

James, Karen

From: Bill Steigelmann <bsteig@aol.com>
Sent: Friday, September 19, 2025 10:32 AM
To: Council Members; County Executive; Nick Carrera
Cc: Planning Commission
Subject: Re: Suggestions for 9/25 meeting on data centers

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Nick and Frederick County Officials,

The reality is that the 5 CC members who controlled what is in the CDI Ordinance would NOT pay any attention to pleas made by me and others to explicitly eliminate considering a power outage an emergency. Because of the their refusal to listen, there is zero noise constraint when ALL THE DIESEL GENERATORS FOR MILES AROUND ALL SIMULTAMEOUSLY OPERATE AT FULL OUTPUT!

I believe the exemption in the County's Noise Ordinance was adopted several decades ago when "Emergency" referred exclusively to either: A) ambulances and fire-fighters getting to a destination ASAP, so the sirens on the fire station roof, fire-trucks, and ambulances were exempt, and B) air-raid sirens, so the public knew to quickly seek shelter. IT IS A TERRIBLE MISTAKE TO PLACE POWER OUTAGES IN THE SAME CATEGORY! INFANTS AND CHILDRES ARE HARMED BY EXCESSIVE NOISE! The noise begins without warning and may continue without pause for hours or days! Citizens will need to evacuate their homes, but most folks have no where to go on a cold winter night when electricity demand hits a peak. The other annual peak in electricity demand occurs between 3 and 4 on a hot summer afternoon, when a family's only vehicle may be miles away.

Bill Steigelmann

On Thursday, September 18, 2025 at 11:02:10 PM EDT, Nick Carrera <mjcarrera@comcast.net> wrote:

Noise was a contentious issue tonight (9/18). Maybe all the criticism was valid, but I for one had no idea what sound we were even talking about. Here's a suggestion, and Mike Kuykendall might need to help. Make a recording of sounds at a data center, to include sound expected when generators are being exercised. Set up speakers at a distance from the entrance to St. Joseph, with the sound meter near the entrance to the church, along with a sign explaining what people are hearing. Adjust the speaker output so the meter measures an honest 55 dB (is that the canonical number). During the later discussion in the church, people will have a realistic idea what sound level we're talking about. Some might find it lower than they'd feared.

Overlay tonight seemed misunderstood. Explain that the overlay is needed to establish and limit where data centers may be located. All that should be at issue is what specific areas the overlay will cover. Project a picture of the overlay map that was submitted for state consideration. Be sure to indicate the part that is, in a sense, already vulnerable for data centers, because it was bought by Quantum Loophole for that purpose.

Well issues. This strikes me as a toughie. It would have been far-seeing, had Quantum done a thorough well survey before any earth disturbance was done, to get a baseline. It might still be useful to do such a survey now, to try to get an idea what changes are occurring because of the construction work. It would be a good PR move for the data center

builders to make free remediation for those wells that are or will be affected. It may be useful, if true, to stress that the well problems are related to construction, and may fade when that is done.

Net Financial benefit. This continues to be a serious weak link in the county's case for data centers. When the issue comes up, have figures from the MuniCap study on how much financial revenue the county might realize from imposing different levels of personal property tax. Be realistic regarding chances of state approval. And have ideas on how the money would be spent. As I hope you are aware by now, you are vulnerable in not having gotten Sage to do a study of the NET financial benefit to the county. You won't manage that now in a week's time -- or maybe you could, if you paid attention to the cost figures and methodology done by Blanca and Steve Poteat. At the very least you should not go on pretending that data centers will be exclusively gravy. There will be costs, even severe costs. Continuing to ignore them erodes your credibility.

You really should get MDE and Catellus to come.

Following these suggestions will not eliminate contention at the meeting, but they could make it better focused and relevant.

