From:	Brandt, Kimberly G.
To:	Specht, Jennifer
Subject:	FW: Vote YES on Sugarloaf Plan compromise
Date:	Tuesday, October 25, 2022 5:11:17 PM
Attachments:	Sugarloaf Plan and Overlay.msg image001.png We are willing to accept the compromise plan for Sugarloaf - from Trail Riders of Today.msg

---

From: Cherney, Ragen <RCherney@FrederickCountyMD.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, October 25, 2022 4:49 PM
To: Brandt, Kimberly G. <KGBrandt@FrederickCountyMD.gov>; Mitchell, Kathy (Legal) <KMitchell2@FrederickCountyMD.gov>
Subject: FW: Vote YES on Sugarloaf Plan compromise

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

From: peterblood3213@comcast.net <peterblood3213@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, October 25, 2022 4:20 PM
To: Council Members <CouncilMembers@FrederickCountyMD.gov>
Subject: Vote YES on Sugarloaf Plan compromise

Dear Council member,

I urge you to vote in favor of the Sugarloaf Plan compromise introduced by Kai Hagen which excludes Resource Conservation (RC) zoning from the Overlay zoning requirements. I am in favor of the compromise because it would preserve Sugarloaf and surrounding areas, hold development at 270 where it has been for decades, remove the invitation on page 54 to reopen the Plan, AND also concedes to several demands by the Stonghold family. The Hagen compromise is the best option now available to Frederick County.

Peter Blood
Urbana, MD

From: Anne Garrett
To: Council Members
Subject: Sugarloaf Plan and Overlay
Date: Tuesday, October 25, 2022 3:45:59 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Dear Council Members:

You have important work ahead of you this evening.

Please:

- Amend the Sugarloaf Plan with the compromise,
- Pass the Plan as amended, and
- Pass the Overlay legislation.

So much time and effort has brought us to this moment. You have spent countless hours listening to public comments, and I really appreciate your hard work and your *truly amazing patience*. Now, it is your responsibility to get this task done! Please show the citizens of Frederick County, particularly the people who live in the Sugarloaf Plan area and those who love to visit that region, that you CARE about the views of your citizens.

Once you have agreed to EVERYTHING *Stronghold requested in writing*, MOVE ON. You will have made the necessary concessions to Stronghold, so it will be time to remember the concerns of your constituents.

Please leave a lasting legacy for the people who come after us, a legacy you can be PROUD of. Pass the Sugarloaf Plan and the Overlay this evening.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Anne Garrett
610 Biggs Avenue
Frederick, MD 21702

From:	Micek, Christina
To:	Council Members; McKay, Steve; Blue, Michael; Donald, Jerry; Fitzwater, Jessica; Keegan-Ayer, MC; Hagen, Kai; Dacey, Phil
Cc:	Christina Micek
Subject:	We are willing to accept the compromise plan for Sugarloaf - from Trail Riders of Today
Date:	Tuesday, October 25, 2022 3:40:26 PM
Attachments:	image001.png

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

We just got an email from the Md Ornithological Soc. conservation committee today- who is just learning about this situation from the Washington Post article published yesterday- and expressed extreme concern to us.
https://www.washingtonpost.com/dc-md-va/2022/10/24/sugarloaf-mountain-frederick-council-vote/
All eyes are on Frederick county, because of this article.

TROT would accept the compromise as the best solution we can get today, but it still has issues. The compromise at least gives Stronghold (Sugarloaf Mountain) everything they've said they need in order to keep the mountain open to the public, which is one of the goals. TROT regretfully supports the compromise as the position that will gain the most preservation possible in this political moment.

We want to thank the Council Members for supporting the I-270 boundary, and for removing page 54 invitation to reopen the Plan. The Plan's proponents already compromised significantly when the Council eliminated the rezoning of steep slopes from Ag to RC. While our hope was that the entire Plan area would be protected to the full extent proposed, we prefer the compromise of excluding RC zoning to the option of a no-vote or a vote to remand the Overlay back to the Planning Commission. In the event that Stronghold refuses to compromise and continues to insist they will close Sugarloaf Mountain, the Council SHOULD pass the Sugarloaf Plan and Overlay as currently amended. **One landowner should not have veto power over County land use policy.**

Sincerely,
TROT
Written by Christina Micek/ Board member

Note: My working hours may not be your working hours. Please do not feel obligated to reply outside of your normal work schedule.

