having taken all the appropriate forestry classes with the Extension Service, we thought we were being good stewards of our woodlands. We have done everything the State and County have required and recommended.

We have had prepared three successive State Forestry Management Plans during these 40 years and paid for annual inspections. We have engaged three separate Maryland approved private registered foresters over these 40 years to mark and inventory all the trees to be cut, prepared detailed harvesting plans with landing yards and skid roads, supervised the timber auctions, contract signings and bond arrangements, developed sediment control plans, and arranged for prereview of the logging operations by the Frederick County Forestry Board. Everything was done by the book.

But we have learned the quality of forest protection all gets down to who signs the contract to harvest the trees and how careful they are in the harvesting. By custom or professional practice our contract forester only reviewed the harvesting perhaps two or three times during the typical three month harvesting period. We learned that enforcing the bond protection requirements is very difficult since the contract forester is more attuned to the “customs” of harvesting and the cutters’ needs than to the necessary level of forest protection. “This is the way it has always been done.” In addition, the Forestry Board has never done a post-harvest inspection.

On the one hand, the forest seems to have benefited by thinning the mature trees. However, on the other hand, the cumulative damage to remaining standing trees along skid roads, exposure and root disturbance at landing areas where the trees are loaded, and injury to other trees struck and damaged by falling cut trees has simply become unacceptable to us, especially as the climate crisis becomes so obvious. We contracted for the harvest cuts before we understood the importance of maintaining mature trees to sequester carbon from the atmosphere.

We don’t blame the current institutions involved in forest land management. They go about their businesses the way they always have, guided by current knowledge. They believe they are doing “right” based on the professional customs of the industry that views trees, forests and timber as commodities rather than as vital resources for dealing with the existential threat of climate change. We predict that in the near future, mature trees will be given endangered species protection so they can help ameliorate climate change.

Our society needs a significant paradigm shift in forest management. The enhanced woodland protection provided by the Overlay Zone in the Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan is a good first step. Let's respect and husband our woodlands as if our lives depend on them, because they do.

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

From: [Steve Poteat](#)
To: [Council Members](#)
Subject: Comments on Sugarloaf Master Plan
Date: Monday, September 12, 2022 8:36:51 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Comments on Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan to the County Council concerning Sugarloaf Thoughts, August 23, 2022

Prepared by Steve Poteat, Sugarloaf Mountain Road

I am concerned about Gordon Strong's vision for Sugarloaf Mountain as outlined in his Will of 89 pages. Gordon Strong had a very strong vision for the Sugarloaf region and not just the mountain. His vision extended to 10,000 acres of mountain and surrounding countryside open space. Of course Strong cannot speak to us today but we have the next best thing, his Will. I urge you to read his Will which I am submitting for the public record on the master plan. I am marking some paragraphs that are especially relevant. Once you read the Will I am sure you would agree that Gordon Strong was an early and dedicated environmentalist who would whole-heartily support and endorse the Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan not only for the mountain but the surrounding area.

Gordon Strong would be surprised at the amount of development encroaching on Sugarloaf Mountain and shocked to learn that probably as many as 500,000 people try to visit Sugarloaf Mountain each year, perhaps as many as 10,000 a weekend, and soaring to probably twice that on some on spring and fall weekends, overwhelming the mountain. Visitors are constantly reminded that they are guests on Gordon Strong's private estate, open to the public. But I suspect that almost everyone views Gordon Strong's Sugarloaf Mountain as simply a beautiful public park to be enjoyed, but not as Strong's household guests. And the pressure to visit grows each year as the combined Washington/Baltimore Metropolitan Areas populations have almost reached 10,000,000 people.

Is this a blessing or a curse that Sugarloaf Mountain faces.

Last night Stronghold's attorney was comparing Sugarloaf Mountain to Camden Yards Stadium in Baltimore. But I think a more reasonable comparison is to a very popular State park. It appears that Stronghold is essentially trying to perform a public State park function on a very inadequate

private budget. Statistically Sugarloaf Mountain looks like a State Park. According to 2020 Annual Report of the Maryland State Parks the average State park has about 287,000 visitors and operates on approximately \$533,000 per year. Apparently this is less than the amount that Stronghold spends each year. I think Stronghold needs to consider the implications of being a de facto State park. Stronghold needs sufficient funding to meet these needs to undertake the several tasks to meet Gordon Strong's objectives moved forward to the 21st century. This would include a study of the realistic holding capacity of visitation to the mountain, a parking study including off-site parking, identification of additional lands to be acquired that are critical to the open space that Gordon Strong envisioned, the need for an adequate level of supervision and/or policing as a park ranger function including mountain climbing monitoring, a plan for modern sanitary facilities and additions to the Board of Directors persons experienced in open space and park management and fund-raising.

These are the steps necessary to bring Sugarloaf Mountain and Stronghold into the 21st century. Gordon Strong would welcome the extra levels of protection that the Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan offers. These actions would help achieve Gordon Strong's goals.

From: [Steve Poteat](#)
To: [Council Members](#)
Subject: Comments on Sugarloaf Master Plan
Date: Monday, September 12, 2022 8:34:18 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Comments on Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan to the County Council concerning Sugarloaf Thoughts, August 23, 2022

Prepared by Steve Poteat, Sugarloaf Mountain Road

Gordon Strong had a very strong vision for the Sugarloaf region and not just the mountain. His vision extended to 10,000 acres of mountain and surrounding countryside open space.

Of course Strong cannot speak to us today but we have his Will. I urge you to read his Will which I am submitting for the public record on the Sugarloaf Plan. Attached are some very relevant passages from the Will.

Once you read the Will I am sure you would agree that Gordon Strong was an early and dedicated environmentalist who would whole-heartedly support and endorse the Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan not only for the mountain but the surrounding area.

Gordon Strong would be shocked to learn that probably as many as 500,000 people try to visit Sugarloaf Mountain each year. Visitors are constantly reminded that they are guests on Gordon Strong's private estate. But I suspect that almost everyone views Gordon Strong's Sugarloaf Mountain as simply a beautiful public park to be enjoyed, but not as Strong's guests.

Last night Stronghold's attorney compared Sugarloaf Mountain to Camden Yards Stadium in Baltimore. But I think a better comparison is to a very popular State park. It appears that Stronghold is essentially trying to perform a public State park function on an inadequate private budget.

Sugarloaf Mountain looks like a very popular State Park. The average State park has about 287,000 visitors and operates on approximately \$533,000 per year. Probably twice the visitors on half the revenue for Sugarloaf Mountain.

I think Stronghold needs to consider the implications of being a "de facto"

State park. Stronghold needs sufficient funding to meet these needs to undertake the several tasks to meet Gordon Strong's objectives moved forward to the 21st century.

This would include a study of the realistic visitor capacity of the mountain, a parking study, identification of additional lands that should be acquired, the need for a park ranger function including mountain climbing monitoring, a plan for modern sanitary facilities and additions to the Board of Directors persons experienced in open space and park management and fund-raising.

These are the necessary steps to bring Sugarloaf Mountain and Stronghold into the 21st century and help achieve Gordon Strong's goals. I am sure Gordon Strong would welcome the extra levels of protection that the Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan offers.

Gordon Strong's Will

Page 39, 3. Stronghold Uses, (8)(c.):

"In short Stronghold will offer to motorists and to residents practically every form of out-of-door-beauty—except that of larger bodies of water. It will offer this beauty not only in intimate glimpses, but in long vistas, and in out-stretching views. From the summit of the mountain, these views have the character of being from the top of the world, over a varied and beautiful world below. If view and beauty have the quality of human inspiration, the outlook from the summit of Stronghold is inspiring."

Page 42, 3. Stronghold Uses, (12)(c.):

"We have no personal experience, no observation of others, on which to base anything like a conclusion. But we incline to believe that, when anyone stands on the summit of the mountain, the sheer cliff hanging over the wild and wooded slopes below, looking out over the peaceful and lovely Frederick valley, and showing Catoctin and Blue Ridge rising to meet the lowering sun, for a moment at least he experiences an inspiration, a moral uplift."

"Page 67, 4. Mountain Slopes, (3.) (a.)

The avoidance or removal of anything detracting from the natural beauty of the woodland has acquired increasing recognition in the management of the national parks. In the case of Stronghold, it is obviously desirable that there

should be no evidences of civilization, either along woodland roads or trails, or appearing in the views from spurs or from the summit. These views should be, as far as possible, first over an unbroken and highly contoured woodland; and beyond, over the more level and cultivated farmlands round-about. The sharper the contrast with the other, the better will each appear.”

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

From: [Steve Poteat](#)
To: [Council Members](#)
Subject: Comments on Sugarloaf Master Plan
Date: Monday, September 12, 2022 8:32:52 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Position on the I-270 Technology Corridor, August 15, 2022

My name is Steve Poteat, I live on Sugarloaf Mountain Road. I think we need to answer the question—Where does the I-270 Technology Corridor exist? Is it both sides of I-270, west side or east side?

The developer lobbied State Department of Commerce comments on the Sugarloaf Plan suggest the I-270 corridor has high importance in the “biotechnology cluster” for the State.

But the I-270 Technology Corridor actually ends at Clarksburg in Montgomery County and for all practical purposes stops in Germantown. There is exactly ONE biotechnology firm from Germantown to Frederick a distance of 25 miles.

Let’s review the west side of I-270. Montgomery County has zoned all the land on the WEST side of I-270 from MD 121 to the county line in Hyattstown as Agriculture Reserve or very low residential density. In this area there are only rural roads, no public water and sewer and no public facilities with the exception of the Montgomery County Detention Center.

In Frederick County land on the WEST side of I-270 from the County line to the Monacacy Battlefield also is zoned low density residential and agriculture with only a two acre plant nursery zoned commercial.

This is clearly not the I-270 Biotechnology Corridor as envisioned by the State, or Frederick County or Montgomery County and mentioned in the Livable Frederick Master Plan.

There are biotechnology firms in Germantown. But along the EAST side of I-270 all the way to Frederick, a distance of 25 miles, there is only one biotechnology firm. Kite Pharmaceuticals, has recently located a manufacturing facility in Urbana.

The remainder of the east side is dominated by a construction companies, heavy equipment parking, a building materials recycling plant, landscape companies, and two federal data centers. All of this is desirable employment but of course not biotechnology as the State desires.

In summary from Clarksburg north the I-270 Corridor only really exists on EAST side of I-270 between MD 355 and I-270.

You should note that the reduced amount of LACK of employment on the east of I-270 was compounded by the fact that Natelli Communities, citing the lack of demand for employment land, had rezoned 250 acres of employment land there, to residential.

That's 4 million square feet of employment development lost, and now Knowledge Farms in Urbana is asking to do the same.

All of this is compounded by the fact that the I-270 Corridor is not scheduled for any transit improvements in the foreseeable future. No transit, no transit oriented development in Urbana.

Let's keep development on the east side of I-270 where it can be managed.

From: [Steve Poteat](#)
To: [Council Members](#)
Subject: Comments on Sugarloaf Master Plan
Date: Monday, September 12, 2022 8:41:46 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

11-7-21 Statement to PC on November 10, 2021

The current Sugarloaf Plan acknowledges a FUTURE Urbana Community Growth Area. This may be the case but that future time frame is certainly a significant distant time away and certainly does not justify carving out land from the Sugarloaf Plan area at this time. At this time the most rational thing to do is to leave the suggested cutout within this current Sugarloaf Plan boundary as conservation/agricultural zoning which will protect it from piecemeal development and allow productive field crops to feed the world as it currently does.

The Livable Frederick Master Plan prioritizes the areas in the County for growth on pages 39-45. Urbana is at the end of the line. The Livable Frederick Plan states “ The Primary Growth Sector is composed of land in and around Frederick City, including the Frederick City Growth Area, the Ballenger Creek Community Growth Area, the South Frederick Community Growth Area, and lands along major infrastructure corridors in the southern portion of the county that connect to regional employment centers. These include the Eastalco Growth Area, the Brunswick Community Growth Area, the Point-of-Rocks Community Growth Area, (and finally!) the Urbana Community Growth Area, and the I-270 Growth Area.”(pg. 39)

The Livable Frederick Plan emphasizes “... major developed areas in the county that have significant access to infrastructure and services-areas where there is a high potential for development patterns that support multi-modal accessibility, and where a significant share of development may occur through infill and redevelopment strategies.” (pg. 39)

After the Central Districts of the City of Frederick, the South Frederick Triangle, and Ballenger Creek are listed for priority development, the existing multi-modal rail corridor areas come next including the Eastalco Growth Area, the Monocacy MARC Station, the Downtown Frederick Center, South Ballenger Creek, Brunswick, and Point of Rocks. The area without transit logically comes last, the I-270 Interstate Corridor, including Urbana Community Area.