Nick Carrera, 2602 scenic Thurston Road

James, Karen

From: Nick Carrera <mjcarrera@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, September 19, 2025 10:53 AM
To: Bill Steigelmann; Council Members; County Executive
Cc: Planning Commission
Subject: Re: Suggestions for 9/25 meeting on data centers

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Good point, Bill. The "all data all the time" folks can't claim that a disruption to data flow is an "emergency" in the same category as for ambulances and fire trucks.

Nick

On 9/19/2025 10:32 AM, Bill Steigelmann wrote:

Nick and Frederick County Officials,

The reality is that the 5 CC members who controlled what is in the CDI Ordinance would NOT pay any attention to pleas made by me and others to explicitly eliminate considering a power outage an emergency. Because of the their refusal to listen, there is zero noise constraint when ALL THE DIESEL GENERATORS FOR MILES AROUND ALL SIMULTAMEOUSLY OPERATE AT FULL OUTPUT!

I believe the exemption in the County's Noise Ordinance was adopted several decades ago when "Emergency" referred exclusively to either: A) ambulances and fire-fighters getting to a destination ASAP, so the sirens on the fire station roof, fire-trucks, and ambulances were exempt, and B) air-raid sirens, so the public knew to quickly seek shelter. IT IS A **TERRIBLE MISTAKE** TO PLACE POWER OUTAGES IN THE SAME CATEGORY! INFANTS AND CHILDRES ARE HARMED BY EXCESSIVE NOISE! The noise begins without warning and may continue without pause for hours or days! Citizens will need to evacuate their homes, but most folks have no where to go on a cold winter night when electricity demand hits a peak. The other annual peak in electricity demand occurs between 3 and 4 on a hot summer afternoon, when a family's only vehicle may be miles away.

Bill Steigelmann

On Thursday, September 18, 2025 at 11:02:10 PM EDT, Nick Carrera <mjcarrera@comcast.net> wrote:

Noise was a contentious issue tonight (9/18). Maybe all the criticism was valid, but I for one had no idea what sound we were even talking about. Here's a suggestion, and Mike Kuykendall might need to help. Make a recording of sounds at a data center, to include sound expected when generators are being exercised. Set up speakers at a distance from the entrance to St. Joseph, with the sound meter near the entrance to the church, along with a sign explaining what people are hearing. Adjust the speaker output so the meter measures an honest 55 dB (is that the canonical number). During the later

discussion in the church, people will have a realistic idea what sound level we're talking about. Some might find it lower than they'd feared.

Overlay tonight seemed misunderstood. Explain that the overlay is needed to establish and limit where data centers may be located. All that should be at issue is what specific areas the overlay will cover. Project a picture of the overlay map that was submitted for state consideration. Be sure to indicate the part that is, in a sense, already vulnerable for data centers, because it was bought by Quantum Loophole for that purpose.

Well issues. This strikes me as a toughie. It would have been far-seeing, had Quantum done a thorough well survey before any earth disturbance was done, to get a baseline. It might still be useful to do such a survey now, to try to get an idea what changes are occurring because of the construction work. It would be a good PR move for the data center builders to make free remediation for those wells that are or will be affected. It may be useful, if true, to stress that the well problems are related to construction, and may fade when that is done.

Net Financial benefit. This continues to be a serious weak link in the county's case for data centers. When the issue comes up, have figures from the MuniCap study on how much financial revenue the county might realize from imposing different levels of personal property tax. Be realistic regarding chances of state approval. And have ideas on how the money would be spent. As I hope you are aware by now, you are vulnerable in not having gotten Sage to do a study of the NET financial benefit to the county. You won't manage that now in a week's time -- or maybe you could, if you paid attention to the cost figures and methodology done by Blanca and Steve Poteat. At the very least you should not go on pretending that data centers will be exclusively gravy. There will be costs, even severe costs. Continuing to ignore them erodes your credibility.

You really should get MDE and Catellus to come.

Following these suggestions will not eliminate contention at the meeting, but they could make it better focused and relevant.

