

Queen Anne's County Comprehensive Plan
Comments Received During 60-Day Public Comment Period: No Changes Needed/No Changes Proposed

ORDERED BY CHAPTER

Updated: January 5, 2022

No.	Name	Comment Category	Affiliation	Chapter	Page	Comment	Notes	Addressed
1	Frank DiGiallenardo	Public		Introduction	Page 1	If Kent Narrows is to maintain a separate plan, as powers there desire, their plan should include a water resources element as well. They should be responsible for that.	All data is included within the County WRE, just as other growth areas of Chester/Stevensville and Grasonville. WRE are only required for government bodies in which the County Plan covers.	No change needed.
2	Frank DiGiallenardo	Public	Corsica River Conservancy	Introduction	Page 2	Community Vision vs Guiding Principles. Based on public feedback in the PlanQACupdate process, this Vision is solidly supported by residents. The Vision statement uses the phrase "to preserve the county as a quintessential rural community" Then, under Guiding Principles later on the same page the phrase (sustaining Queen Anne's County) "As a predominantly rural agricultural community". We believe the use of "predominantly" dilutes the Vision statement and should be omitted. Does 51% rural qualify as "predominant"? Why muddle such a clear vision? (more on this under Land Use)	Quintessential refers to the County's character, while predominantly refers to the ~56% agricultural land use/land cover; written so other uses aren't discounted.	No changes proposed.
3	Frank DiGiallenardo	Public		Introduction	Page 2	Vision for QAC: the Vision stated in the current plan continues to be widely supported by the public and should be better used to guide the Planning Commission as well as the County Commissioners in making land use decisions.. The vision statement could be translated into a fairly simple set of criteria that could be used to screen development proposals and help guide Planning Commission decisions.	Noted.	No change needed.
4	Cheryl Huyck	Public		Introduction	Page 4	Community Design: I am encouraged by "walkable design" reference but recommend this section be expanded to include walkability to shopping areas near residential area development. Too great a dependency on public to use vehicle(s) to get from home to store and back. Kent Island developments in particular do little to support walkability (Four seasons or Gibsons Grant lack safe, walkable access to grocery, pharmacy, hardware, etc., as an example). Obesity is a growing problem in Maryland and is well documented in United Health Foundations 2021 Edition Study on Obesity. https://www.americashealthrankings.org/explore/annual/measure/Obesity/state/MD County residents would be healthier if they could get out and walk more versus driving.	This section specifically addresses the State's 12 Visions - those are what's replicated in the text.	No change needed.
5	Charles Boyd	Agency	Maryland Department of Planning	Introduction	Page 11	In the section related to Chapter 10 – Town Planning Framework and Chapter 11- Community Plans, bullet four references 'establishing' a "town fringe" for short-term and long-term annexations. A "town fringe" was already identified in the 2010 Comprehensive Plan. The town fringe reflected Municipal Growth Elements at that time. Therefore, the town fringe is already established. This bullet should be revised to "update the "town fringe" to reflect adopted changes to Municipal Growth Elements.	Other points use same tense for ongoing or past framework policies.	No change needed.
6	Charles Boyd	Agency	Maryland Department of Planning	County Profile	Page 8, Table 2-5	This chapter effectively uses the most recent data available from the decennial Census and American Community Survey (ACS); and the most up-to-date population projections from the Maryland Department of Planning were also included. However, consider revising the second row of this table, High School Graduate, No Degree. 'No Degree' usually applies to the number of persons who had some college but did not graduate or receive a degree. Consider adding rows to make this distinction between high school and college degrees.	Row includes those with GEDs, HS graduates, or some college but no degree.	No change needed.