And transit is certainly far into the future. The ongoing Montgomery County general plan for the County “Strive 2050” seems to suggest the developed area in Montgomery County ends at Clarksburg and is hardly transit serviceable. The Montgomery County Agricultural Preservation area surrounds Clarksburg. I think it is fair to say Montgomery County is not very supportive of a continuation of the I-270 Technology Corridor beyond Clarksburg. Montgomery County also has a transit master plan underway known as the “Corridor Forward—2040” and I think it is fair to say that the transit plan currently under preparation suggests the expansion of the MARC commuter rail to Frederick is much more likely than either a monorail to Frederick or a Bus Rapid Transit in the I-270 Corridor. These are important considerations since any expansion of transit from the Washington area must pass through Montgomery County.

The Governor’s Managed Lanes Study from I-495 to Frederick Study to including HOT, HOV

and Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) will soon get underway but the future of that study is questionable with only about a year left in the Governor's term. No multi-modal transit development at the Urbana Interchange SHOULD be considered based on a study whose continuation and outcomes are so tenuous. At the very least any approval of multimodal based development in Urbana should only take place once construction of a dedicated lane BRT to Frederick is approved and funded. This is probably decades into the future like all other promises of improvements in the I-270 Corridor.

Frederick County must prioritize its planning and development as the Livable Frederick Plan outlines. Frederick County cannot support development in all the potential development areas at once. Development in and around Frederick and along the existing rail corridors must receive priority.

The border of the Sugarloaf Plan must be extended to I-270 from the Montgomery County boundary to the Monocacy River for the foreseeable future to avoid scattered development at great cost to the County and the Sugarloaf environment.

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

From: [Steve Poteat](#)
To: [Council Members](#)
Subject: Comments on Sugarloaf Plan
Date: Monday, September 12, 2022 8:27:15 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Testimony for the Record on the Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan, June 17, 2022

Prepared by Steve Poteat, 1340 Sugarloaf Mountain Road Frederick County Dickerson, Maryland 20842

Thank you for your detailed discussions on the Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan. As the Planning Commission concludes your work on the Sugarloaf Plan there are three points that should be kept in mind concerning the relationship of the Sugarloaf Plan and I-270 Technology Corridor:

1. No transit, no transit oriented development
2. The I-270 Corridor in the Sugarloaf Plan only exists between I-270 and MD 355 for the foreseeable future
3. Employment development on the east side I-270 should be maximized

-

1. No transit, no transit oriented development: To plan transit oriented development as part of the Sugarloaf Plan on the west side of I-270 at this time is inappropriate and misleading. As reported in the Frederick Post on June 16, 2022, on June 15 the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments voted to approve the Visualize 2045 transportation plan and did not include expansion of I-270 or any plans for transit on I-270. It did include the widening of US 15 through Frederick as well as increasing the frequency and capacity of trips on MARC commuter rail lines including the Brunswick Line that serves stations in Frederick, Brunswick and Point of Rocks. This supports the logical organic development growth around Frederick City and the common sense approach to improving commuter services into DC and the Metro area. There are no programmed improvements to expand I-270, with transit, beyond I-370, south of Gaithersburg. The Maryland Governor's Op Lanes public-private efforts to increase I-270 capacity north of Gaithersburg have been pushed back again to the planning process maelstrom that has been ongoing for at least 50 years. That effort is under legal challenge which could delay the approval of the improvements beyond the term of the existing Governor and put the whole effort in jeopardy. To repeat, No Transit, No Transit Oriented Development.

2. The I-270 Corridor in the Sugarloaf Plan only exists between I-270 and MD 355 for the foreseeable future: The State comments on the Sugarloaf Plan suggest the corridor has high importance in the "biotechnology cluster" being supported by the State. However, the I-270 Technology Corridor ends in Clarksburg but for all practical purposes in Germantown. While there are biotechnology firms in Germantown the areas along the east side of I-270 all the way to Frederick, a distance of 25 miles, only one biotechnology firm, Kite Pharmaceuticals, has recently located a manufacturing facility in Urbana. The remainder of the east side is dominated by a multitude of construction companies, landscape companies, service industries, residential and agricultural reserve. On the west side there are residential uses in Clarksburg, an outlet mall, a jail and a cemetery and agricultural reserve. But beyond Clarksburg only a pet resort, cannabis dispensary, and a plant nursery exist at the MD 85/I-270

interchange. All of this is desirable employment but of course not biotechnology as the State desires. This employment concentration on the east side of I-270 has existed for the life of I-270, over 70 years, illustrating that the I-270 Corridor that has evolved is between I-270 and MD 355 on the east side of I-270.

3. Employment Development of the East Side I-270 Should be Maximized: Suggested development on the west side ignores the development potential already available on the east side which remains at between 2-3 million square feet. Unfortunately, a major developer on the east side of I-270 in 2017 requested and received rezoning to convert approximately 4 million square feet of employment area, about 250 acres, to residential citing the lack of market demand for employment. This would have accommodated 40 buildings of 100,000 square feet each. This was a lost opportunity to expand technology development in Urbana in furtherance of the County and State goals. Finally, as noted above, it is inappropriate to plan for transit oriented development without assurance of transit availability which does not exist. A Sugarloaf Plan suggestion of transit oriented development on the west side of I-270 creates misguided expectations on the part of the community. This will inevitably lead to a developer pressure to go ahead with transit oriented development since they will contend that transportation improvements are imminent. Since transit availability is probably decades away the Sugarloaf Plan needs to delete all reference to west side development.

-

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

From: [Steve Poteat](#)
To: [Council Members](#)
Subject: Comments on Sugarloaf Plan
Date: Monday, September 12, 2022 8:26:50 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

6-14-22

Testimony on Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan
concerning the Land Ethic

Prepared by Steve Poteat, 1340 Sugarloaf Mtn Rd. Dickerson Frederick
County Maryland 20842

At the Planning Commission public hearing on the Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan on May 18, 2022, and in subsequent communications to the Planning Commission it was very gratifying to learn that many landowners are very protective of their land and believe they do an excellent job of protecting their land without further government assistance.

I have to believe that this stewardship of their land is intended to continue beyond their ownership or lifetimes and it will be their legacy.

There are only limited ways to ensure this legacy. One way is to have the landowner put a perpetual easement on their land dictating their wishes on how the land will be preserved. This is easily achieved by working with the Maryland Environmental Trust or other open space easements programs with the State or County or even locally established land trusts. These opportunities are mentioned in the Sugarloaf Plan, and I am sure the County will assist in these efforts.

Personally, our family placed a Maryland Environmental Trust easement on our 54 acres of woodland adjacent to Sugarloaf Mountain over 40 years ago. Some modest development is still allowed by the easement for family members, and we are still allowed to practice careful forestry on the property. But the property will look pretty much the same 50 or 100 years from now assuming the world comes to its

senses and commits to bold action on climate and sustainability.

In addition to the MET easement we are on our third Forest Stewardship Plan. I am sure you know that the maximum time period for such plans is 15 years. Many forestry and farmland stewardship programs have limited time periods. There is no protection for your land beyond that time period unless there is a perpetual easement of some kind.

This is the advantage of the of the Conservation Zone and the Overlay Zone on the properties in the Sugarloaf Plan area. One still has flexibility in the use of the land especially as circumstances change without the constraints of a perpetual easement. Further there still are uses, special exceptions, and variances that can be applied to the land in accordance with the zones. Subdivision of land is still possible by the landowner but must be undertaken carefully to protect the Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape resources and be consistent with the Overlay Zone. Further, inappropriate uses for the Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape are prohibited by the application of the Overlay Zone such as rubble fills and gun shooting ranges.

Finally, if one desires to protect their land beyond their stewardship or lifetime only stringent perpetual easements are available. However use of the Conservation and Overlay Zones will achieve this same goal with much more flexibility.

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

From: [Steve Poteat](#)
To: [Council Members](#)
Subject: Comments on Sugarloaf Plan
Date: Monday, September 12, 2022 8:22:59 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

**Testimony on Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan
Response to Livable Frederick Coalition concerns about the March 2022 draft
By Steve Poteat, 1340 Sugarloaf Mtn Rd. Dickerson Frederick County Maryland, 6/6/22**

A group recently self-identified as the Livable Frederick Coalition (LFC) opposes the March 2022 edition of the Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan (Sugarloaf Plan). Many of the members of the LFC have participated in the 23 public forums, workshops and a public hearing on the Sugarloaf Plan that have taken place over the last two and a half years. LFC has had ongoing opportunities to offer comments and alternative positions. After due consideration of all comments from the public and discussions with County planning staff, the Planning Commission has chosen different approaches to the Sugarloaf Plan than many of the LFC opposition group's positions. The four contrary positions on the Sugarloaf Plan listed on the LFC website are the following:

1. LFC states that planning and recommendations are inconsistent with the Livable Frederick Plan. RESPONSE: The Livable Frederick Plan designates the Sugarloaf Plan (comprising less than 5% of the area of Frederick County) as part of the Green Infrastructure Sector (page 48), comprised primarily of "Forests, Mountains, Stream Valleys and Parkland/Protected Lands." However, LFC states that the Sugarloaf Plan should include transit-oriented development on the west side of I-270 in the Urbana area. The Livable Frederick Plan does not include a map designating the I-270 corridor and development on the west side of I-270. For 50 years the historical eastern boundary of the Sugarloaf Plan region has been I-270. For decades the I-270 corridor has actually been limited to the area between I-270 and MD 355.

Between Germantown and Frederick only one small parcel of commercial zoning exists on the west side of I-270 in Urbana for this entire distance of 22 miles. According to the State of Maryland, there are no concrete plans to add transit or widen I-270 or build any new interchanges.* Clearly, transit oriented development is impossible if no transit exists. If intensive development is allowed on the west side of I-270 between the Monocacy River and the Montgomery County line, there is no realistic way to stop the inexorable development pressure from spreading southward toward Sugarloaf Mountain.

Due to the absence of increased traffic capacity, future development of Frederick County will need to be concentrated around Frederick City where public facilities exist. This growth will be largely independent of the Washington Metropolitan Area as the City continues to grow as an economic entity generating its own jobs, and as society responds to the climate crisis and the move to more "at-home" work.

2. LFC contends that the Sugarloaf Plan is unnecessary regulatory overreach by proposing to rezone properties to the Conservation Zone and applying a restrictive Overlay Zone on all properties to control development.

RESPONSE: The opposition group expresses concern about overregulation but ignores the fact that the Sugarloaf Plan is a preservation plan, not a development plan, and that extra layers of protection are necessary to preserve the Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape. Specific rezonings, including residential and conservation are proposed to make the zoning consistent with existing land uses and actual topography. Conservation zoning is more consistent with steep slopes, wetlands, stream valleys, and valuable forest lands, all areas that are a priority for the Sugarloaf Plan's treasured landscape and Livable Frederick Plan's Green Infrastructure Sector. Farming will continue to be

allowed on both Conservation and Agriculture zoned lands, where appropriate.

Silviculture is allowed but more restrictions will be required due to the importance of forest overstory in preserving high quality stream beds, water quality, and a diversity of birds and endangered wildlife. Special protection of large mature trees is now essential for their role in carbon sequestration as we address the climate change crisis. Large mature tree overstory cannot be duplicated by seedlings and early growth trees for several decades. In addition, the Sugarloaf Plan's proposed Overlay Zone will protect these critical environmental features if the land is subdivided and will prohibit inconsistent land uses such as rubble fills and gun ranges that have been and continue to be a threat to the Treasured Landscape.

3. LFC asserts that the current draft of the Sugarloaf Plan does not accommodate the preservation of future mixed-use development in the I-270 Corridor as the Livable Frederick Plan envisions.

RESPONSE: LFC complains that the Sugarloaf Plan is inequitable since there is a perceived lack of development opportunity in the I-270 corridor in Urbana. In fact, the Livable Frederick Plan shows future growth as part of the Urbana Community Growth Area, concentrated completely on the east side of I-270. There is no equivocation here: the symbol is completely on the eastern side of I-270 and is labeled the Urbana Community Growth Area in the Livable Frederick Plan.

In fact, approximately 2,000,000 square feet of employment development, the equivalent of twenty 100,000 square foot buildings, remains in Urbana on the east side of I-270. This was actually reduced in 2017 by 3,500,000 square feet of employment development when a major developer requested and received rezoning from employment to residential use, citing a lack of employment demand in Urbana.** To repeat, the so-called technology corridor on the west side of I-270 stops at Germantown, 22 miles south of Frederick. There are no State plans or programmed projects for expansion of roadway, transit or interchanges for highly congested I-270 north of I-370 in Gaithersburg, now or in the foreseeable future.

4. LFC claims there is no inclusion of new approaches for resource protection and zoning concepts offered by Stronghold, Inc. and envisioned by the Livable Frederick Plan.