From: Christina Micek <Christina.Micek@natgeo.com>

Date: Monday, October 17, 2022 at 7:38 PM

To: "councilmembers@frederickcountymd.gov" <councilmembers@frederickcountymd.gov>, "SMcKay@frederickcountymd.gov" <SMcKay@frederickcountymd.gov>, "MBlue@FrederickCountyMD.gov" <MBlue@FrederickCountyMD.gov>, "JDonald@FrederickCountyMD.gov" <JDonald@FrederickCountyMD.gov>, "JFitzwater@FrederickCountyMD.gov" <JFitzwater@FrederickCountyMD.gov>, "MCKeegan-Ayer@FrederickCountyMD.gov" <MCKeegan-Ayer@FrederickCountyMD.gov>, "KHagen@FrederickCountyMD.gov" <KHagen@FrederickCountyMD.gov>, "PDacey@FrederickCountyMD.gov" <PDacey@FrederickCountyMD.gov>

Cc: Christina Micek <boardmember01@trot-md.org>

Subject: Please keep the current language about the overlay in the Sugarloaf plan- from Trail Riders of Today

October 17, 2022

Dear Honorable Council Members,

Trail Riders of Today (TROT) would like to express our sincere thanks for your hard work over the last few months on the Sugarloaf Plan. This is an important time in the county, as land use becomes a hot topic around the state, country, and world. Since we can't send another representative to the meeting scheduled

for tomorrow, October 18th, we hope you will accept this letter to encourage you to vote in favor of the Sugarloaf Plan as currently amended.

As you are holding a hearing on the Overlay District, Bill 22.25 tomorrow, we would like to specifically request that the current language about the overlay remain in the plan. We need to be able to rely on our council members to uphold the Overlay preservation zoning. We understand that Stronghold (Sugarloaf Mountain) opposes this legislation as they want to be cut out of the plan and the overlay, but we believe their concerns are misplaces. As you know, neither the plan or the overlay change current land uses. Of course, as is typical in any land use conservation or preservation push in lang management, we are also seeing opposition from developers, builders, and realtors. Their interests do not align with the community interest of preservation, but in being able to do more business on the west side of 1-270.

We feel it would be outside of the interests of the community to do otherwise. Remember, Frederick County planners have long used 1-270 as a boundary between developed areas to the east and undeveloped areas to the west.

- We need to preserve the beautiful views of Sugarloaf
- Sugarloaf is at the headwaters of part of the protected area
- It is covered by fields and woods with no commercially-zoned property
- It comprises agriculturally zoned property
- It abuts the Monocacy battlefield, an area of historic and cultural significance It abuts Hopehiill, an historic village with cultural significance

he lasting cost to communities of permanently losing open space – unique and irreplaceable areas that cannot be replicated – is steep. Livable Frederick's "Making Our Environment Vision A Reality" includes "Category: Land: Goal: …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."

We sincerely appreciate you listening to our concerns, and hope you will vote that the current language about the overlay remain in the plan.

In Kind Regards,
Trail Riders of Today
*Written by Christina Micek- Board Member of TROT-

From: Brandt, Kimberly G.
To: Specht, Jennifer
Cc: Goodfellow, Tim; Superczynski, Denis
Subject: Fwd: To All Council Members
Date: Wednesday, October 26, 2022 9:03:39 AM

From: Cherney, Ragen <RCherney@FrederickCountyMD.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, October 25, 2022 8:18:42 PM
To: Brandt, Kimberly G. <KGBrandt@FrederickCountyMD.gov>; Mitchell, Kathy (Legal) <KMitchell2@FrederickCountyMD.gov>
Subject: FW: To All Council Members

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

From: TERRY OLAND <terry.oland@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, October 25, 2022 7:34 PM
To: Council Members <CouncilMembers@FrederickCountyMD.gov>
Subject: To All Council Members

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

At this time, to the 4 of you that VOTED AGAINST the Sugarloaf revised plan, YOU SHOULD BE ASHAIMED! YOU DID NOT DO YOUR JOB!

YOU WILL NEVER GET A VOTE FROM ME FOR ANY OFFICE & I HOPE YOU DO NOT GET A SINGLE ELECTED OFFICE AGAIN!

YOU DID NOT SUPPORT US, THE PEOPLE WHO HAVE BEEN FIGHTING TO SAVE THE SUGARLOAF AREA ON OUR DOLLAR! AND THAT IS NOT RIGHT!!!!

I, WE, WILL NOT FORGET! NOVEMBER 8th. IS UPON!!!!!

NO VOTES FOR YOU!!!!! NONE OF YOU, the 4, DESERVE ANOTHER ELECTED OFFICE!

SO SO SAD to see our ELECTED OFFICIALS talking out of both sides of their months!

SHAME SHAME ----- WHAT A WASTE !!!!

Terry Oland
2409 Thurston Rd.