7	Peter Johnston	Agency	Town of Queenstown	Community Facilities & Services	Page 1, Key Issue- Pedestrian & Bicycle Linkages; 3-3 BPAC; 3-19; 3-20; AC-8; AC-12; Goal 3-3	Pedestrian and bicycle linkages are identified as a key planning issue. Yet, there appears to be little focus on realistic strategies to address the issue, even though the public recognizes that trails present alternative means of moving around in the urbanizing corridor stretching from the Bay Bridge to Queenstown and beyond. Until specific pedestrian and bicycle corridors are identified and officially recognized in planning, and more importantly, in capital improvements programs, there is a limited legal basis for requiring dedication. Nor are developers put on notice so they can design projects accordingly. For example, the feasibility of extending the Cross Island Trail to Queenstown and onward to Centreville (Cross County Trail) and eastward to activity nodes such as Chesapeake College, and of providing a functional off-corridor alternative mode of travel in the urbanizing Bay Bridge to Queenstown Corridor depends in large part on the location of pedestrian and bicycle overpasses at appropriate locations along US 50 and US 301. That crossing points are contemplated is implied on Map 3-7, Proposed Trail Connections. Retrofitting crossover facilities as an afterthought when congestion starts to affect the quality of life for residents, capital improvement funds have been expended on highway improvements without consideration for pedestrian and bicycle movement within and through the area, and the local economy adversely affected is poor planning.	Chapter 6: Transportation addresses bicycle and pedestrian connections. See Plan Themes, Bikeways & Pedestrians (Page 6-5), US 50 Ocean Gateway to include bicycle and pedestrian accommodations (Page 6-15), bicycle and pedestrian improvements (Page 6-16), Kent Island Transportation Plan (Page 6-18), and Map 6-3 addresses bicycle routes within the County.	No action needed: Bicycle and pedestrian corridors are addressed throughout Chapter 3 and 6. Recommendations for bicycle and pedestrian planning can be found in Goal 6-2, Strategy 2.
8	Elle Bassett/Anne Richards	Public	ShoreRivers	Community Facilities & Services	Page 11	Page 3-11 states that the Kent Narrows/Stevensville/Grasonville ((KNSG) Waste Water Treatment Plant (WWTP) has demonstrated "outstanding operating performance," however it is currently under a violation for the last two reporting periods according to the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Enforcement and Compliance History Online (ECHO) database (https://echo.epa.gov/detailed-facility-report?fid=110000560385). The Centreville WWTP has reportable violations since 2018; the Church Hill WWTP and the Millington WWTP have also had reportable violations and effluent exceedances in Biological Oxygen Demand (BOD); and the Sudlersville WWTP has not been in full compliance for at least the past 4 years. Not all Queen Anne's WWTP are operating with Enhanced Nutrient Reduction (ENR). This is important to note for the public, as it is stated in section 4-15 that residential growth should be redirected from KNSG to other incorporated towns. Given that the first stated goal of this chapter is to "reduce environmental impacts associated with community facilities," the County should prioritize getting these community facilities to be compliant with their permits, and utilizing the best available technology for nutrient reductions.	These details reside in the County Water and Sewer Plan. The W&S Plan will be updated in accordance with the Comp Plan update. MDE has enforcement authority over WWTPs. Compliance with State and Federal requirements is outlined in the WRE, as is upgrading of WWTPs.	No change needed.
9	Craig Holberger	Public	Kent Island Resident; Member of Piney Narrows Yacht Haven Marina Condominium	Community Facilities & Services	Page 13	1. Recycling of additional types of plastics should be a priority, Type 1 and 2 plastics are a small part of the waste stream, with takeout foods now using mostly type 5 and 6 plastic containers. 2. I don't understand the logic or need to reduce the number of solid waste drop off areas, Batts Neck is convenient and serves a large part of Kent Island.	Details regarding recycling can be found on Page 3-13, Solid Waste & Recycling, but specific details to the process could be found in the Comprehensive Solid Waste Plan. The number of drop off centers would be reduced due to high cost.	No changes needed: See Goal 3-1, Strategy 1 to increase recycling rates and page 3-14, 2005 Study of County Administered Contact Districts for Collection of Residential Waste and Recyclables-major steps are identified and still exist.