RESPONSE: The Livable Frederick Plan envisions a Sugarloaf Mountain Rural Heritage Landscape (page 58). It calls for the protection of: streams and stream buffers; habitat of endangered and threatened species; steep slopes; forest lands; the Monocacy Scenic River; and limestone and karst areas. The expanded application of the Conservation Zone and the Sugarloaf Rural Heritage Overlay Zoning District are substantial steps to achieve these Livable Frederick Plan goals, hardly environmentally misguided, as the opposition suggests.

Further, an individually designed zone for Sugarloaf Mountain would be an untenable legal precedent that would undermine and eventually destroy the County's zoning ordinance as others would request the same individualized treatment. In fact, a close comparison of Gordon Strong's Will with the existing Conservation Zone plus the Sugarloaf Plan's proposed Overlay Zone shows fundamental consistency with the protections proposed in the Livable Frederick Plan.

* Letter dated June 10, 2021, from Gregory Slater, Secretary, Maryland Department of Transportation, Chairman, Maryland Transportation Authority, transmitting "A report to the Maryland General Assembly, Regarding Phase 1 of the I-495 and I-270 Public Private Partnership (P3) Program.

** Staff Report: Urbana PUD-MXD Rezoning R-16-0, December 19, 2016

From: [Steve Poteat](#)
To: [Council Members](#)
Subject: Comments on Sugarloaf Plan
Date: Monday, September 12, 2022 8:18:07 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Comments

State Comment on Plan:

“Sugarloaf Plan may diminish the State’s investment in I-270 highway infrastructure including existing and planned corridor and interchange improvements” by extending the Conservation land on the western side to I-270

- What “I-270 infrastructure investments”?
- What State investment has taken place in I-270 expansion in the 72 years of the existence of US 240/I-70S/I-270?
- I-270 is still four travel lanes 72 years later. New interchanges are not programmed.

- What OpLanes Maryland Study? It stops at I-370 and is now starting over as a pre-NEPA study--all study, no results 72 years later.
- Where were the State's comments when Montgomery County extended the Agricultural lands to the western side of I-270 for four miles between Clarksburg to the Frederick County Line taking away prime development land in Montgomery County?
- Where were the State's comments Natelli Communities changed 500 acres of land with all public facilities on place on the east side of I-270 in Urbana from employment to residential because there was "no market for employment"?
- Where were the State's comments when Natelli Communities chose to allow two

massive Federal data centers on the east side of I-270 taking up valuable employment land and paying no taxes

- Why has there been only one small parcel zoned commercial (at MD 80) on the west side of I-270 in the 17 miles from Clarksburg to Frederick. This area has not had any development infrastructure constructed in these 72 years.
- Why no complement for a Sugarloaf Plan as part of its Green Infrastructure for the County including a recognized national Natural Landmark

From: [Steve Poteat](#)
To: [Council Members](#)
Subject: Comments on Sugarloaf Plan
Date: Monday, September 12, 2022 8:15:29 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Sugarloaf Plan, Growth Boundary Considerations, April 8, 2022

The July 2021 version of the masterplan under a paragraph entitled Urbana Community Growth Area on pages 40-41 included the following wording:

“As improvements to the transportation function of I-270 are completed in future years, the County cannot afford to summarily dispense growth opportunities on the western side of the highway right-of-way in the vicinity of the MD 80 interchange. These future public and private investments in our mobility may encourage the placement of multi-modal transit centers, compact transit oriented villages, or growth of Urbana’s existing biological and information technology hub along the I-270 corridor.”

It is fair to say that this wording was inspired by local development interests who planned to use this wording as justification for extending intensive industrial, commercial, or employment development west of I-270 that the developer owned or controlled. Ignored would be the catastrophic impact on Thurston and Park Mills Road communities. (Ironically, this is the same developer that within the last 5 years changed the use of over 500 acres of MXP land he owned on the east side of I-270 from employment to residential claiming there was no market for employment land in Urbana at that time. It was subsequently learned that the west side property was projected to include data centers by the largest corporation in the world with unknown tax benefits. But Frederick County belatedly refused to agree with to the land use changes and the project was data center project was halted, at this time.)

The community disagreed with this policy direction and argued strongly and vociferously that any additional industrial, commercial or employment development planned for the west side of I-270 would be destructive of the intent of the Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Plan. The community also argued that the area between MD 80 the Monocacy River should also be given the same protection due to its consistency with the adjacent Sugarloaf Treasured

Landscape area and the historical boundary, I-270, that divided the developed area east and the preservation area on the west side. The Planning Commission agreed with the community and moved the planning area boundary east to I-270 from the Montgomery County Line to the Monocacy River.

The boundary issue between development on the east side and preservation on the west side received much discussion among the Planning Commission members. Of importance was the definition of the I-270 Corridor. It was pointed out that in Frederick County that the I-270 Corridor has been traditionally defined as the area between I-270 and MD 355. The only commercial zoning on the west side of I-270 from MD 121 in Clarksburg in Montgomery County to the Monocacy River, a distance of 21 miles is the 2 acre Potomac Garden Nursery at MD 80. For that distance on the west side of I-270 there are no schools, libraries, stores, public water and sewer or significant roads with the exception of MD 80 which we all know is very inadequate and dangerous. All the major public services in that 21 miles are on the east side of I-270. That is where the I-270 Corridor naturally exists.

One has to seriously question any major transportation improvements in the I-270 Corridor in that 21 miles as implied by the "Op Lanes" Project being conducted by the State of Maryland. No major road improvements will make economic sense especially by a private firm as contemplated which will require profits. Even a casual observation suggests that the traffic on I-270 has dramatically declined when you notice the Park and Ride lots at Urbana are mostly empty throughout the day. People are adjusting their work life as many more are working from home and this trend will only increase especially as the climate crisis worsens. This is compounded by the fact that Montgomery County shows no transit corridor in its plans north of Clarksburg. Their study suggests that MARC Rail from downtown Frederick should be the only affordable mass transit in the I-270 Corridor for Frederick County. There is also the suggestion that additional interchanges will be needed on I-270 at Park Mills Road and Mott Road near the Montgomery County Line. Neither interchange is in the Frederick County 20 Year Needs Study. In light of the planned lack of development on the west side of I-270, the justification for these interchanges is questionable. An upgrading of the current MD80 and I-270 should be pursued to determine if that first will bring any needed capacity before any new preservation areas are threatened. The fact of the matter is that

the second largest incorporated city in Maryland, Frederick, has become its own self-perpetuating economic entity. The jobs are coming to Frederick, Frederick County residents don't have to travel south on I-270 for their livelihood. Those that prefer jobs in the Washington region can use MARC Rail.

I believe the wording on page 54 of the March 2022 Sugarloaf Plan should be changed along these lines. Prepared by Steve Poteat

Windows

From: [Steve Poteat](#)
To: [Council Members](#)
Subject: Further comments on the Sugarloaf Plan
Date: Monday, September 12, 2022 8:10:22 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Position of the Sugarloaf Alliance Inc., January 11, 2022

Restore the natural and historical Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan boundary along the west side of I270 from the Montgomery County line north to the Monocacy River and Monocacy National Battlefield Park.

The Sugarloaf Alliance has reviewed the 752 pages of the Planning Commission record regarding the Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan. Recorded there are 791 individuals who support our position to restore the Sugarloaf Plan natural and historical boundary along the west side of I-270 from the Montgomery County line north to the Monocacy River and the Monocacy National Battlefield Park. The comments of the 791 individuals are summarized below.

1. The I-270 boundary for the Sugarloaf Plan, in existence for 50 years, is manageable, recognizable, logical, defendable and has public support within and beyond the community.
2. The Livable Frederick Master Plan's Action Framework includes "Making Our Environment Vision A Reality: "...The natural environment and its habitat provision and ecosystem services are critical to our quality of life, and so they should be the primary consideration in all land planning and governmental decision-making processes." The Sugarloaf Plan should reflect and support these considerations.
3. Given the reality of intensive urban development on the Urbana east side of I-270, there is a need to balance growth by preserving the west side of I270 for agriculture, forest conservation and low density residential development and protecting the Sugarloaf area's current AG/RC zoning.
4. Development-driven "change in the character of neighborhood" in the Sugarloaf region would lead to inexorable development spread west on Thurston, Roderick and Park Mills Roads which would destroy these roadside communities, farmlands and woodlands.
5. Development at Park Mills Road and Baker Valley Road in the Monocacy watershed would damage stream valleys and cause runoff, erosion, flooding and destruction of valuable aquatic life.
6. The Sugarloaf Mountain viewshed, both from the mountain and toward the mountain, would be damaged by development near the natural and historic boundary of I-270.
7. The "hallowed grounds" adjacent to the Monocacy National Battlefield Park and the historic Hopehill community must be respected and protected from development.

8. Developers and corporations should not be allowed to reshape the County's planning priorities and prerogatives to serve their private interests in short-term development "opportunities."
9. The Frederick County Transportation Needs and Priorities Review Report for Year 2045 does not support development at the historical and natural boundary of I-270 and includes no reference to a possible future interchange at I-270 and Park Mills Road.
10. Urbana is at the end of the County's Livable Frederick priority line for development, despite developer pressures and statements to the contrary.
11. The heyday of the I270 Technology Corridor is over, made obsolete by the technologies it was intended to promote. Frederick County is part of a world that is grappling with rapid reassessment and reinvention in the face of climate change and the covid pandemic.
12. The engine for economic growth in Frederick County is not the I-270 corridor coming from the south but the robust economic development radiating from Frederick City.

Among the comments to the record was the following: "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 Road 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."

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

From: [Cherney, Ragen](#)
To: [Brandt, Kimberly G.](#)
Cc: [Mitchell, Kathy \(Legal\)](#)
Subject: FW: From Monocacy Citizens Group Re: Suggested Reforms To Sugarloaf Plan / Please act to protect property rights from govt over-reach
Date: Monday, September 12, 2022 3:53:50 PM
Attachments: [Suggested Reforms to Protect Property Rights shared by Monocacy Citizens Group submitted Sept 2022.docx](#)
[image001.png](#)

Ragen Cherney
Chief of Staff/Legislative Director
Frederick County Council
Winchester Hall
12 East Church Street
Frederick, Maryland 21701
301.600.1049



From: Lisa Bell <bdsllbell@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2022 3:51 PM
To: Council Members <CouncilMembers@FrederickCountyMD.gov>
Subject: From Monocacy Citizens Group Re: Suggested Reforms To Sugarloaf Plan / Please act to protect property rights from govt over-reach
[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Dear County Council members,

We hope you'll take time to read this letter in full to consider the suggested reforms (see attached) to the proposed July 2022 Sugarloaf Management Plan. These reforms reflect shared thoughts from folks in our large, grass roots citizens group, The Monocacy Citizens Group.

When we recently realized there really weren't amendments coming forward from the Council to specifically add property rights language to the plan and clarify that many of the measures / initiatives are voluntary not regulatory - we pulled together our notes to send you this. Sorry for the short notice but there is still ample time between now and voting on the plan to add amendments!

Please fix the plan to protect property rights!

There may seem to be a lot of suggested reforms from us but many are clarifying or emphasizing voluntary, not regulatory actions and including property rights language.

When a similar situation occurred with the update of the Monocacy River Plan a few years back, many members on the current County Council acknowledged the importance of inserting property rights language and emphasizing voluntary measures including Council members MC Keegan Ayers and Steve McKay as discussed in the media article below.

www.wfmd.com/2019/04/03/county-council-approves-22-amendments-to-monocacy-river-plan/

I. Why the Sugarloaf Plan is so important:

The Sugarloaf Area Plan is the first of multiple "area plans" that will be developed by the county government as part of Frederick County's Comprehensive Master Plan. Thus, it will set a precedent for all other area plans that will impact landowners and farmers far and wide across the county.

This is why it's vital to fix the flawed Sugarloaf Plan to protect property rights before the Council adopts the plan.

II. The Sugarloaf Plan is Government Over-reach / Unduly hurting landowners & farmers:

As you know, our citizens group was formed to defend property rights when the initially proposed Monocacy River Management Plan update used language (provided by the Frederick County government's Planning Office) calling for the counties to take control of 8,000 acres of

private land along The Monocacy via unnecessary government regulations.

Citizens called this a "Government Land Grab." Attorneys who reviewed the plan, called it "Unconstitutional" and a government "regulatory-taking" of private properties without just cause or compensation to landowners.

Fortunately, the current County Council in office today, previously took action to fix the plan and adopted a Monocacy River Plan update with 22 amendments focused on protecting property rights and removing egregious "land grab" language.

Now the proposed Sugarloaf Management Plan is before the County Council for review and adoption, and it's déjà vu all over again.

The Sugarloaf Plan has significant unnecessary govt regulations to private land that infringe on property rights and can cause undue harm to landowners and farmers - including hurting land use and property values. All without credible and compelling evidence of need or compensation to landowners unduly harmed. It's no surprise citizens are calling the Sugarloaf Plan a "Govt Land Grab" and "Govt Over-reach."