From: Brandt, Kimberly G.
To: Specht, Jennifer
Subject: FW: Compromise Overlay to Sugarloaf Mountain Plan
Date: Wednesday, October 26, 2022 2:46:15 PM

From: David Reeves <dave2442ree@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 26, 2022 9:22 AM
To: Council Members <CouncilMembers@FrederickCountyMD.gov>
Subject: Compromise Overlay to Sugarloaf Mountain Plan

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Dear Frederick County Council,

Having lived and raised a family for 24 years at the base of Sugarloaf Mountain in Frederick County, I am deeply disappointed in the 4 to 3 vote last night of the Frederick County Council to reject the Compromise Overlay to the Sugarloaf Mountain plan. Council members Fitzwater, Keegan-Ayer, Blue, and Dacey, this is directed at you in particular for your "no" votes. Council members Hagen, Donald, and McKay, I want to thank you for your efforts and your "yes" votes. As councilmember McKay pointed out in his remarks, this leaves the Sugarloaf Mountain Plan as a pretty book with no teeth to protect the beloved Sugarloaf Mountain area from future rezoning by corporate development interests, many of which are out of county corporations.

By your actions you have contravened the will of the people, the citizens of Frederick County who are your constituents and voters, who overwhelmingly supported the Compromise Sugarloaf Mountain Plan and Overlay to preserve and protect the region for future generations.

Our society, the people of Frederick County, have decided in zoning areas agricultural and resource conservation, and in supporting the Sugarloaf Mountain Plan and Overlay, that they wish to preserve the family farms and natural resources, environmental, wildlife, outdoor recreation, cultural, and historical values of certain regions of Frederick county. Do not mistake the profit motives of corporations for the will of the people, the voters and your constituents in the county. And do not confuse the dollars that corporate developers contribute to your campaigns with the wishes and the votes of your constituents. The will of our society, the people of Frederick County, should not be able to be thwarted by out of county corporate developers seeking to develop land and make a profit by changing the zoning within a treasured area like Sugarloaf Mountain that our society has so designated.

Without the Overlay, the future preservation of the Sugarloaf Mountain region remains uncertain. I hope that in your future deliberations concerning Sugarloaf Mountain and the

Overlay, and land use planning in general throughout our county, you will consider what the people want, your constituents and voters, rather than that of out of county corporations seeking to profit from zoning changes while forever destroying the family farms, and natural resource, wildlife, outdoor recreation, cultural, and historical values of our county. It is these values that the people want to preserve, not that of out of county corporate developer profit at the expense of those values, in order to maintain the quality of life in Frederick County for our children and grandchildren in the future.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Dave Reeves
9265 Starlight Mews North
Frederick, Maryland 21704

From: Brandt, Kimberly G.
To: Specht, Jennifer
Subject: FW: Sugarloaf Plan and Overlay
Date: Thursday, October 27, 2022 9:33:06 AM
Attachments: Vote YES on (Kai Hagen) Sugarloaf Plan compromise.msg
Fwd County Council FINAL VOTE October 25 2022.msg

From: Katherine Jones <axelkjz@msn.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 25, 2022 4:52 PM
To: Council Members <CouncilMembers@FrederickCountyMD.gov>
Subject: Sugarloaf Plan and Overlay

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Dear Council Members:

Thank you for your hard work and ability to hear everyone.

Please:

- Amend the Sugarloaf Plan with the compromise, Pass
- the Plan as amended, and
- Pass the Overlay legislation.

I really appreciate your hard work. It is time to complete this task! Show the citizens of Frederick County, particularly the people who live in the Sugarloaf Plan area and those who love to visit that region, that you heard them.

The amendment agrees to everything Stronghold requested. If they do not agree now, you have done everything you need to do with this amendment, to address their concerns. It is time to address the concerns of the majority of your constituents as stated repeatedly at these hearings.

Leave a lasting legacy for the people who come after us. Prove your ability to lead by making these hard decisions to protect our homes. Pass the Sugarloaf Plan and the Overlay this evening.

Thank you,

Katherine J. Jones

From: Kristen
To: Council Members
Subject: Vote YES on (Kai Hagen) Sugarloaf Plan compromise
Date: Tuesday, October 25, 2022 4:55:36 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Dear Council member,

I urge you to vote in favor of the Sugarloaf Plan compromise introduced by Kai Hagen which excludes Resource Conservation (RC) zoning from the Overlay zoning requirements. While it is not ideal, I am in favor of the compromise because it preserves Sugarloaf and surrounding areas, holds development at 270 where it has been for decades, removes the invitation on page 54 to reopen the Plan, AND also concedes to several demands by the Stonghold family. Given the sordid details of closed meetings, potential legal violations, and the appearance of preferential treatment shown toward Mr. Natelli, the Hagen compromise appears to be the best solution available at this point in time.