Queen Anne's County Comprehensive Plan
Comments Received During 60-Day Public Comment Period: No Changes Needed/No Changes Proposed

ORDERED BY CHAPTER

Updated: January 5, 2022

No.	Name	Comment Category	Affiliation	Chapter	Page	Comment	Notes	Addressed
10	Ginger Cushing	Public	Corsica River Conservancy	Community Facilities & Services	Page 13	Regarding SOLID WASTE & RECYCLING, the Caroline waste facility is scheduled to close in 2030, and QAC is next in line. These comments pertain to the location and capacity of the new site. Increased development implies additional waste from the heavier population, which should be factored into project approvals when the Planning staff does its analysis. Of course, landfills can also negatively affect water quality and should be thoroughly analyzed before approval. Further, any additional costs that may accrue to County residents should be identified. On page 3-13, there is discussion of benefits of a County Cubside Program for collecting waste. There is a list of steps to plan a program, but no decisive language regarding action. This discussion was based on a 2005 study conducted by the County. An updated study is in order and now is the time for stronger language and specific action plan.	Environmental impacts will be reviewed at time of development review. The Plan outlines major steps necessary to plan, development, and implement the program and study that was completed.	No change needed.
11	Chrissy Aull	Public	Q.A. resident, Centreville	Community Facilities & Services	Page 15	I would have expected to read more detailed plans or acknowledgement regarding the state of the Central Office Building in Centreville. I note a reference to Arise Academy but what about the core purpose and function of the structure as it impacts employees, visitors, the Town of C-ville. Prior to pandemic, a BOE presentation was provided to the Centreville Planning Committee, one option being a total abandonment of the current building and a move to the County facilities area across from Acme in Centreville. How would this move interface with the goals and guidelines of the Comp Plan? What to do with the current structure if it is abandoned. I do not recall, but have not gone back to rewatch the presentation, any reference to the Comp Plan. Thank you for any consideration.	The Board of Education Central Office Building is located in the Town of Centreville. The County does not have jurisdiction of the current or Vincit Street locations. The intent of the Comprehensive Plan is not to list specific projects.	No change needed.
12	Elle Bassett/Anne Richards	Public	ShoreRivers	Community Facilities & Services	Page 19	Parks & Recreation – The (Land Preservation, Parks, and Recreation Plan (LPPRP) is referenced as an important document used to “address the issues related to ownership, management, and preservation needs and desires”, as well as providing recommendations for “Parks and recreation, agricultural land preservation, and natural resource conservation.” This resource should be available for comment since it will be incorporated into the final Plan. The public should be able to review this document, as 75.9% of the community participants ranked the natural environment and open space preservation as priority considerations related to future development (Environmental Resources, Figure 5.3).	The County is currently updating the LPPRP; the adopted 2017 LPPRP is available on the County's website.	No change needed.
13	Sara Ramotnik	Public	Eastern Shore Land Conservancy	Community Facilities & Services	Page 19	“The LPPRP is currently being updated, with a final draft expected in early 2022. The adopted LPPRP is incorporated by reference as part of PlanQAC. The LPPRP provides recommendations for the following topics: parks and recreation; agricultural land preservation; and natural resource conservation.” Given the described importance of the LPPRP and it being a part of PlanQAC, the public should be able to weigh in and comment on this plan.	The County is currently updating the LPPRP; the adopted 2017 LPPRP is available on the County's website.	No change needed.
14	Elle Bassett/Anne Richards	Public	ShoreRivers	Community Facilities & Services	Page 20	The sixth bullet under Goals and Initiatives should Say “Create new and protect existing recreation open space.” The County could include more specifics as to when and how you will identify new public access locations, and what factors are considered in designating appropriate locations.	By design, more specifics such as those identified are included in the LPPRP.	No change needed.
15	Charles Boyd	Agency	Maryland Department of Planning	Community Facilities & Services	Page 21	Goal 3-2, Strategy 2, Recommendation 2. This strategy suggests that capacity at KNSG is not currently available. According to page AD-9, Table 1-3, Public Sewer System Demand and Capacity Summary, there is potentially a deficit of up to 110,000 gallons of capacity. See associated comment in the Water Resource Element review section. Without available capacity, future growth, infill, and affordable housing goals will be difficult to achieve, particularly within the county and municipal growth areas. Planning is available to assist with convening a dialogue with the county and the Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE) to address capacity planning.	So noted.	No changes proposed.
16	Cheryl Huyck	Public		Community Facilities & Services	Page 21	Goal 3-2, Strategy 1: As written Recommendation #2: Infrastructure improvements should be planned..... The words should be are too weak for such a critical Goal and give the County an easy out to not follow through. Change should be to must be. As written Recommendation#3: Regarding Adequate Public Facilities testing – should be needs to be must be.	Utilizing the term "must" is not appropriate in the Comprehensive Plan, specifically when it includes the budget.	No change needed.
17	Elle Bassett/Anne Richards	Public	ShoreRivers	Community Facilities & Services	Page 22	Goal 3-4 should include additional recommendations that result in the County evaluating walkable public water access opportunities County-wide and identifying and addressing equity gaps.	Please see Goal 3-4, Strategy 1, Rec 1 (page 3-22) and affiliated discussion in the Transportation Chapter, page 6-8. Additional specificity regarding this matter is outlined in the LPPRP.	No change needed.
18	Scott Gutschick	Public		Community Facilities & Services	Page 22	Goal 3-2, Strategy 4, Recommendation 1: Recommendations 1a and 1b concerning the development and implementation of performance benchmarks for the public safety services will allow the public to gauge the performance of the County's public safety services and encourage those services to meet or exceed their benchmarks. Suggest adding a Recommendation “1c” to conduct a countywide risk assessment of fire-rescue, EMS and law enforcement related risks as well as conducting a subsequent needs-assessment for adequately addressing those risks during the next 10 years.	The intention of this comment is outlined within Goal 3-2, Strategy 4. This extra level of detail regarding specific risk assessment is not housed in the Comp Plan but may be found in Emergency Management planning documents.	No change needed.
19	Sara Ramotnik	Public	Eastern Shore Land Conservancy	Community Facilities & Services	Page 22	Goal 3-4, Strategy 3, Recommendation 1: The draft reads “Promote the economic, cultural, health, and environmental benefits of outdoor recreation and conservation of natural lands.” It would be helpful to have a plan outlined on how this will be conducted so that stakeholders who can provide additional feedback on how best to go about this.	Specific implementation details are better coordinated outside of the Comprehensive Plan versus strict proscription. This level of detail is not found elsewhere.	No change needed.
20	Elle Bassett/Anne Richards	Public	ShoreRivers	Community Facilities & Services	Page 25	The Community Facilities map (3-3) should include the County's wastewater treatment plants.	Wastewater facilities are shown on Map 5-10.	No change needed.
21	Chrissy Aull	Public	Q.A. resident, Centreville	Community Facilities & Services	Page 30	I'd like to know/read more of the "existing Greenway Trail" as keyed on the map on p.30 - I am a pretty savvy consumer of local recreational opps and I knew nothing about this trail. Also suggest awareness be raised, through the Comp Plan and related advertising, regarding the recreational hiking equestrian trails being developed at Conquest. Those could be biking trails also. There is no mention or reference to opportunities for recreation at Wye Island. Finally, and the most visionary/bold, I encourage more connected walking/biking trails between Queenstown/KI and Centreville. At one point the KI Trail was a bold vision, I hope there might be same for Centreville.	Greenway Trails information was taken directly from the Queen Anne's County Land, Preservation, Parks & Recreation Plan. Wye Island is listed on Map 3-7. See Chapter 6 for more details on Cross Island Trail and Goal 6-2, Strategy 2.	No change needed.