There is *no* fair balance in the Sugarloaf Plan between adding ample restrictions to private land and protecting property rights! Did you know that the 180 page proposed Sugarloaf Plan does not mention the words "Property Rights" once in the entire plan? What does this tell you about the plan's disregard for property rights?

III. There is significant opposition to the Sugarloaf Plan / It needs to be fairly reformed to protect property rights:

Many citizens along with highly regarded organizations such as the Association of Realtors; The Farm Bureau; The Chamber of Commerce and others, are OPPOSED to all or parts of the Sugarloaf Plan. Even the private landowner of Sugarloaf Mountain itself (who've generously made Sugarloaf Mountain available for public access for decades) - has rejected the Sugarloaf Plan as-is. They've stated they intend to shut down public access to Sugarloaf Mountain if the plan is not fairly reformed to protect property rights.

What does this tell you about the plan?

We ask the County Council to listen and act on the suggested reforms to protect property rights coming from our Monocacy Citizens group; The owners of Sugarloaf Mountain; The Assn of Realtors; The Farm Bureau; and the organizations and citizens who support the Livable Frederick Coalition. All who reasonably want property rights protected and desire sensible reforms to be made to the proposed Sugarloaf Plan before its adoption.

IV. The Monocacy Citizens Groups suggested reforms are attached and overall seek to:

- **ADD various property rights language to the Sugarloaf Plan (as this same County Council did before when adopting both The Monocacy River Plan and adopting the all important, Livable Frederick Master Plan).**

Property rights language should be inserted into the Sugarloaf Plan that is identical to language used in the Livable Frederick Master Plan on page 18 under the section "Property Rights." Moreover, certain other language in the Sugarloaf Plan should be modified to emphasize / clarify that various actions and initiatives are voluntary in nature, not regulatory. (See attached reforms).

- **REMOVE the egregious and unwarranted "Rural Heritage Overlay" (with its unnecessary restrictions to private properties) from the Sugarloaf Plan.**
- **REMOVE the unnecessary down-zoning of portions of a large number of properties in the Sugarloaf Plan area. If the Sugarloaf Plan is adopted as-is, these properties would be needlessly down-zoned from AG to RC to**

unduly hurt landowners and farmers.

This creates more restrictions to private land and can also wrongly reduce or diminish the extremely limited existing subdivision rights on AG zoned land, including potentially preventing an owner from building a home on their own property! Not to mention hurting land use and property values.

V. It's a false and disingenuous narrative being pushed by proponents of the Sugarloaf Plan that the plan's additional restrictions to private land is necessary "to prevent over-development and protect the environment."

Both the overlay and down-zoning are no more than a solution in search of a problem.

They are truly unnecessary because according to the Sugarloaf Plan itself (page 60), most all of the land in the Sugarloaf Plan area (94% of it) is already zoned Agricultural and Resource Conservation - which are the most highly restrictive zoning there is to prevent over development and protect the environment.

Moreover, such over-development simply can *not* happen in the Sugarloaf area given the existing zoning in place and the tiny percentage of developable lots remaining in the area.

According to the Sugarloaf Plan (see Chapter 4 / Land Use, Page 66 Land Subdivision paragraph):

93% of the parcels and lots within the Sugarloaf Planning Area are already developed (with the exception of the majority of Stronghold, Incorporated lands (Sugarloaf Mountain) and the DNR holdings (govt owned land).

Thus, an overwhelming majority of the land is already developed leaving a small percentage undeveloped. Most existing development is very low density, large lot residential and farms.

Thus, fears of "over-development" and concerns about "protecting the environment" are being stoked without any credible basis, in an effort to gin up support for the Sugarloaf Plan.

Regarding the environment, you should know that the land and waterways in the Sugarloaf Plan's boundaries are already THE MOST PROTECTED IN THE NATION! Extensive layers of federal, state, and local government environmental and land preservation policies and programs already exist that are successfully protecting and preserving land and waterway

All of this negates the need for additional restrictions to private land under the false guise it's necessary to "protect the environment" and "shield" the Sugarloaf area from over development.

Additionally, Frederick County government's existing zoning approval process has already been successfully working to prevent any inappropriate land use from happening in the Sugarloaf area.

Gun ranges and other uses citizens object to, have rightly been denied approval in the past through the existing zoning approval process. Thus, the system has worked just fine as it should, and no need to add a list of prohibited types of businesses / operations as imposed in the Sugarloaf Plan's "Overlay." This list should be removed.

The bottom line question is: Why cause undue harm to landowners and farmers by needlessly revoking, reducing, and eroding existing property rights when the plan can be easily reformed to protect property rights?

Especially since evidenced-based information is available to prove many of the Sugarloaf Plans additional restrictions to private properties are unnecessary.

VI. It's an election year and many want to elect County Council leaders who will act to protect and defend property rights from government over-reach.

Just wanted to share that this is an important topic in the voting booth.

Folks from our citizens group would very much like to meet with any of the Council members to discuss the concerning Sugarloaf Plan and our suggested reforms.

Please let us know if any Council members are available.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully submitted by Lisa Bell,

Sharing thoughts from The Monocacy Citizens group

SUGGESTED REFORMS TO THE PROPOSED JULY 2022 SUGARLOAF MANAGEMENT PLAN FROM THE MONOCACY CITIZENS GROUP / FOCUSED ON SUPPORTING AND PROTECTING VITAL PROPERTY RIGHTS

The reforms suggested below are shared thoughts from folks in the large, grass roots citizens group / The Monocacy Citizens Group. It is vital to protect property rights of landowners and farmers who will be unduly hurt should the unacceptable Sugarloaf Plan be adopted as-is.

Suggested reforms are listed sequentially by chapters in the Sugarloaf Plan and are mostly shown in underlined, bold text. They may seem numerous, but actually, they are easy changes that mostly clarify suggested actions and initiatives are voluntary, not regulatory. If the creators of the Sugarloaf Plan had simply clarified and done the job right from the start - there wouldn't be this problem in fixing the plan.

It must be fixed to protect property rights to satisfy so many citizens who are justly worried about government over-reach.

PROPOSED REVISIONS:

- 1) First and foremost, remove the Sugarloaf Heritage Overlay which is causing alarm among citizens.
- 2) Remove the rezoning of a large number of properties to downzone portions of properties from AG to RC Zoning. Also, causing alarm among citizens.
- 3) See below for revisions to existing language to clarify voluntary, not regulatory measures.

Executive Summary:

- 1). Modify the Executive Summary of the July 2022 proposed Sugarloaf Plan as follows:

Add a new section / paragraph titled "Property Rights" immediately following paragraph 5 and the corresponding graph on page 3 of the Executive Summary. This new paragraph cites direct property rights language from page 18 of the 2019 adopted Livable Frederick Master Plan as follows:

Property Rights: The Livable Frederick Master Plan fully supports stable and enforceable private property rights under the laws of our county, state, and nation. Acknowledging and protecting these rights in our community plans, policies, and regulations can provide property owners with key incentives to invest in our neighborhoods and employment centers, bringing benefit to the broader community. Nothing in this plan shall be construed to change the longstanding Frederick County policy of honoring and protecting individual private property rights. Any legislation, regulations, or policies arising from this plan should consider the rights of individual property owners.

Both the U.S. Constitution and Maryland State law support land use planning, undertaken by and for local communities, that balances private property rights with public health, safety, and welfare. The Livable Frederick Master Plan is a key part of Frederick County's planning process,

intended to guide our progress toward commonly held goals in areas such as economic development, housing affordability, community health, and transportation choice.

NOTES: The above language has already been voted upon and approved by the same County Council in place today. It stands to reason, that since the Sugarloaf Plan will become part of the Livable Frederick Master Plan, it should be no problem to reflect the same language in the Sugarloaf Plan.

2) Add to the above Property Rights paragraph:

- **Additionally, The Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan does not advocate public use of private property or the compromise of constitutional property rights.**

NOTES: This is language is an excerpt from Amendment 22 of the adopted 2019 Monocacy River Plan. The current County Council has already voted to approve this language in another plan so it's reasonable to include such language in the Sugarloaf Plan by citizens' request.

CHAPTER 2 – History and Culture

1). Modify Policy 2.1 on page 28:

- Add the underlined, bold text as shown below to the beginning of the first sentence of policy 2.1 so it reads:

In cooperation with landowners, encourage the design of new buildings, subdivisions, infrastructure, and signs in the Sugarloaf Planning Area to be compatible in scale and siting with existing, adjoining historic structures and settlements.

CHAPTER 3 – Stronghold Inc. and Sugarloaf Mountain

1). Modify Chapter 3 page 38 to insert the underlined, bold text shown below to Initiatives 3A, 3B, 3C, and 3E to more fairly protect the property rights of the private landowners of Sugarloaf Mountain (Stronghold, Inc):

- Initiative 3A **If desired by Sugarloaf Incorporated, Stronghold shall work with** *the State of Maryland*, and Frederick County Tourism to clarify Sugarloaf Mountain's status as a privately-owned and operated park.
- Initiative 3B **If desired by Sugarloaf Incorporated, Stronghold shall collaborate with** DNR to explore the desire and feasibility of extending and connecting the Monocacy Natural Resource Management Area's Rustic Trail Network to the Sugarloaf Mountain trail network to create a longer and linked trail system.
- Initiative 3C Partner with Stronghold, Incorporated **if desired by Stronghold**, to establish **voluntary** mechanisms to ensure long-term public access to Sugarloaf Mountain and identify ways in which the Frederick County community (residents, government, private organizations) can assist in these endeavors.
- Initiative 3E Support the preservation of Stronghold, Incorporated's 3,000 acres through a **voluntary and incentivized** conservation easement device **if desired by Stronghold, Inc.** to

ensure permanence and protection of all of its resources — cultural, environmental, historic — with no reduction in size, integrity, or ecological function

NOTES: Chapter 3 Initiatives sound like Frederick County government thinks they own Sugarloaf Mountain! It also sounds like the county government intends to impose regulatory actions to Sugarloaf Mountain private land dismissing private property rights altogether. The mountain and its approximate 3,000 acres is privately owned. These initiatives in Ch. 3 noted above, should occur if desired by Stronghold and be clarified to be voluntary in nature.

CHAPTER 4 – Land Use

1). Chapter 4: Modify Policies as shown below in underlined, bold text:

- Land Use in the Sugarloaf Planning Area Policy 4.1: Limit forest loss, forest fragmentation, and increased impervious cover through **voluntary** modifications to land use designations, zoning classifications, and development densities.
- Policy 4.2: Assess future land use changes in the context of the rural character of the Sugarloaf Planning Area **and implement through voluntary efforts and incentivized programs.**
- Policy 4.3 **In cooperation with Landowners**, minimize the growth of new residential development that utilizes wells and septic systems through non-expansion of the Rural Residential Land Use Designation into undeveloped Agricultural and Natural Resource areas
- Initiative 4B: To ensure that nitrogen inputs to ground and surface waters are minimized, and to help safeguard the Piedmont Sole Source Aquifer, consider, in consultation with the Health Department **and in cooperation with landowners**, the requirement for all non-residential land uses in the Sugarloaf Planning Area to utilize Best Available Technology (BAT) for new or replacement on-site sewage disposal systems
- **REMOVE IN ITS ENTIRETY Initiative 4E which states:** Adopt and apply the Sugarloaf Rural Heritage Overlay Zoning District and its ordinance to achieve the goals and vision articulated in the Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan
- Policy 4.4: Maintain agriculture as a significant land use in the Sugarloaf Planning Area through **voluntary** easements, incentives **and** policies. (**DELETE** the word “regulation” at end of the sentence as shown in plan on page 71.

CHAPTER 6: Watershed Water Quality

1). Chapter 6: Modify Policies as shown below in underlined, bold text:

- Policy 6.1: Foster increased awareness and appreciation of environmental resources in the Sugarloaf Planning Area and their relationship to man-made systems, and support management actions to sustain and protect resource function, resilience and quality, **through voluntary efforts.**

- Policy 6.3: Support **voluntary, incentivized and non-regulatory** public and private watershed restoration initiatives such as stormwater management system upgrades and retrofits, infrastructure repair, reforestation, and stream restoration projects that minimize riparian vegetation removal in the Sugarloaf Planning Area.
- Policy 6.4: Maintain high-quality watershed conditions to sustain coldwater biological communities **through voluntary measures and existing programs and policies.**
- Policy 6.5: Protect sensitive aquatic resources, including brook trout populations, in Bear Branch Watershed **through voluntary measures and existing programs and policies.**
- Policy 6.6: Support efforts to achieve Tier III Use Class Status for additional streams in the Sugarloaf Planning Area and ensure that the unique high-quality features of these streams are maintained **through voluntary measures and existing programs and policies.**
- Initiative 6E: **Through voluntary, non-regulatory measures**, preserve and enhance environmental functions, such as flood control, temperature modulation, and downstream water quality protection, by enhancing the buffering of aquatic systems, including headwater areas and mapped natural flow and drainage paths.
- Policy 6.10: Support **voluntary, non-regulatory** efforts for implementing conservation practices on all agricultural lands, including livestock exclusion from streams, wetland protection and enhancement, and regenerative agricultural practices to sequester carbon and increase soil and water health.