Kristen Spear
Urbana, MD

From: Pandora Gunsallus
To: Council Members
Subject: Fwd: County Council FINAL VOTE, October 25, 2022
Date: Tuesday, October 25, 2022 5:10:34 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

>
> Dear Frederick County Council Members,
>
> Hi, I'm Pandora Gunsallus, I have farm property at 3350 Park Mills Rd., located within the Overlay plan area.
>
> I sincerely want to thank Council members for all their hard work towards maintaining preservation in the Sugarloaf region and for supporting the I-270 boundary. I also want to thank them for removing the language on page 54 that was a possible invitation to reopen the development, that for two and a half years we've been trying to curtail and keep balanced.
>
> Again, after working for so long to assure preservation in the Sugarloaf area and in an effort not to remand this acceptable plan back to the planning commission, I would be pleased to accept this new compromise. I hope that it will be enough to protect the region for the long term. I want to thank Council for offering this as a palatable solution, but if Stronghold refuses to accept this compromise, then I urge Council to pass the Sugarloaf plan and Overlay as currently amended.
>
> Thank you,
> Pandora Gunsallus
> 241 Cynthia Dr. Canonsburg PA 15317
> Sent from my iPad

From: Brandt, Kimberly G.
To: Specht, Jennifer
Subject: Fwd: Sugarloaf Plan Votes
Date: Tuesday, November 1, 2022 11:13:49 AM

From: Matt Seubert <matts853@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 1, 2022, 10:23 AM
To: Keegan-Ayer, MC <MCKeegan-Ayer@FrederickCountyMD.gov>; Fitzwater, Jessica <JFitzwater@FrederickCountyMD.gov>
Cc: Council Members <CouncilMembers@FrederickCountyMD.gov>; Gardner, Jan <JGardner@FrederickCountyMD.gov>; Horn, Steve <SHorn@FrederickCountyMD.gov>; Brandt, Kimberly G. <KGBrandt@FrederickCountyMD.gov>; Goodfellow, Tim <TGoodfellow@FrederickCountyMD.gov>
Subject: Sugarloaf Plan Votes

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Dear MC and Jessica:

I cannot fathom how the two of you wound up voting with Michael and Phil on the 4-3 votes last Tuesday. If someone told me in July that would happen I would have said they were nuts.

Michael won't be back and Phil was never going to support any version of the Plan, and yet the 4 of you voted to gut it of the overlay and punt on your responsibility to address the legislation. Phil was even elated with the outcome. That speaks volumes that you voted against the desires of your supporters.

Depending on the outcome of the election, there's a very strong possibility you permanently scuttled the overlay legislation, thus jeopardizing the viability of the Plan itself. You may never touch this again, so why you ceded control of the process to the Planning Commission and the next council is beyond me.

Do you really think the PC has the ability to resolve your concerns? I don't, given how poorly they handled things the first go-round. Plus, Stronghold is now in a much stronger position to control the ultimate outcome of the overlay. They now know for certain that if elected, neither of you have the political will to counter their objections. As long as they keep objecting, nothing will change, so you very likely made the ultimate outcome worse. The Plan as it stands now with no overlay is a failure in my view.

But what's really bothersome to me is your lack of participation and transparency throughout the process. The two of you barely - if at all - engaged in the deliberations, made no discernible efforts to garner Stronghold's support, and produced no successful amendments except for Jessica's last minute grenade, which was really a significant, out of process amendment masquerading as a proposal. In the end, all you accomplished was to blow the Plan up and negate Steve's and Kai's earnest efforts to achieve Stronghold's support.

Steve especially worked hard on this plan - harder than everyone else combined - to make the best of a bad situation. Your last minute maneuver, which was obviously coordinated with Jan, was extremely disrespectful to his efforts. You should have trusted him.

Bottom line: you both could not have possibly mishandled this any worse, and I'm shaken by your actions.

Jan shares much of the blame for this fiasco. Her 5 month delay and carve out of Natelli's land started this process on a downward trajectory and compressed the timeline: two plus years of work should never have come down to the wire.

The meetings with Amazon were not transparent and violated the Open Meetings Act. This blemish on what was otherwise a well run and well intentioned administration could have lasting consequences for the future of this part of the County.

My gut tells me that you both are not pleased with the boundary and therefore used Stronghold's opposition to keep the door open to Amazon developing data centers on the Natelli properties. So far you haven't had to take a stance on this crucial matter, and I would love to hear you both state publicly tonight that you absolutely support the Plan boundary and are not interested in allowing intensive development west of 270.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Matt Seubert

Sent from my iPhone

From: Brandt, Kimberly G.
To: Specht, Jennifer
Subject: FW: Sugarloaf petition
Date: Wednesday, November 16, 2022 2:37:56 PM

From: Suzanne Sella <thesellas@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, November 12, 2022 1:49 PM
To: Council Members <CouncilMembers@FrederickCountyMD.gov>
Subject: Sugarloaf petition

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Sincere thanks to all of you for giving this petition your attention and concern. My family supports the Alliance as revised to the new proposal. One concern is the amount of damage being done to the banks of Little Bennett Creek and ongoing littering! Sincerely, Suzanne Sella