Queen Anne's County Comprehensive Plan
Comments Received During 60-Day Public Comment Period: No Changes Needed/No Changes Proposed

ORDERED BY CHAPTER

Updated: January 5, 2022

No.	Name	Comment Category	Affiliation	Chapter	Page	Comment	Notes	Addressed
22	Church Hill Town Commissioners	Agency	Town of Church Hill Board of Town Commissioners	Community Facilities & Services		We are mindful that the Church Hill Elementary School, according to the County School Board, is projected to have a utilization rate of just 63% of State Rated Capacity by 2030. We consider this an opportunity and a call to action for the County's Plan to embrace the Town and State planning visions which encourage more families to locate within Church Hill. You may not know, unlike other wastewater treatment plants, Church Hill's has capacity to accommodate growth, and new sewer pumps stations that are were expanded to accommodate growth. Church Hill also has a history of responsible management of sewer allocations and capacity. We routinely addresses maintenance, and we conservatively manage sewer system financing and development. A preliminary engineering and a feasibility study conducted in the last decade also showed the planned development of the Town and the municipal growth area will not be constrained by MDE discharge limits. The Town is a County Growth Area.	Recommendations already include directing growth to appropriate Growth Areas. Church Hill's Growth Area and public facilities also discussed in Chapter 10, beginning on p. 10-10.	No changes proposed.
23	Charles Boyd	Agency	Maryland Department of Planning	Community Facilities & Services	Map 3-7	Consider including a description of the existing and proposed trails identified on this map.	See map 6-3 for existing bicycle trails and Figure 6-2 for water trails. Trails are discussed in Facilities: Trails on Page 3-19. Existing trails are discussed on page 6-6 and waterways on page 6-8. Proposed trails are discussed in Bicycle & Pedestrian Improvements on page 6-16 and in the Kent Island Transportation Plan on page 6-19. Other information on proposed trails can be found in the Queen Anne's County Land, Preservation, Parks & Recreation Plan that is currently/near future being update.	No change needed.
24	Lori Sallet	Public	American Farmland Trust	Land Use	General	PDF of comments saved in folder - overall concern for agricultural preservation	Draft already discusses points of concern. See Pg 4-8, Pg 4-20, Goal 4-2, Strategy 1, Recommendation 6, and Pg 5-17	No changes proposed.
25	Barry Waterman	Public		Land Use	Page 1	The Plan Theme of "Direct Growth to areas..." would be far more accurate if stated as "Prohibit growth as possible in areas lacking adequate public facilities" This plan makes clear that the County sewer plant is at capacity – but it does nothing to direct or encourage growth to go elsewhere. To do that would require incentives, and the plan offers nothing in that regard. What is suggested are only prohibitions and limitations.	Addressed in Chapter 3 (Community Facilities)--GOAL 3-2: Provide sustainable smart growth management inside and outside Growth Areas; Chapter 4 (Land Use)--Sustainability Indicators; Chapter 5 (Environmental Resources)--GOAL 5-3: Implement a growth management strategy to direct new and infill development to existing County and Town Growth Areas; and Chapter 10 (Town Planning)--GOAL 10-2: Direct growth to incorporated municipalities.	No changes proposed.
26	Todd Redpath	Public		Land Use	Page 1	The county's zoning and permit decisions seem to be in conflict with the vision of the Comprehensive Plan	Zoning is the result of the overarching Comprehensive Plan (Pg 4-4). See also Chapter 8 (Economic Development) for strategies which outline reviewing permitted uses and ensuring economic growth in appropriate zoning districts.	No changes proposed.
27	Todd Redpath	Public		Land Use	Page 1	As the Comp Plan strives towards preserving agricultural, pressure to develop the northern area of the County threatens the plan's vision. I'm not against development, just do it properly.	Noted. Discussed in Draft.	No changes proposed.
28	Frank DiGiallenardo	Public	Corsica River Conservancy	Land Use	Page 1	The question that this introductory page on land use raises is to what extent does QAC lay aside the commitments to natural resource preservation and rural character that it makes repeatedly elsewhere in PlanQAC in order to support the "vibrant urbanized areas of the County such as Kent Island and Kent Narrows". A double standard is implied. If that is the actual intent, it should be spelled out more explicitly, else how is the county to apply its standards consistently in making land use decisions. The Kent Island Bay (12.41%) and Eastern Bay (10.94%) watersheds are well into the "danger zone" for aquatic health based on 2016 data on impervious surface. The situation in those areas must be significantly worse today. How far is QAC prepared to allow this implied land use tradeoff to go in order to support commercial expansion and population growth?	Related to the statistics provided, there are recommendations in Chapter 5 which address impervious surfaces (See Chapter 5: Goal 5, Strategy 1, Recommendations 2 and 3; Goal 3, Strategy 3, Recommendations 4 and 9). In addition, the Land Use Chapter acknowledges the diversity of land uses in the County but emphasizes the management and protection of water resources and climate impacts (See Chapter 4: Goal 4-1, Strategy 2, Recs 7 and 10).	No change needed.
29	Elle Bassett/Anne Richards	Public	ShoreRivers	Land Use	Page 1	The first sentence of this chapter in the Vision states that the county plans "to protect and sustain a primarily agricultural, forested, and maritime community within the limits of natural resources." However, the outlined Goals, and Strategies & Actions only include preservation of agricultural land despite the plan stating "a no net loss policy should be considered" for forested lands under sustainability indicators on page 4-20. Forested land preservation should be included as a Goal within the chapter and a no net loss policy should be included in the Strategies & Actions section.	Addressed in Chapter 5 (Environment) in several ways: a no net loss directive (page 5-23) and an implementation recommendation (Goal 5-1, Strategy 2, Rec 4--page 5-25). Further, the Local Conservation Fund is outlined on page 5-12 and prioritizes a plan of action to maintain a viable Forest Conservation program by exploring land acquisition, forest banking, GIS tracking, and an increased forest conservation fee in lieu rate. Protection of the viability of the maritime industry is addressed in Chapters 4, 5, and 8 and in the WRE.	No change needed.