Nick Carrera, 2602 scenic Thurston Road

Quantum Project -- Obvious ongoing violations of Environmental Covenant and EMPs at Quantum Maryland Project

AC Malinak acmalinak@gmail.com

To: Anuradha Mohanty -MDE- anuradha.mohanty@maryland.gov

Good afternoon Ms. Mohanty,

Subsequent to our correspondence earlier this year regarding violations at the Quantum Maryland project site in Adamstown, today I am writing to share further serious concerns about the roads around the site. Today we drove to St. Joseph's Church on Manor Woods Road in Adamstown, on the section of road that remains open to the public. I have included photos taken today of the muddy road conditions we encountered this afternoon.

Along the open section of Manor Woods Road, on Ballenger Creek Pike, and on Mountville Road, portions of the public travel lanes were fully covered in mud, with pavement underneath not even visible in some sections of the roads. The truck traffic is incessant, and dirt and mud are constantly being tracked out on every vehicle coming out of the construction sites.

While it is understandable that rainy weather may make things harder to keep clean, this issue is not unexpected in the construction industry in general and methods surely must exist to manage it. The sloppy public road management of the developers in charge of the Quantum project is certainly not consistent with the conditions of the EMPs that apply here, and that were specifically agreed to by signature of those same project developers. Furthermore, no typical construction project of any kind in Maryland should be allowed to consistently have this level of dirt on the public roads.

Can MDE confirm that all of the material being tracked out from the sites has been tested to ascertain whether it is safe or not? Copious amounts of potentially contaminated soil and mud are obviously leaving the sites on tires, cars, and trucks, from multiple access points. This careless practice by the site developers is clearly a violation of the

Environmental Covenant, the EMPs, and likely of other Maryland law, and puts the public and also the project workers at risk, not only in the areas immediately adjacent to the site, but also at their own workplaces and homes where the contamination is being carried.

MDE should immediately require whatever actions are needed to prevent this widespread dispersal of untested soil and mud from leaving the Quantum project. The current approach, even with street sweepers, is demonstrably ineffective and clearly insufficient to protect the residents of the area from exposure to known toxic materials. One solution could be paved, dedicated equipment and truck wash racks, for all vehicles, likely similar to the process required for excavators handling contaminated soil. [See page 16 of the Site Management Plan, October 30, 2017, by Geo-Technology Associates, included with the Environmental Covenant document on the MDE website, which states

"Section 5.2 General Activities Associated with Earth Work

....Excavating equipment used within the Soil Management Area must be decontaminated at the conclusion of the work, and before being removed from the work area."]

Overall, the actions and practices of the Quantum developers appear to violate not only the EC and EMPs, but also the spirit and concept of "controlled removal" that is the fundamental basis of much of the reasoning behind the mandatory guidelines of those binding documents. All violations should be remedied immediately and inadequate controls corrected before the Quantum project is allowed to continue.

Best regards,

AC Malinak

Adamstown, Maryland

cc: Mr. Brian Dietz, Chief, State Assessment and Remediation Division (Via email:
bdietz@maryland.gov)

Ms. Amy Hollister, Section Head, State Superfund (Via email: amy.hollister@maryland.gov)
Frederick County Executive Jessica Fitzwater (Via email:
jfitzwater@frederickcountymd.gov)

Frederick County Council (Via email: councilmembers@frederickcountymd.gov)

Frederick County Planning Commission (Via email: planningcommission@frederickcountymd.gov)

Ms. Jessica Shulman, Geologist, Land Restoration Program (Via email: jessica.shulman@maryland.gov)

Mr. Tate Stevens, Geologist, Land Restoration Program (Via email: tate.stevens@maryland.gov)



Maryland

Department of the Environment

Wes Moore, Governor
Aruna Miller, Lt. Governor

Serena McIlwain, Secretary
Suzanne E. Dorsey, Deputy Secretary
Adam Ortiz, Deputy Secretary