CHAPTER 7: Forestlands, Green Infrastructure, and Biodiversity

1). Chapter 7: Modify Policies as shown below with reforms in underlined, bold text:

On page 111 of Chapter 7 where ESA (Ecological Sensitive Areas are discussed)in paragraph 5, our suggested reform is shown in bold, underlined text below to modify the language to insert additional language. This will bring the Sugarloaf Plan in keeping with DNR regulations for publishing DNA data as the plan currently breaches DNR regulations for publishing ESA information.

- Ecologically Significant Areas (paragraph 5 on pg 111)

The Sugarloaf Planning Area contains eight State-designated Ecological Significant Areas (ESAs), attesting to the unique landscapes and species found there. **ESA's are areas delineated by DNR to identify where RTE species and habitats may be present. ESAs are only a generalized indication of where significant plant and animal habitats may be located and are not used in any toe of regulatory means either by the counties or the state. MD DNR when requested by local**

government agencies or landowners, will review development proposals and offer recommendations for mitigation if projects may impact habitat and areas within the ESAs.

- Additionally, the ESA Maps on page 116 and 115 need to be removed as they are not allowed by DNR to be published.

NOTES: The suggested language above has already been previously voted on and approved by the current County Council when the Council adopted the 2019 Monocacy River Plan. Please reasonably use the same language you agreed upon before, to insert into the Sugarloaf Plan to bring the plan in line with DNR regulations for publishing ESA data.

- Policy 7.1: Promote the creation of **voluntary, non-regulatory** Forest Management Plans and Forest Stewardship Plans that address increasing species and landscape diversity over time, including the extent and quality of older forests and early successional habitat. Such plans should include methods to control invasive pests, destructive insects, and diseases to prevent widespread forest mortality and loss of native forest types

NOTES: Such plans are county-wide issues and should not be in Sugarloaf Plan. Plus, there are already multiple, existing federal, state, and local forest management and conservation regulations and programs. There isn't really a need for the above. Regardless, participation in the Policy 7.1 should be on a voluntary basis.

- Policy 7.3: Support **voluntary, non-regulatory efforts** of landowners and organizations to improve deer herd management to reduce deer browsing of native trees.
- Initiative 7A: Initiate the development and creation of a **voluntary** functional Green Infrastructure Plan for the County that prioritizes areas for forest restoration and conservation across ownerships to increase natural landscape continuity and reduce forest fragmentation.
- Policy 7.4: **Through voluntary, non-regulatory efforts**, retain existing forestlands, promote sound forestry management, and expand tree planting, including riparian forest buffers and the conversion of lawn to forest in the Sugarloaf Planning Area, to help achieve climate change resilience.
- Policy 7.5: Collaborate with stakeholders, agencies, and organizations to plant trees and establish forest cover through **voluntary, non-regulatory** programs that improve watershed conditions, including the conservation of forests critical for protecting high quality waters.
- Initiative 7B: Establish the Sugarloaf Area Forest Initiative, modeled after the Linganore Watershed Forest Program, to utilize the County's Forest Resource Ordinance mitigation funds to plant new forest on private lands **in cooperation with willing landowners on a voluntary, non-regulatory basis.**

- Initiative 7C: Through partnerships with natural resource professionals, provide technical and financial assistance to help private landowners practice sustainable forest resource management and to transition lawn to natural areas **on a voluntary basis.**
- Policy 7.8: Foster increased awareness and appreciation of environmental resources and their relationship to man-made systems, and support for management action to sustain and protect resource function and quality **on a voluntary basis.**
- Initiative 7G: To improve public safety and reduce the costs of property insurance for residents and businesses within the Planning Area, establish a network of water storage tanks to be owned and maintained by the County for rural fire suppression. **Such tanks shall only be placed on private properties with consent from willing landowners - the approval of which can be given by landowners and later withdrawn at any time by landowners requiring timely removal of water tanks from the subject property.**

CHAPTER 8: Climate Change

1). Chapter 8: Modify Policies as shown below with suggested reforms in underlined, bold text:

- Policy 8.1: Factor climate change into land use and planning initiatives and processes to achieve a natural and built environment that is highly resilient and adaptive, **so as not to infringe on property rights. The county remains committed to following the rule of law pertaining to, and protecting private property ownership.**

NOTES: The suggested language was derived from the adopted 2019 Monocacy River Plan Amendment #19 that was agreed to and approved by the current County Council in 2019.

- Policy 8.2: Support alternative energy production and storage systems, while carefully evaluating their impact on forestlands, viewsheds, and the transportation network in the Sugarloaf Planning Area.

Add the following to the above paragraph: **Any energy production and storage systems located on private land shall be with approval from a willing landowner.**

- Policy 8.4: **Through voluntary efforts and only with approval from willing landowners who's land may be affected,** preserve vast forestlands in the Sugarloaf Planning Area that comprise an “ecological sanctuary” and acknowledge their importance in providing clean water, sequestering carbon, and mitigating climate change.
- Policy 8.5: All future repairs and upgrades of stream culverts in the Sugarloaf Planning Area should be designed to: ensure unimpeded upstream and downstream movement **while respecting the property rights of landowners.**

- Policy 8.6: **Through voluntary efforts, existing regulations and programs, and in cooperation with landowners,** expand the capacity of the Sugarloaf Planning Area to provide essential contributions to the County's efforts to reduce, mitigate, and adapt to climate change.

Specht, Jennifer

From: Cherney, Ragen
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2022 4:14 PM
To: Brandt, Kimberly G.; Mitchell, Kathy (Legal)
Subject: FW: Sugarloaf Plan Boundary

Ragen Cherney
Chief of Staff/Legislative Director
Frederick County Council
Winchester Hall
12 East Church Street
Frederick, Maryland 21701
301.600.1049



From: bcpoteat@gmail.com <bcpoteat@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2022 4:13 PM
To: Keegan-Ayer, MC <MCKeegan-Ayer@FrederickCountyMD.gov>; Fitzwater, Jessica <JFitzwater@FrederickCountyMD.gov>
Cc: Council Members <CouncilMembers@FrederickCountyMD.gov>
Subject: Sugarloaf Plan Boundary

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

To Council President Keegan-Ayer and Councilmember Fitzwater:

I urge you to support the Sugarloaf Plan boundary as recommended by the Frederick County Planning Commission, on the east along I270 from the Montgomery County line to the Monocacy National Battlefield, and on the west to include Sugarloaf Mountain.

Further, please support the inclusion of this entire Plan area in the Rural Heritage Overlay Zoning District.

Thank you.
Blanca Poteat
Sugarloaf Mountain Road

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

Specht, Jennifer

From: Cherney, Ragen
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2022 4:27 PM
To: Brandt, Kimberly G.
Cc: Mitchell, Kathy (Legal)
Subject: FW: WE NEED YOU NOW!

Ragen Cherney

Chief of Staff/Legislative Director

Frederick County Council
Winchester Hall
12 East Church Street
Frederick, Maryland 21701
301.600.1049



From: Kyla Moore <kymoore0509@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2022 4:25 PM
To: Council Members <CouncilMembers@FrederickCountyMD.gov>
Cc: Fitzwater, Jessica <JFitzwater@FrederickCountyMD.gov>; Donald, Jerry <JDonald@FrederickCountyMD.gov>; Keegan-Ayer, MC <MCKeegan-Ayer@FrederickCountyMD.gov>
Subject: WE NEED YOU NOW!

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Council Members:

I am urgently writing to you in hopes that you will join me in the fervent support of the preservation of the Sugarloaf area!

I support the Plan's I-270 boundary from Montgomery County to the Monocacy as well as the Overlay and the Plan's preservation goals for the Sugarloaf area.

I STRONGLY oppose the paragraph on page 54, which opens the door to short-term Plan amendments because it creates an explicit opportunity for developers to quickly push for Plan changes despite more than 2 years of work and public input on the current version.

While likely stating the obvious, our schools are immensely overcrowded and even if we were to add yet another school to another development the traffic and road infrastructure would quickly turn this place into a new metropolitan area, which is not what makes this part of Frederick County so beautiful and unique.

I can't help but think that money and making more of it always wins but PLEASE PLEASE hold the boundaries west of I-270. I wonder...what is the point of zoning land agricultural when in truth it appears deals are being struck with the county to allow for constant further development on this supposedly zoned land. We live in a beautiful area that is rapidly declining in its natural beauty that most of us are EXTREMELY grateful to be a part of. At some point, land has to

finally be left alone. It feels only greed would dictate that not enough money has been made because there are still scraps of land yet left. The agricultural and environmental impacts speak volumes. Why be another contributor to the negative effects of climate change and environmental risk? Bennett Creek, our soil, our wildlife, our natural landscapes are all at major risk and why most of us choose to call this area home. What may seem like a "small plot of land" to developers, I can assure you is NOT to the residents who care so much about the rural landscape and sustaining life it creates and allows. Please don't take all of this away.

While I appreciate the opportunity to have a "voice," I hope my voice is truly being heard and considered. PLEASE OPPOSE ANY FURTHER FUTURE DEVELOPMENT WEST OF I-270! Thank you so much for all you do for our community and for the support of the Sugarloaf Plan.

Respectfully,
Kyla Moore
(Dixon Road resident)

Specht, Jennifer

From: peterblood3213@comcast.net
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2022 6:41 PM
To: Council Members
Subject: Hold the line at 270

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Dear Council Member,

For decades, development in Frederick County has been avoided west of 270, but there is now an amendment that ignores this history and pushes the development boundary back from 270 to 80. Do you know how overdevelopment happens? Not at once, but in small increments when it is allowed to start. There is tremendous pressure to overdevelop this quiet corner of the county. We have already fought off efforts to site the Machine Gun Nest, a Mega Church, a weapons training facility, and the Urbana Loop. If you vote yes, years from now, people will ask "How did we let this happen?"

The Sugarloaf Mgt Plan was revised to extend the preservation boundary to the Monocacy Battlefield. That's a good idea. Moving the development boundary to 80 is a bad idea. **I urge you to Vote NO on this terrible amendment.**

Peter Blood
3213 Ramsland Way
Urbana, MD

Specht, Jennifer

From: Jane Thompson <jayteehike@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2022 5:51 PM
To: Council Members
Subject: New amendment

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Please vote AGAINST the amendment returning to the July 2021 Plan boundary (Rt 80 and Thurston Rd)

Please SUPPORT preservation from the Montgomery County line, along I270 to the Monocacy River.

Peaceful trails,

Jane Thompson

Nature is a communion of subjects.

Not a collection of objects.

Thomas Berry

Specht, Jennifer

From: Cherney, Ragen
Sent: Tuesday, September 13, 2022 9:06 AM
To: Brandt, Kimberly G.
Cc: Mitchell, Kathy (Legal)
Subject: FW: Rt. 80/Thurston Road Sugarloaf Boundary Proposal
Attachments: New voicemail for County Council from Public Input; Boundry for Sugarloaf TL; Sugarloaf Plan; Vote No on the Amendment to change the boundary of the Sugarloaf Plan; Oppose Council Member Dacey's amendment; Sugar Loaf Plan - Dacey's Proposed Amendment; Please hold the Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan boundary at I-270; PLEASE INCLUDE US!!!; New amendment ; Property owners against west of I 270 expansion of development; Hold the line at 270; Re: Sugarloaf

Sugarloaf record emails.

Ragen Cherney

Chief of Staff/Legislative Director

Frederick County Council
Winchester Hall
12 East Church Street
Frederick, Maryland 21701
301.600.1049



From: Karen Lynch <kromer.lynch@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 13, 2022 8:55 AM
To: Keegan-Ayer, MC <MCKeegan-Ayer@FrederickCountyMD.gov>; Fitzwater, Jessica <JFitzwater@FrederickCountyMD.gov>; Council Members <CouncilMembers@FrederickCountyMD.gov>
Subject: Rt. 80/Thurston Road Sugarloaf Boundary Proposal

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

All,

I understand that you are currently considering an amendment to the Sugarloaf Plan to allow for dense development on the west side of I-270. As a Frederick County resident, I urge you to vote against the amendment which uses the July 2021 Plan boundary of Route 80 and Thurston Road.

Please preserve the historical approach which is to not allow development on the west side of I-270 - from the Montgomery Cty line to the Monocacy River.