Queen Anne's County Comprehensive Plan
Comments Received During 60-Day Public Comment Period: No Changes Needed/No Changes Proposed
ORDERED BY CHAPTER
Updated: January 5, 2022

No.	Name	Comment Category	Affiliation	Chapter	Page	Comment	Notes	Addressed
30	Charles Boyd	Agency	Maryland Department of Planning	Land Use	Page 2	fourth and fifth bullets, and Page 4-4 reference the County and Town Growth Areas, while the last paragraph on Page 2-3 defines two types of growth areas, Municipal Growth Area (aka Town Future Annexation Areas), and Community Growth Areas. Planning suggests that the county select one set of growth area names and standardize them across the PlanQAC for clarity and consistency.	Agreed. However, staff has used the term Growth Area deliberately to remain consistent with the MGE. Staff does not see a need to also note Municipal and County to introduce this nomenclature.	No change needed.
31	Gayle Jayne	Public		Land Use	Page 4	I understand that the plan is general and somewhat flexible, yet zoning decisions are based on laws. When zoning decisions are made, their accordance with the Comp Plan should be determined by explicit analysis. Inconsistencies with the plan should be noted with future action to review/change the laws to conform to the plan. At present, decisions can be made to the letter of the law but not necessarily to the betterment of the County or the intent of the Comp Plan.	Discussions related to Growth Area Boundary and changes to Future Land Use (precursors to Comprehensive Rezoning) took place at multiple Planning Commission meetings; these recommendations have been incorporated in the draft and are reflected in the Future Land Use maps.	No changes proposed.
32	Frank DiGiallenardo	Public	Corsica River Conservancy	Land Use	Page 4, Table 4-1	This table does a good job of distinguishing the differences between comprehensive planning versus zoning decisions that are carried out by the Planning Commission and Planning and Zoning. Planning and zoning decisions rely on extensive regulatory code and ordinances in making case by case decisions on land use. The Commissioners regularly affirm that a proposal is in accord with the Comprehensive Plan. Yet, there is no detail as to which part of the Plan a proposal is in accordance with nor which parts of the Plan the proposal conflicts with - a situation that is often the case. We believe that the requirement to affirm accordance with the Comprehensive Plan should be supported by more specific and explicit analysis, pointing out any potential conflicts, or inconsistencies. Without this increased scrutiny, it is too easy for the aggregate effect of various zoning decisions to get substantially out of alignment with the Plan. Such an analysis is also necessary for effective public review of the many zoning approvals that occur. It would make the zoning process more transparent to the public and help assure the integrity of the Comprehensive Plan which has passed public muster.	Understood. These comments are more germane to Planning Commission/County Commissioner operations/procedures and outside the direct scope of the Comprehensive Plan. However, staff takes note.	Staff to provide clear Comp Plan findings in all reports to the the Planning Commission and County Commissioners when decisions are required in accordance with the direction of the Plan.
33	Cheryl Huyck	Public		Land Use	Page 5	Land Use Change: As written the Plan states: While the amount of low-density residential steadily grew, both medium- and high-density residential increased significantly. The amount of developed land has nearly tripled in just under 50 years. Yet the very next page 6 states (see next comment) "has lost some of these resources"	Regarding the phrase, "Lost some of these resources," resources referred to are agricultural/resource lands, not residential.	No changes proposed.
34	Sara Ramotnik	Public	Eastern Shore Land Conservancy	Land Use	Page 6	Priority Preservation: "As of June 2021, the County has permanently preserved 83,903 acres of land through various programs. It also has committed to MALPF to reach a preserved land goal of 100,000 acres of land in agricultural production, forestry or natural resources by 2030." The County should aim to permanently preserve 50% of their land by 2030, therefore having preserved 119,019 acres by 2030.	This particular point was discussed at both public outreach workshops, Technical Committee meetings, and during Planning Commission review of Chapter 4. Determination was to leave at 100,000 acres.	No change needed.
35	Cheryl Huyck	Public		Land Use	Page 6	Land Use Change: As written the Plan states: While the County has lost some of these resources, it continues to be defined by its rural and agricultural setting, the water, and its natural habitats, which are among the most important in the nation. My comment is this: You can't say we lost some of these resources because that's not true. State a factual percentage which you can calculate. The loss is much more than "some"! The Plan needs to be honest about how much Land has actually been lost to development.	It is difficult to land on a specific number due to changes in methodology used to develop land use/land cover data and their classifications, on which these comments are based (see Table 4-2 note). Table 4-2 already identifies those changes.	No changes proposed.
36	Elle Bassett/Anne Richards	Public	ShoreRivers	Land Use	Page 7	2021 MD legislation identifies a goal of 5 billion new trees being planted in the state, and provides funds for implementation. Therefore, prioritizing increasing tree canopy will put the County in a better position to receive such funding for tree planting programs in the near future. Increasing tree canopy is directly linked to a number of community benefits including: Reduced traffic speed, safer walking environments, lower crime rates, improved business, less runoff, lower temperatures, improved physical, emotional, and mental health, and added property value	Forest conservation, Conservation Fund, Resource Protection Standards, and Mitigation Plans already discussed on p. 5-12.	No change needed.
37	Barry Waterman	Public		Land Use	Page 7	"The County commits to matching MALPF ...from ag transfer tax" is more than misleading – there is minimal ag transfer tax collected as ag development is nearly non-existent. In Fiscal 2021 QAC collected a TOTAL of \$148,591 – not going to match much of anything with such a small number. The same holds true for PDR – I am unaware that the County EVER purchased any development rights. Given that there is no development pressure in the Ag districts, any County taxpayer money invested to buy development rights is money that could be spent better elsewhere.	Comment noted. Please see Goal 4-2, Strategy 1, Rec 5. Conduct analysis of benefits of TDRs to County and Municipal Growth Areas and evaluate the County's Noncontiguous Development Rights (NCD) program.	No changes proposed.
38	Barry Waterman	Public		Land Use	Page 8	"justification for investment to purchase Conquest" and other properties – we should work with State Legislators to force a change in the restriction on Open Space money that prohibits farming for profit on land acquired with those monies so that we can again offer those opportunities to beginning farmers, collect some income, and so we can maintain the agricultural vistas the public enjoys	Comment noted. This comment is beyond the scope of the Comp Plan update but might be better placed with the LPPRP (Land Preservation, Parks, and Recreation Plan).	No change needed.
39	Charles Boyd	Agency	Maryland Department of Planning	Land Use	Page 12	Table 4-6. This table indicates that the county has preserved 1,789 acres annually, on average, over the past decade and will achieve its 100,000-acre countywide preservation goal in 2030. However, the PPA element in the county's 2010 comprehensive plan then identified a PPA containing 119,004 acres (updated to 119,557 acres in PlanQAC), none of which were preserved or developed. The PPA preservation acreage goal is 95,565 acres (80%), as noted on PPA map in PlanQAC. With 1,076 acres preserved annually over the past decade, according to certification reports submitted by the county, Queen Anne's County is projected to meet its PPA preservation acreage goal in 2119, with unreserved farmland to spare. The preserved acres inside the PPA are in addition to the approximately 70,000 acres already preserved outside the PPA. See the graph below for details on county progress towards meeting its PPA-specific preservation goal.	Noted. Chapter 4 addresses all goals.	No change needed.