April 7, 2025

ELECTRONIC AND CERTIFIED MAIL

Mr. David Irving, Vice President
Catellus Maryland, LLC
20251 Century Boulevard, Suite 170
Germantown, MD 20874

RE: Request for Information to ensure compliance with Land Use Controls in Quantum Maryland
Property (Former Eastalco Aluminum Plant)
5601 Manor Woods Road, Frederick MD 21701
BMI#MD202

Dear Mr. Irving:

The Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE) conducted an inspection at the Quantum Maryland property located at 5601 Manor Woods Road, Frederick, MD (“site”) on March 28th, 2025. By this letter, we request additional information to evaluate compliance with the requirements set forth in the following documents:

- Environmental Covenant (EC) issued for the property on November 28, 2017.
- Environmental Management Plan (EMP) 1A dated April 1, 2024
- EMP 2 dated May 20, 2024
- EMP 3 dated June 4, 2024
- EMP 4 dated June 4, 2024
- EMP 5 dated November 13, 2024

Specifically, **the property must maintain compliance with the following:**

1. **Environmental Covenant issued by the MDE specifies:**
 - a. The Health and Safety Plan must include appropriate dust control measures and air monitoring to ensure that all worker protection requirements are met.
2. **All EMPs approved by the MDE specifies:**
 - a. Visual indications of dust will be observed and recorded, and dust suppression activities will be implemented during earth moving activities at the site.
 - b. A water truck will be routinely present on-site during construction activities and available for use.
 - c. Potable water and approved site dewatering water will be used for dust control.
 - d. Dust monitoring efforts will be implemented to confirm dust doesn't exceed OSHA PEL of 15 mg/m³.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NEEDED:

MDE identified the following areas where additional information is needed to determine compliance with the LUCs:

- The MDE site inspection on March 28th, 2025, identified that the required dust control measures were not being implemented on site. Excessive dust was noted by Tate Stevens and Jessica Shulman on March 28th, 2025, Site Visit report. Onsite personnel confirmed the lack of water trucks being used for dust control in the previous weeks, resulting in excessive dust in the work site. In addition, LRP has received citizen inquiries about elevated dust levels in the past month. Consequently, MDE is requesting additional clarification/information regarding the dust control measures. **Please provide verification that proper dust control and monitoring measures were occurring on site in the form of invoices documentation confirming the presence of a water truck, approximate volumes of water utilized for dust control, source of water (potable/frac tanks), and photographic evidence of dust control and monitoring being implemented on site. Please also confirm that dust monitoring will occur daily at the site and dust control measures will be implemented, as required, during all future work at the site.**

The information submitted will be used to determine whether the property is in compliance with the LUCs as set forth in the Environmental Covenant and Environmental Management Plans. All requested information should be provided to the MDE within fourteen (14) business days of receipt of this letter. If you have any questions, please contact Ms. Anuradha Mohanty at 410-537-3446 or anuradha.mohanty@maryland.gov.

Sincerely,

Anuradha Mohanty

Anuradha Mohanty
Project Manager
Land Restoration Program

cc: Mr. Michael Kuykendall, Sr. Vice President, Catellus Maryland, LLC. (Via email: mkuykendall@catellus.com)

Mr. Bill Kennedy, Sr. Vice President, Catellus Maryland, LLC. (Via email: bkennedy@catellus.com)

Mr. William Silverstein, Senior Consultant, GEI (Via email: wsilverstein@geiconsultants.com)
Mr. Brian Dietz, Chief, State Assessment and Remediation Division (Via email: bdietz@maryland.gov)

Ms. Amy Hollister, Section Head, State Superfund (Via email: amy.hollister@maryland.gov)
Ms. Jessica Shulman, Geologist, Land Restoration Program (Via email: jessica.shulman@maryland.gov)

Mr. Tate Stevens, Geologist, Land Restoration Program (Via email: tate.stevens@maryland.gov)



OUTSIDE

70°F

MPH
60 80 100