I don't know when the developer who wants to build west of I-270 bought the land with plans for development. There are many issues and concerns about dense development planning as we face the limits of growth and climate change. We also face here in Frederick County the pressure of growth from a growing population, and companies who find this area highly desirable. There are currently various developments in the planning stages inside the city limits which will keep the footprint of development inside the city.

The way our current land use approval system for development works puts you at the forefront of decision-making where development is concerned. Can this be the moment where you hold the line, and make a hard decision to reject development west of I-270, and preserve the agricultural and rural landscape? I sincerely hope so.

Thank you for your hard work.

Best Regards,

Karen Lynch
103 Catoctin Avenue
Frederick, MD 21701

Specht, Jennifer

From: Luna, Nancy
Sent: Tuesday, September 13, 2022 8:52 AM
To: Council Members
Cc: County Council Staff
Subject: New voicemail for County Council from Public Input

From: +13019728361

Message Transcription: My name is Margaret Kelly. I strongly support the preservation of land west of I two 70 allowing development on that land w would be a great loss to the wider community. Presently, I have enjoyed the rural nature of this community for almost 50 years. By living here, it would be a horrible disservice to the whole community to develop land that provides respite from a very troubled world. Thank you.

[Audio File](#)

You can change or disable notifications like these on the [project settings tab](#).

Specht, Jennifer

From: Barbara Luchsinger <blagluch@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2022 4:46 PM
To: Council Members
Cc: peter luchsinger; barbara luchsinger
Subject: Oppose Council Member Dacey's amendment

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Council Members,

We adamantly oppose any amendment that would allow development west of I270. One toe-hold west of 270 means more will come.

270 is a natural boundary and essential to preservation of the Sugarloaf Plan area.

Such a late-date amendment proposal only arouses suspicion and mistrust among your constituents and must be avoided.

We urge you to oppose this amendment and hold the 270 boundary that most citizens have supported.

Barbara and Peter Luchsinger

Specht, Jennifer

From: smordensky@aol.com
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2022 5:33 PM
To: Council Members; Gardner, Jan
Subject: Please hold the Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan boundary at I-270

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Dear County Council & County Executive,

I do not know why but I expected one at-large candidate to make such a move to propose such a sneaky & underhanded amendment.

The entire community is aware of the \$3,000.00 contribution from an Urbana developer to one of the At-large county council members and since Kai Hagan has pledged to not take developers' contributions. That was an easy riddle to solve.

I strongly recommend the county council hold that I-270 historical & understood & grandfathered boundary between the high-density development to the east side of this interstate and have natural settings of farms, fields, forests & streams on the west side of I-270.

Furthermore, one at-large council member and the other sitting county council member who received developer money but gave it back should both recluse (abstain from voting on this amendment vote) themselves.

I think Senator Dick Chaney might have liked to invite this one At-large bird hunting w/him?

I am so physically tired & drained from preparing my driveway for winter today but tonight may be quite a show. It may pan out like that famously delivered Winchester Hall, "**FACT Letter of 2014**" proudly read into the public record by BoCC chairman Blaine Young as the clock struck midnight.

The headlines of the FNP the next day said it all!

That is and was a real FACT (FACT - **Frederick Area Council of Transportation Letter**)!

One BoCC member vacated politics forevermore over this bogus & misrepresented letter composed by only two members of this 20-member council. He did however ask FC government to help w/paying his legal fees.

Spoiling & mudding the waters is not new to FC public hearings & rezonings tainting the process.

Please let only the five clean county council members vote if the process gets that far on the amendment to move the boundary from I-270 to Thurston Road.

I do not know why almost every park or forest in local town, county, state, and national parks has had such battles with developers including Yosemite and Yellowstone, the first National park.

Why are developers seldom satisfied?

When is enough enough?

Some developers are just greedy, and some are obscenely greedy until all is destroyed if left unchecked!

We, the people, do not need any more concrete jungles. Smart growth reduces crime!

Please hold that I - 270 boundary.

Sincerely,

Stan Sr., (Retired MD World Studies & Science Teacher)

Stan Mordensky, Sr.
11401 Meadowlark DR.
Ijamsville, MD 21754

Home/Office Phone: 301-831-6619

Specht, Jennifer

From: L B <shallyn333@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2022 5:42 PM
To: Council Members
Subject: PLEASE INCLUDE US!!!

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Please include our property in the new boundary, we have adamantly opposed this "Sugarloaf Overlay" (a joke in itself since Sugarloaf opposes this landowners' travesty). All of my emails have fallen on deaf ears. We have been here for 43 years and now some entity that means absolutely nothing to my family farm is trying to tell me what I can and can't do!? I have been to several public meetings where the robot - like actors simply reiterate the plan and can't answer a question.

You have included my brothers' property, you can include ours.

PLEASE INCLUDE OUR PROPERTY ALSO.

2713 and 2719 Thurston Rd
and 2613 Dixon Rd
The corner of Thurston and Dixon

Lynda Bryant
301.788.8279

Specht, Jennifer

From: Cherney, Ragen
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2022 11:17 AM
To: Susan Trainor
Cc: Cherney, Ragen; Brandt, Kimberly G.; Mitchell, Kathy (Legal)
Subject: RE: Question about CC process for the Sugarloaf Plan

Good Morning Ms. Trainor,

Thank you for your inquiry. The Council is permitted under the Charter to vote on Amendments at workshops. The Council will be discussing and possibly voting on amendments to the Plan tomorrow evening, September 13, 2022. Any approved amendments along with the Plan will then go to public hearing on Tuesday, September 27, 2022, at 5:30 pm at Winchester Hall in the First Floor Hearing Room.

Please keep in mind that once the public hearing is held that does not preclude a council member from bringing forward other amendments after the public hearing based on public comments. This is why we have additional time built into the schedule. Also, a comp plan is not the same as a bill and does not necessarily have to follow the same process.

Thank you.

R

Ragen Cherney
Chief of Staff/Legislative Director
Frederick County Council
Winchester Hall
12 East Church Street
Frederick, Maryland 21701
301.600.1049

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

From: Susan Trainor <sue.trainor.music@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2022 10:15 AM
To: Cherney, Ragen <RCherney@FrederickCountyMD.gov>
Subject: Question about CC process for the Sugarloaf Plan

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Good morning, Mr. Cherney,

I'm writing with a question that came up at our Sugarloaf Alliance meeting yesterday.

What is the Council's process regarding the Plan amendments that have been introduced so far and any that may be introduced prior to (at?) the hearing on 9/27?

We thought we had heard that the amendments would be voted on prior to the hearing and that the hearing would be on the Council's draft of the Plan. Now we're wondering if that's correct. Will they vote on amendments before the hearing, or is the hearing about the Planning Commission draft plus proposed amendments (or some other interpretation)? What's the deadline for amendments to be introduced prior to the hearing? (We understand that amendments proposed after the hearing will require another hearing.)

Thanks for your help!

Sue

Sue Trainor, Vice President

Sugarloaf Alliance

410-948-4422

Specht, Jennifer

From: Cherney, Ragen
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2022 11:16 AM
To: Steve Black
Cc: Cherney, Ragen; Brandt, Kimberly G.; Mitchell, Kathy (Legal)
Subject: RE: Schedule for votes on amendments to Sugarloaf Plan?

Good Morning Mr. Black,

Thank you for your inquiry. The Council is permitted under the Charter to vote on Amendments at workshops. The Council will be discussing and possibly voting on amendments to the Plan tomorrow evening, September 13, 2022. Any approved amendments along with the Plan will then go to public hearing on Tuesday, September 27, 2022, at 5:30 pm at Winchester Hall in the First Floor Hearing Room.

Please keep in mind that once the public hearing is held that does not preclude a council member from bringing forward other amendments after the public hearing based on public comments. This is why we have additional time built into the schedule. Also, a comp plan is not the same as a bill and does not necessarily have to follow the same process.

Thank you.

R

Ragen Cherney
Chief of Staff/Legislative Director
Frederick County Council
Winchester Hall
12 East Church Street
Frederick, Maryland 21701
301.600.1049



From: Steve Black <steveblack2313@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2022 8:32 AM
To: Cherney, Ragen <RCherney@FrederickCountyMD.gov>
Subject: Schedule for votes on amendments to Sugarloaf Plan?

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Ragen,

There is some confusion on the schedule for votes on plan amendments.

At which meetings are 'decisions' on amendments expected to take place?

We had all been expecting votes at tomorrow's meeting, but now because it's a Workshop we are unsure.

Alternatively, is the public hearing on the 27th covering the draft plan from the Planning Commission and potential amendments?

If you can clarify, we'd greatly appreciate it.

Thank you,

Steve Black
President
Sugarloaf Alliance

Specht, Jennifer

From: Eric Hartlaub <ericfish74@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2022 5:14 PM
To: Council Members
Subject: Sugar Loaf Plan - Dacey's Proposed Amendment

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Since 1996, I have owned and resided at the property located at 1649 Thurston Road in Frederick County, MD, which is in the heart of the Sugarloaf Area. I appreciate the rural nature of the surroundings and support the Sugarloaf Plan.

- Please vote against the amendment returning to the July 2021 Plan boundary (Rt. 80 and Thurston Road).
- Please support preservation from the Montgomery County line, along I-270 to the Monocacy River.

I appreciate all Council member's support of the Plan without this amendment.

Thank you,

Eric Hartlaub
1649 Thurston Road
Dickerson, MD 20842
717-357-1746 - cell

Specht, Jennifer

From: Janet Aker <jalisonaker@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2022 10:20 PM
To: Council Members
Subject: Sugarloaf Plan

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Council members,

I urge you to not support councilman Dacey's amendment to the Sugarloaf Plan when you meet tomorrow. There is absolutely no reason to have such uncalled-for development abutting that area.

Sincerely,

Janet Aker

5934 Norwood Pl W

Adamstown MD

From: Steve Poteat <cspoteat@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2022 8:31 PM
To: Council Members
Subject: Sugarloaf Plan Comments

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Comments on Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan. August 11, 2022.

My name is Steve Poteat and I live on Sugarloaf Mountain Road. **I support this Plan. I do have concerns about four issues.** But first recall this is a preservation Plan not a development Plan.

Transportation Realities. My main objection is the discussion of transportation issues on page 54 and in Chapter 5. The Plan suggests development in the near future on the west side of I-270 based on road and transit improvements that have little likelihood of taking place in the foreseeable future. In fact, last week the Federal Highway Administration halted the Maryland Governor's Opportunity Lanes project to take a closer look at the environmental impact study. Clearly the Opportunity Lanes effort is a 20th century solution to a 21st century problem.

Previous versions of the Sugarloaf Plan discussed transit oriented development in Urbana. But with no transit there can be no transit oriented development. The lack of Opportunity lanes will support Frederick's home grown economic development, especially with the changes taking place in work places and commuting patterns as more people work from home. For those requiring a commute to the Washington area, expansion of the MARC commuter rail system will address this need.

Developer Inspired Development: The developer pushing for development on the west side of I-270 is the same developer who had rezoned 250 acres of employment land to residential land on the east side of I-270 citing a lack of demand. This took 4 million square feet of employment development away from Urbana, the equivalent of 40 one hundred thousand square foot buildings. Now the developer of the Knowledge Farms employment center is trying to do the same. Why does

the County need employment land on the west side of I-270 if developers cannot market the employment land already on the east side?

Support the Overlay Zone. One critical purpose for the Overlay zone in addition to protecting unique and essential environmental resources is to prohibit destructive uses. These include gun firing ranges and rubble fills that are completely inconsistent with the Sugarloaf region and cannot be prohibited any other way

Forest Protection. A note for those who say our forests do not need additional protection. We personally have done everything the State and County have required during three harvest cuts over the last 40 years: Forestry Management Plans, use of a registered forester, sediment control plans, and prereview of the logging operations by the Forestry Board. But it all gets down to who signs the contract to harvest the trees. The Forestry Board has never done a post-harvest inspection. The increasing level of woodland damage has become unacceptable. If Frederick County truly wants to promote and protect its forest lands, our experience suggests that stricter regulations and inspections are needed.

Thank you for considering my comments. Please preserve and protect the Sugarloaf region.

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

From: Steve Poteat <cspoteat@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2022 8:21 PM
To: Council Members
Subject: Sugarloaf Plan Comments

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

**Testimony to the Frederick County Planning Commission for the May 18
Public Hearing on Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan
Steve Poteat, 1340 Sugarloaf Mountain Road, Frederick County**

The Planning Commission and staff have done outstanding work in the preparation of this master plan. The Sugarloaf area is truly a Treasured Landscape and we need to do what is necessary to protect it and preserve it now and for future generations as Gordon Strong set out to do at Sugarloaf.