Queen Anne's County Comprehensive Plan
Comments Received During 60-Day Public Comment Period: No Changes Needed/No Changes Proposed
ORDERED BY CHAPTER

Updated: January 5, 2022

No.	Name	Comment Category	Affiliation	Chapter	Page	Comment	Notes	Addressed
40	Carol Bilek	Public		Land Use	Page 13	Under the chapter on Land Use, Futuer Land Use, Growth Management Strategies, first paragraph (page 4-13), it states a strategy will be used "directing growth to existing population centers located in towns, villages, crossroads, County and Town and Growth Areas and Priority Funding Areas." Although the above strategy stipulates growth will be directed to existing population centers, identifying crossroads a san acceptable location provides legitimacy to developers' favorite place for commercial development, even when no population center exists. I think the word "Crossroads" should be struck from this statement of strategy. Every crossroad along US 50 or US 301 or MD 213 will be targeted as a possible stie for development. If a gas station, convenience store, tattoo parlor or other commercial endeavor can be built utilizing a septic system, identifying crossroads as potential sites for growth will assure attempts will be made to get them approved, regardless of the lack of a population center. Please remove this word from the strategy, as it will provide a loophole that is sure to be exploited.	This statement must be read in context: some growth areas and PFAs are located within the populatoin centers listed in that introductory statement; some are not. The context of this statement is consistent with the Smarth Growth management tools which directly follow that paragraph and the rest of the Land Use Chapter.	No changes proposed.
41	Frank DiGiallenardo	Public	Corsica River Conservancy	Land Use	Page 13	The Plan indicates the strong support from stakeholders to keep the lands within the Rt. 301 corridor agricultural. Yet, it discusses only a designation of Scenic Byway to do this. Other zoning, permitting and regulatory measures within the county's purview could be used to keep the lands agricultural and should be recommended here.	The draft Plan supports existing zoning and uses. The strategies relative to scenic byways and vistas along Route 301 are longstanding.	No change needed.
42	Sara Ramotnik	Public	Eastern Shore Land Conservancy	Land Use	Page 13	Growth Management Strategy: The second listed strategy to accomplish sustainable Smart Growth management should include permanently protecting rural agricultural and sensitive area lands. Permanently protecting these areas is your best method of reducing development encroachment threats into your rural areas. Throughout this document, it should note that these lands should be permanently protected.	Preservation programs identified throughout chapter (pp. 4-8 - 4-11) already concern permanent preservation.	No change needed.
43	Comments received by: Charles & Edith Breeding, FRC Properties, LLC,; Larry Romjue, Ron and Julie Bennett, Robert Krampitz, Brigitte Barbee, Charles Lawhead, DeSales Ward, Robert Berra, TDSM, LLC, TDSM, LLC, Dawn and Earl Eber, and Kathy Gascon	Public	Grasonville	Land Use	Page 13-15	I concur that growth management strategies should prevent encroachment in rural areas by directing growth to existing towns and growth areas to preserve existing agricultural land. My property is located in a Growth Area, a Priority Funding Area, as well as a Foreign Trade Zone which makes it ideal for targeted commercial growth. Foreign Trade Zones permit domestic and foreign private and public entities to defer or totally avoid duty and taxes for exported merchandise.	Noted.	No changes proposed.
44	Charles Boyd	Agency	Maryland Department of Planning	Land Use	Page 15	The discussion on infill development could be expanded to include an analysis of the land available in the County Growth Areas and how much growth could occur within them.	Such an analysis is not recommended at present, as redevelopment is a key component of the infill strategy supported in this Plan update. In addition, there may be an action to reduce the mapped growth areas in light of the sewer capacity limitations. Such an analysis at this time would likely be confusing to the developers, property owerns, and the general public.	No change needed.
45	Comments received by: Charles & Edith Breeding, FRC Properties, LLC,; Larry Romjue, Ron and Julie Bennett, Robert Krampitz, Brigitte Barbee, Charles Lawhead, DeSales Ward, Robert Berra, TDSM, LLC, TDSM, LLC, Dawn and Earl Eber, and Kathy Gascon	Public	Grasonville	Land Use	Page 15	Table 4-7: In this Table the County identifies Grasonville as a County Growth Area which maintains optimal characteristics for growth and development through infill, redevelopment and new commercial development. Main Street is a logical place for commercial expansion in any county. I also believe a Main Street revitalization project for infill and redevelopment would benefit the County economically and provide more services to the community.	Related discussion already included (see pp. 11-20 - 11-22). See Goal 4-1, Strategy 4, Recommendation 5.	No change needed.