No Transit Equals No Transit Oriented Development For Urbana

One issue does need attention. As a preservation Plan, the discussion of concentrated growth and transit oriented development on the west side of I-270 at Urbana is **inconsistent** (*pages 54 and 74*). The Plan says this suggested growth is based on the provision of transit to Urbana as a result of the State's Opportunity Lanes effort, **not new interchanges**. The Opportunity Lanes effort would expand I-495 and I-270 to Frederick with Bus Rapid Transit.

But this effort was dramatically altered recently when the Governor modified the project. Now it only considers I-270 improvements south of I-370 in Gaithersburg, over 20 miles south. **He proposes only more study for from Gaithersburg to Frederick.** (*Letter dated June 10, 2021, from Gregory Slater, Secretary, Maryland Department of Transportation, Chairman, Maryland Transportation Authority, transmitting "A report to the Maryland General Assembly, Regarding Phase 1 of the I-495 and I-270 Public Private Partnership (P3) Program."*)

Let's recall that there have been no significant capacity improvements on I-270 between Clarksburg and Frederick for over 70 years. Now due to the State's decision, no improvements are on the horizon.

Because of the Governor's changes, the State's recent comments on the Plan are wrong. It is the Governor's actions that will diminish the State's investment in I-270 highway infrastructure as well as and the role of I-270 as an economic generator.

Urbana's Diminished Priority for Development In Livable Frederick Plan

The State also notes that according to the Livable Frederick Plan, Urbana is a primary growth area. But it is listed fifth behind the City of Frederick, the South Frederick Triangle, Ballenger Creek, the Marc Rail Corridor. Logically you give priority to those areas best

equipped to support development—that is not the heavily congested I-270 corridor with no relief in sight.

Let's recall that Urbana's role as an economic generator was significantly diminished five years ago when, at the request of Natelli Communities, 603 acres were rezoned. This resulted in the loss of 3.5 million square feet of employment in Urbana. That is the equivalent of thirty five 100,000 square foot office buildings. **Now Natelli wants it back on the west side of I-270.** (*R-16-01-Urbana PUD-MXD staff report, dated December 7, 2016.*) This rezoning compounded Natelli's earlier mistake when prime employment land adjacent to I-270 was lost with the construction of two data centers that pay no taxes and employ few people. **Let's not forget, the main purpose for economic development is the creation of jobs and a robust tax base.**

Let's face it, for all practical purposes the I-270 high technology corridor now ends at Germantown. *Employment only exists in the east side of I-270 between MD 355 and I-270 from Clarksburg to Urbana.*

Employment Is Changing Dramatically Favoring Frederick City

Now and in the near future, many changes have and will take place in the future of employment in Frederick County. Adjusting to climate change, working from home, expansion of MARC rail service, and continued evolution of the City of Frederick as an independent economic entity generating its own jobs will decrease the need for any significant expansion of I-270.

The Sugarloaf Plan Should Aim to Preserve the Treasured Landscape

Let's get this Plan back to the original objective: preservation of the Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape. *The Sugarloaf Plan is not the place to plan for the Urbana Community Growth Area and Transit Oriented Development, despite what developers and their unregistered lobbyists may say and write.*

Specht, Jennifer

From: Johanna Springston <johannaspringston@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2022 9:18 PM
To: Council Members
Subject: Vote No on the Amendment to change the boundary of the Sugarloaf Plan

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Dear Council members,

I live across Rt. 80 from Tom Natelli's land. I am against allowing him to bring development into the Sugarloaf area. Not only would this be personally devastating to me and my family, but it will also jeopardize preservation in the Sugarloaf area. I am already aware of another large land owner, Worthington Manor Golf course (right next to my farm), that is interested in rezoning to commercial use. No doubt, if Mr. Natelli is allowed to develop his property, the golf course will have good justification to do the same. Then, my farm will be surrounded on two sides with development. At that point, we will no longer be living in a rural area. We will be living in an industrialized area.

The Sugarloaf area is worth preserving. There are plenty of other places in Frederick County that are appropriate for development. Sugarloaf is not one of them. We need to prioritize preservation, particularly in the southern part of the County, where the development pressure is so intense. Please hold the line for development at I-270 and reject this amendment.

Thank you,

Johanna Springston
8101 Fingerboard Rd.
Frederick, MD 21704 .

Specht, Jennifer

From: Carol Waldmann <c.waldmann@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, September 13, 2022 6:36 AM
To: Council Members
Subject: Boundry for Sugarloaf TL

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

I urge you with the strongest urgency to vote against the change in the border from rt 270 to rt 80. This is the gateway to Frederick county and must be preserved! It has key sight lines as well as important streams. The Border has long been 270 and this promise should be honored. Please vote against the amendment changing the border!

Carol Waldmann
Frederick Cty resident

Specht, Jennifer

From: Cherney, Ragen
Sent: Tuesday, September 13, 2022 9:23 AM
To: Brandt, Kimberly G.
Cc: Mitchell, Kathy (Legal)
Subject: FW: Frederick County Council on Disabilities seeking to discuss w/other Maryland counties who have up & running succesful MD Special Olympics Programs & our Sunday 4 pm trainings

Ragen Cherney
Chief of Staff/Legislative Director
Frederick County Council
Winchester Hall
12 East Church Street
Frederick, Maryland 21701
301.600.1049



From: smordensky@aol.com <smordensky@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 13, 2022 9:20 AM
To: Gardner, Jan <JGardner@FrederickCountyMD.gov>; Council Members <CouncilMembers@FrederickCountyMD.gov>
Subject: Fwd: Frederick County Council on Disabilities seeking to discuss w/other Maryland counties who have up & running succesful MD Special Olympics Programs & our Sunday 4 pm trainings

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Good morning council members & county executive,

After reading on Monday, 9/12/22 that an **"at-large council member"** might introduce an amendment to move the long-honored boundary from I-270 boundary separating high-density development of townhouses & strip malls to the east in Urbana City from the tranquility of a rural setting of natural forests, fields, streams, historic settings & deep roots along w/native brook trout & small farms & private homes of which very few are alike on the west of this interstate.

The Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan allows for creativity for both left and right-brained individuals. This plan also helps maintain the good health of the mind, body & soul with green, natural and open spaces. Who goes to a strip mall & drive in congested traffic to recreate?

Since Kai Hagan does not and will not accept developer contributions therefore we all know who is beholden & likely to repay that contribution!

In my humble estimation, this person who has not earned one thin dime of his FC council wages in any productivity during these many days & hours of public hearings on the Sugarloaf Plan & **needs to**

RECUSE himself from any future voting on this plan, immediately if not sooner!\

"Recuse" means to not vote because they may have been influenced by prior events like acting campaign contributions from developers.

This individual needs to learn & demonstrate good listening skills like sitting up straight, making good eye contact w/those speaking, and start paying attention to those making public comment & asking questions and doing the same for other FC council members.

I then drove up to Winchester Hall on 9/12/22 after composing my written public comment thinking it was Tuesday to share my thoughts w/this, **"out of touch council person"** to do a reality check.

Does he work for developers or the voters & residents of Frederick County?

The required public record shows he accepted campaign contributions from FC developers.

Shame , Shame Shame!

If this ill-informed individual introduces this amendment wanting to change the two and one half long & very long years of discussions & compromise upon reaching a consensus by all parties **there will be consequences at the ballot box!**

In Pennsylvania plain speak, where in the hell has he been?

Again, since his ears & processing of the spoken & written word leave something to be desired, many FC residents & property owners have been sitting at the compromising table composing this document w/input from all interested parties of The Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Management Plan **are just plain fed up & very fed up!**

This at-large candidate **will lose the election in November.**

The residents of Frederick County, MD are fed up with the development & traffic congestion it creates & causing increased taxes county spending & overcrowded schools, and creating more demand on our police department & limited social services & safety nets.

Former BoCC Chairman B.Y. of the last FC BoCC always said, "Development costs"! We agreed on that one point.

Development causes more traffic, more portables, more demand for public services and higher taxes!

We have had more than enough of the 50,000 approved building lots put in the FC-approved housing pipeline by the end of 2014 BoCC. Less than half have been built to date.

Many more approved building lots have been added since for different reasons. The New Market (NM) area, to the NM mayor's delight \$\$\$\$\$, will soon be exploding w/more development & more cabinet orders to sell for these homes!

It is proven **FACT** that development & concrete jungles promote more crime.

What's wrong with leaving natural areas, natural?

It

This proposed Sugarloaf PPlan as it came out of the PPlanning Commission also helps to reduce climate change, global warming and help the health of the Chesapeake bay. It makes for a much better world.

New development should go into those decaying urban areas where infrastructure already exists and not the exurbs. Land for growing food is limited. **When is the last time they tore down a strip mall to build a farm?**

We need are more protections & preservations like the Maryland Smart Growth Initiatives,

The real & original purpose of this email was to let FC elected leadership know that my visit to Winchester Hall Monday was not in vain. Below is a letter I composed to help the FC Commission on Disabilities.

Since I was already at Winchester Hall & I have never met a public hearing where I did not share my always valuable public comment. I shared what I hope is helpful to that body.

Now it is time to take my blood pressure medication.

I am driving up early this morning to get a free parking space at Winchester Hall while free parking is still available!

By the way, left-brained individuals are not always in their right minds. Most of us use both sides of our brains but one side is more dominant.

THERE IS HOPE FOR ALL.

Sincerely,

Stan Sr., (Retired MD World Studies & Science Teacher & Renaissance Man)

Address:

Pleasant Branch of Bennett Creek, a tributary of the Monocacy River in the Sugarloaf Treasured Management Plan (**STLMP**)

11401 Meadowlark DR.
ljamsville, MD 21754

Home/Office Phone: 301-831-6619

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

Cc: mward@frederickcountymd.gov <mward@frederickcountymd.gov>

Sent: Tue, Sep 13, 2022 7:27 am

Subject: Frederick County Council on Disabilities seeking to discuss w/other Maryland counties who have up & running succesful MD Special Olympics Programs & our Sunday 4 pm training

Good Morning,

Miles Ward (mward@frederickcountymd.gov) or 301-600-1110 is a member of the Frederick County, MD Commission on Disabilities and is seeking & requesting contact information from other successful Maryland Special Olympics Programs.

FC is wanting to expand its Maryland Special Olympics Program.

These young people came out Sunday after Sunday training w/their advisors to prepare for the Maryland Special Olympics.

I volunteered last season on Sunday afternoons to work w/the Carroll & Baltimore County-sponsored Special Olympics Team. These 5 - 6 young persons and their 2 -3 instructors have a very good program. It was a pleasure to meet them & enjoy their company.

Could you please forward this email to advisors of other Maryland Special Olympic Programs for all four seasons?

Miles is copied on this email & can find more BRASS information below.

Sincerely,

Stan Sr., (Retired MD World Studies & Science Teacher & Renaissance Man)

Stan Mordensky, Sr.
11401 Meadowlark DR.
ljamsville, MD 21754

Cell Phone: 301-639-8584 (Best choice)

Specht, Jennifer

From: Jean Rosolino <jeanrosolino@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2022 6:51 PM
To: McKay, Steve; Blue, Michael; Donald, Jerry; Fitzwater, Jessica; Keegan-Ayer, MC; Hagen, Kai; Council Members
Subject: Re: Sugarloaf

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

PLEASE!!!!

Do not agree to Mr. Dacey's proposal to amend the I270 boundary.

Do not cow-tow to special interests/developers. There are plenty of areas in and around Frederick that can and are being developed.

We, who have chosen to live in the area around Hope Hill, have done so because we want a rural surrounding! Not development.

This pristine landscape needs to stay as such. Why should certain individuals/corporations have their parcels of land exempted from the original I270 border? The farm area on either side of Park Mills between Fingerboard and I270 could become as densely housed as Urbana!! *Do not let that sprawl creep over the other side of 270!!* We want and need farmland in Frederick County. It's part of the agricultural heritage of this area.

Keep to the I270 border. Thank you.

Jean Rosolino
Acting & Voiceovers
609-430-9000 (MD)
JeanRosolino@gmail.com

Dear County Council,

I hope to make it to the meeting tonight. Here is the gist of what I would like to say:

As I step back from the problem of the Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape debate, I am struck by a few themes voiced meeting after meeting: Many constituents and landowners fear that governmental constraints on their land is either; A. insulting because they have been such good stewards of the land and they will always remain so (Stronghold and many farmers and nature lovers who own land understandably feel this way); B. feel they are losing their livelihood because arable land is being deemed off limits – (Am I correct that much of this is actually now mandated by federal regulation and not county meddling... and except for logging, residents for the foreseeable future are not probably going to be seeing county meddling in their farming practices); or C. realize that the money they could make from developing land they own will no longer be gained, as major housing and industrial developments will no longer be allowed.

While I don't think everyone can get what they feel they want, if we do this right, everyone will get what they need.

I understand that everyone is passionate about this issue and want what is best. To get some direction on how to proceed it is helpful to pull back farther from this picture I think about other areas in society where we have had push and pull over governmental control and how it has played out.

In 1980, realizing that pressures of development were only going to grow stronger, Montgomery County set aside an area to be an Agricultural Reserve. Looking at the zoning maps of Frederick County, one can see that unless planning is done to safeguard our green spaces, Frederick County could become MORE DEVELOPED than Montgomery County.

"Oh, it could never happen here!" You say?

I find the concept of the "Fairness Doctrine" to be a good example of why government safeguards are important. The "fairness doctrine" implemented in 1927 to ensure radio served the public interest led to the formation of the FCC in 1934 to regulate media so our country never became like the Soviet Union or other fascist countries where propaganda drove the masses to believe falsehoods. Unfortunately, in 1985 it was deemed that cable media need not abide to portions of the fairness doctrine and in 2000 even more regulations were eliminated. I recall hearing a spokesperson for the FCC in 2000 saying "In the United States of America we don't need safeguards to keep our democratic institutions intact." I was alone in my car at the time, but I shouted back at my radio "The reason we are a democracy is BECAUSE we have safeguards in place." In 2011 the doctrine was fully repealed so that it is no longer illegal for radio and tv to broadcast lies. Think about what an effect this has had on our society. We have people who watch Fox News and people who watch MSNBC and those of us in the middle have to put up with screaming idiocy and unhappiness all around.

Just as I believe that what separates most Americans is much less than what the politicians and media would have us believe. I believe there are solutions that can give some satisfaction to the parties who are worried about the county moving to safeguard our land for generations to come. I have suggested to Tom Natelli that we could join our land to create a mountain bike trail system that would be of great use to our community but also allow for forest growth that we greatly need in this area. I was struck by the fact that the Earth Science Center by Lincoln Elementary is now also considered an Arboretum. What if some of us followed the amazing model of Stronghold and created a privately owned arboretum and nature preserve?

Anyway, I can't say all of this tonight, but these are my thoughts. I need to talk to my neighbors who have a tree farm and are also big supporters of the treasured landscape.

I think, when you think about the future, there is really a no brainer. We either protect the land all the way to 270, or we concede that Frederick can not be as bold and forward thinking as Montgomery County. Montgomery county resisted people with money and power who lived within their county who wanted to develop more land- we should be able to resist those same citizens of Montgomery County who wish to make Frederick their own personal goldmine for development.

Thanks for being brave through all of this and sticking up for our children and championing the great plan the planners in our county have put forth.

Yours truly,

Johnny Carrera

Specht, Jennifer

From: Cherney, Ragen
Sent: Tuesday, September 13, 2022 11:40 AM
To: Brandt, Kimberly G.
Cc: Mitchell, Kathy (Legal)
Subject: FW: Thurston Rd development
Attachments: Please hold firm to the I-270 boundary; Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Plan; Save the Sugarloaf & Frederick Co.; PLEASE support preservation of the Sugarloaf Region; Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Master Plan; Sugarloaf Plan ; Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Plan

Sugarloaf record emails.

Ragen Cherney

Chief of Staff/Legislative Director

Frederick County Council
Winchester Hall
12 East Church Street
Frederick, Maryland 21701
301.600.1049



From: siejohunt@aol.com <siejohunt@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 13, 2022 11:23 AM
To: Council Members <CouncilMembers@FrederickCountyMD.gov>
Subject: Thurston Rd development

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

To all the County Council members:

I wanted to share my thoughts on this proposal - Development of Thurston Rd. (the 2 parcels that Natelli owns). I am against it. Phil Dacey has put this forward for approval. How does someone completely contradict his own views. He has said that he wants to fix roads and infrastructure. You can't keep building and not fix the traffic and roads. How can you even contemplate adding more housing to southern Frederick County when the roads can't support it as it is now.

When 270 backs up Thurston Rd becomes a highway. A road that is 30 mph, people traveling at 50, 60, 70 mph and passing on a curvy road. My daughter almost got T-Boned pulling out of our driveway.

Natelli lives in Potomac. He does not care how much he keeps building. It is money in his pocket. Is it "Money in your Pocket"??? I have to ask. How can you consider this and another question, why does this keep coming up for debate.

Do any of you even come down to this part of the county? Do you see what is happening?

I am asking you to vote against this proposal. The West side of 270 cannot support more houses.

Thank you for your time.

Leslie Novotny

2323 Thurston Rd
Frederick, MD 21704

Specht, Jennifer

From: Ilene Freedman <ilene@houseinthewoods.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 13, 2022 11:15 AM
To: Fitzwater, Jessica; Keegan-Ayer, MC; Council Members
Subject: Please hold firm to the I-270 boundary

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

I am writing to urge Council members to vote against the proposal to allow dense development west of I-270 or exempt any properties from this boundary. This has been the most important point for me throughout the whole process of preserving this important rural region. The line has been to keep west of I-270 rural and I urge you to hold this line by voting against Council Member Dacey's proposal to change it.

The development pressure, from Natelli and others, cannot be stronger than the will to preserve this region and hold the line at 270. If this amendment goes through to exempt Natelli's properties from the plan, it is a clear message that development will continue to creep in with disregard to the preservation of the Sugarloaf and Battlefield regions. It is the very thing we are trying to restrain. Please stay firm on this one.

Thank you,

Ilene Freedman
House in the Woods Farm
Adamstown, MD



Virus-free. www.avast.com

Specht, Jennifer

From: Maureen Heavner <moheavner@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, September 13, 2022 10:16 AM
To: Council Members
Subject: PLEASE support preservation of the Sugarloaf Region

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Frederick County Council Members:

Please vote against the amendment and return to the July 2021 Plan boundary (Rt. 80 and Thurston Road). I urge all of you to support preservation from the Montgomery County line, along I-270 to the Monocacy River.

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 is losing 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, both of which I have experienced. I now have a security system installed to help keep my property safe.

In the last 20+/- years we in the Sugarloaf Conservancy area have had to fight, a Mega Church, the power company and high-tension power lines, and a high-powered gun range with Old Line Arsenal. All in efforts to keep the landscape, wildlife and agricultural undisturbed. It has been exhausting mentally and financially, 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. I live a modest life with a modest income, and have contributed money I couldn't afford to give to fight these endless battles in hopes of maintaining the tranquil beauty of my community.

The last thing Urbana needs is more cookie-cutter houses, which has brought unbelievable traffic to an infrastructure that can't support the volume of the community. I am also concerned about the huge increase in crime that has come to the region with all the new builds. I am very thankful we have 3 police officers that live on my street of 13 houses. We have had cars and houses broken into along with a felon loose on our road trying to steal a car. Life as we once knew it, is long gone, but you can control adding to the demise of our beautiful countryside.

During the Covid shutdown thousands of people from around the county and beyond made daily trips to Sugarloaf Mountain to partake in its 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 26 years in the peace and tranquility of your home. I have watched the Natelli family, along with the Planning Commission destroy the beautiful countryside I invested in. I drive up Route 80 and across Park Mills Road to avoid the nightmare development that was once known as Urbana without any streetlights. I realize change is inevitable, but we need to be responsible with the long-term planning.

I am looking for leadership that hears from all the people, not just the developers who will line their pockets. Please listen to the community. I doubt you will ever hear people say, "Oh yes, please over-develop my town, kill the wildlife and take away all the beautiful natural resources". Please do the right thing!

Best regards,
Maureen Heavner
8603 Burnt Hickory Circle
Frederick, MD 21704

Specht, Jennifer

From: TERRY OLAND <terry.oland@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, September 13, 2022 10:30 AM
To: Council Members
Subject: Save the Sugarloaf & Frederick Co.

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Council Members,

It's time to STEP UP for the Sugarloaf & Frederick's Preservation and HOLD THE 270 LINE !!! PLEASE do your job & DO NOT approve Councilmen's Dacey's amendment to CUT OUT Mr. Natelli's FARMLAND from a GREAT PRESERVATION plan! Mr. Natelli, who lives in Montgomery Co. and ALWAYS give his Frederick office address at Council meetings, purchased OUTSTANDING FARMLAND and he should FARM IT! Frederick Co. or the State of Maryland DID NOT give Mr. Natelli any guarantee for development rights!

IF you open the door to more development like he has already done in Frederick how do we support our Schools, Roads, Fire & Police Protection, Clean Air & Water and ALL the other services that will be needed! We, the ones who live here, will be stuck with the bill & all the mess as Mr. Natelli returns to his home in Montgomery Co. with pockets full of money!

PLEASE do what's right and HOLD THE LINE !!!!!!!

My wife & I have lived in Frederick Co. for 71 years and it's time to save our OUTSATNDING HOME before it's TO LATE !!!!!

Terry & Sharon
2409 Thurston Road
Frederick, Maryland 21704

Specht, Jennifer

From: MBorders <mborders@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, September 13, 2022 10:06 AM
To: Council Members
Subject: Sugarloaf Plan

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Good morning,

The Frederick County Civil War Round Table would like to express its opposition to the proposed boundary changes to the Sugarloaf Plan and recommend the use of the boundaries originally proposed by the Planning Commission. As many of you are aware, the proposed changes threaten the encirclement of Monocacy National Battlefield with the sort of rampant, unchecked development that has swallowed the village of Urbana. The development that has been unleashed there has ruined the historic landscape and viewshed of that region, while the proposed boundary adjustment to the Sugarloaf Plan would allow for much the same thing around two of the significant public green spaces of Frederick County, Sugarloaf Mountain and Monocacy National Battlefield.

We have reached out to our history and preservation partners about this and you will be hearing from them in your individual emails or by phone. Again, we encourage you to resist the recent boundary amendment and stick with the Planning Commission's original boundary so as to protect both the viewshed and landscape of these historic locations.

Most sincerely,

Matt Borders,
President, FCCWRT

Specht, Jennifer

From: Bev Thoms <thoms.bev@icloud.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 13, 2022 10:14 AM
To: Council Members
Cc: Bev Thoms
Subject: Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Master Plan

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Dear Council Members,

- I support the Plan's I-270 boundary from Montgomery County to the Monocacy.
- I support the Overlay and the Plan's preservation goals for the Sugarloaf area.
- I oppose the paragraph on page 54, which opens the door to short-term Plan amendments because it creates an explicit opportunity for developers to quickly push for Plan changes despite more than 2 years of work and public input on the current version.

Every society needs rural landscape for the benefit of its people. It provides food, fiber, recreation (hiking, biking, kayaking), cleansing of the air and water, carbon sequestration, and the spiritual renewal that comes with communing with the natural world. Please restrict development to the east of I 270. Rural landscape is rare and precious and for the sake of human health and welfare, needs to be protected.

Thank you for having the courage to stand up to development pressure.

Bev Thoms
Dickerson, MD 20842

Specht, Jennifer

From: Paul Rosencrantz <bakervalley1@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 13, 2022 10:03 AM
To: Council Members
Cc: Fitzwater, Jessica; Keegan-Ayer, MC; Donald, Jerry
Subject: Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Plan

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Dear Council Members,

As local residents who would be directly affected by the proposed special interest carve-out for a developer, we strongly urge you to vote NO on the Dacey amendment to the Sugarloaf Plan. The existing plan as voted on by the planning commission properly safeguards environmental, historical and community interests, and weakening those protections for the sake of providing economic privilege for one special interest smacks of the worst of cronyism.

A vote for the amendment excluding the developer from the same rules risks undermining the entire purpose of the boundary plan. It provides a gateway for large-scale restructuring of the use of land on the quiet west side of 270, and would place enormous development pressure on land adjacent to the special-interest carve outs.

Perhaps worst of all, this amendment provides yet another nail for those who wish to hammer home a message that cynicism about government in all forms is warranted. Given our country's current deep distrust of the role of government, do members really want to be seen to blatantly favor the powerful at the expense of local residents and farmers? Holding the line to the Monocacy River has the benefit of being the fairest approach, is the right choice scientifically, and remains the best way to preserve unique rural nature.

Many thanks for your consideration,
Paul and Gretchen Rosencrantz

4139 Baker Valley Road
Frederick MD 21704

Specht, Jennifer

From: Dave Honchalk <hayduke2@verizon.net>
Sent: Tuesday, September 13, 2022 10:44 AM
To: Cherney, Ragen
Subject: Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Plan

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

County Council members:

I am writing to encourage the Council to vote to approve the original version of the Sugarloaf Treasured Landscape Plan that holds development to the eastern side of I-270. The plan has been through months of reviews, numerous workshops and has had ample time for public input. The recent efforts to modify this to allow more intensive development is short-sighted and giving voice to a loud, vocal group who are raising concerns and using fear tactics at the last minute.

Please vote to protect and enhance this area of unique natural resources, great biodiversity and wildlife habitat. It would also serve to help mitigate the impacts of climate change on the county. This is an opportunity to preserve a portion of Frederick County for future generations.

Respectfully,

Dave Honchalk
Monrovia, MD.