Queen Anne's County Comprehensive Plan
Comments Received During 60-Day Public Comment Period: No Changes Needed/No Changes Proposed

ORDERED BY CHAPTER

Updated: January 5, 2022

No.	Name	Comment Category	Affiliation	Chapter	Page	Comment	Notes	Addressed
46	Frank DiGiallenardo	Public	Corsica River Conservancy	Land Use	Page 15	Sustainable Growth Strategy - The Plan lays out the importance of directing future growth in such a way as to maintain the rural character of the County and lists several tools the County has in place to do so. However, as noted earlier with respect to the Vision, this draft seems to allow for future growth that does not fit a sustainable strategy by setting out a vision of "primarily rural character." This is a change from earlier drafts. Further, the tools listed here have not prevented growth that does not fit within the sustainable strategy. For example, the Adequate Public Facility Ordinance (APFO) does not capture the social, environmental, or long-term costs incurred by County taxpayers and residents of massive development projects such as Four Seasons. The APFO and other tools should be reexamined to ensure developers do not benefit at the expense of existing County residents. New tools should be found to ensure the sustainable growth strategies outcome.	All recommendations under Goal 4-1, Strategy 2 reflect strategies to address this. This is a change from earlier drafts and plans due to the identification/extent of limitations related to adequate public facility provisions. In addition, the Land Use Chapter emphasizes the management and protection of water resources and climate impacts (See Chapter 4: Goal 4-1, Strategy 2, Recs 7 and 10).	No change needed.
47	Comments received by: Charles & Edith Breeding, FRC Properties, LLC,; Larry Romjue, Ron and Julie Bennett, Robert Krampitz, Brigitte Barbee, Charles Lawhead, DeSales Ward, Robert Berra, TDSM, LLC, TDSM, LLC, Dawn and Earl Eber, and Kathy Gascon	Public	Grasonville	Land Use	Page 16	My property is located in a Priority Funding Area that directs growth to my property. A PFA designation is applied to properties that are a) identified in the Comprehensive Water & Sewer Plan, b) are identified as projected population growth areas, c) are optimally located and contain the size, land use and zoning consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, d) are optimally planned for a full range of public services, and e) provide sufficient space, public facilities and amenities discouraging sprawl and strip retail development.	Priority Funding Areas are addressed in a few sections of the draft, namely on p. 4-16, 8-21 and are shown on Map 4-7.	No change needed.
48	Frank DiGiallenardo	Public	Corsica River Conservancy	Land Use	Page 17	Impact on Water Resources: The Plan appropriately points out that "proper application of tools and techniques" for agricultural best management practices and growth management practices are necessary to minimize the impact of stormwater and other water resources and sensitive areas. Yet the Plan does not provide assurance as to how proper application will be achieved. Clear and enforced limits need to be set for impervious surface growth and water supply usage, just as for waste water, in order to prevent irreversible environmental damage.	Goal 5-1, Strategy 1, Recommendation 3 and Goal 5-3, Strategy 3, Recommendations 4, 8, and 9 (among others) provided related recommendations. See also specific agricultural BMPs addressed in the WRE (Table 1-20). The Environment Chapter calls for measures which reduce impervious surface and introduces a strategy to ensure that recommended percentage thresholds are not exceeded.	No change needed.
49	Comments received by: Charles & Edith Breeding, FRC Properties, LLC,; Larry Romjue, Ron and Julie Bennett, Robert Krampitz, Brigitte Barbee, Charles Lawhead, DeSales Ward, Robert Berra, TDSM, LLC, TDSM, LLC, Dawn and Earl Eber, and Kathy Gascon	Public	Grasonville	Land Use	Page 18	My property on Main Street is subject to traffic congestion in the summer due to beach traffic. For this reason, I do not believe residential medium or high density land use would be a benefit to Main Street residents or the County. Medium and high density land use would create more local traffic and increase summer beach traffic congestion. If the County were to implement a Main Street redevelopment project, this would offer beach travelers more opportunity to stop east of Kent Narrows to access more antique stores, coffee shops, unique retail shops or bike rental services. In addition to services for local residents, if a Main Street project included parking, sidewalks, a bike lane and lighting it would facilitate travelers stopping on the way to or from the beach or even spending the day on Main Street enjoying services offered in Queen Anne's County. Main Street could become a destination location. Expansion of commercial services east of Kent Narrows to the 50/301 split would alleviate high summer congestion closer to the Bay Bridge and could earmark Main Street as a hub of commercial services for locals as well as beach travelers. The tremendous residential growth in Stevensville and Chester clearly indicates the need for more year-round commercial services. I believe this can be accomplished by a Commercial land use and Open Space/Recreation classifications.	Related discussion already included (see pp. 11-20 - 11-22). The strategies outlined in the Comp Plan present a platform to have this conversation during the Zoning Code and Map update to follow the adoption of the Comp Plan. The points raised are valid and should be considered specifically in Grasonville and generally in all communities in which streamlined zoning is considered to address and incentivize mixed use development/infill. Any zoning changes must take into account infrastructure constraints and the impact of uses within the communities in which zoning changes are proposed in accordance with the APFO. It should be noted that both residential and commercial uses are currently permitted on Main Street in Grasonville. The requests submitted by residents for the County to consider rezoning from GNC to GVC did not require a change to the land use category on the existing land use map.	No change needed.

Queen Anne's County Comprehensive Plan
Comments Received During 60-Day Public Comment Period: No Changes Needed/No Changes Proposed
ORDERED BY CHAPTER

Updated: January 5, 2022

No.	Name	Comment Category	Affiliation	Chapter	Page	Comment	Notes	Addressed
50	Comments received by: Charles & Edith Breeding, FRC Properties, LLC.; Larry Romjue, Ron and Julie Bennett, Robert Krampitz, Brigitte Barbee, Charles Lawhead, DeSales Ward, Robert Berra, TDSM, LLC, TDSM, LLC, Dawn and Earl Eber, and Kathy Gascon	Public	Grasonville	Land Use	Page 21	Strategy 1: Recommendations, Paragraph 4-5: I would additionally like to see a re-evaluation of Main Street corridor standards which would permit lighted signage of an adequate size on properties where residents reside on the premises if the commercial space is separated from the residence.	The identified recommendation to develop a "Main Street Corridor" zoning district will involve review and creation of appropriate regulation language. The strategies outlined in the Comp Plan present a platform to have this conversation during the Zoning Code and Map update to follow the adoption of the Comp Plan. The points raised are valid and should be considered specifically in Grasonville and generally in all communities in which streamlined zoning is considered to address and incentivize mixed use development/infill. Any zoning changes must take into account infrastructure constraints and the impact of uses within the communities in which zoning changes are proposed in accordance with the APFO. It should be noted that both residential and commercial uses are currently permitted on Main Street in Grasonville. The requests submitted by residents for the County to consider rezoning from GNC to GVC did not require a change to the land use category on the existing land use map.	No change needed.
51	Comments received by: Charles & Edith Breeding, FRC Properties, LLC.; Larry Romjue, Ron and Julie Bennett, Robert Krampitz, Brigitte Barbee, Charles Lawhead, DeSales Ward, Robert Berra, TDSM, LLC, TDSM, LLC, Dawn and Earl Eber, and Kathy Gascon	Public	Grasonville	Land Use	Page 22	Paragraph 4: I believe it is in the County's best interest to consolidate zoning districts along Main Street in Grasonville to allow for more consistent standards. I submitted my Comprehensive Review Form requesting my standard be changed to FROM GNC (Grasonville Neighborhood Commercial) TO GVC (Grasonville Village Center) to provide consistent standards with the Main Street properties east of Chester River Beach Road. I would additionally like to see a re-evaluation of GVC district standards which would permit lighted signage of an adequate size on properties where residents reside on the premises if the commercial space is separated from the residence.	The identified recommendation to develop a "Main Street Corridor" zoning district will involve review and creation of appropriate regulation language. See Goal 4-1, Strategy 4, Recommendation 5.	No change needed.
52	Comments received by: Charles & Edith Breeding, FRC Properties, LLC.; Larry Romjue, Ron and Julie Bennett, Robert Krampitz, Brigitte Barbee, Charles Lawhead, DeSales Ward, Robert Berra, TDSM, LLC, TDSM, LLC, Dawn and Earl Eber, and Kathy Gascon	Public	Grasonville	Land Use	Page 22	Paragraph 6: I am not in agreement to modify infill development on Main Street in Grasonville to medium or high density residential. I believe Commercial land use and Open Space/Recreation classifications would be ideal.	The strategies outlined in the Comp Plan present a platform to have this conversation during the Zoning Code and Map update to follow the adoption of the Comp Plan. The points raised are valid and should be considered specifically in Grasonville and generally in all communities in which streamlined zoning is considered to address and incentivize mixed use development/infill. Any zoning changes must take into account infrastructure constraints and the impact of uses within the communities in which zoning changes are proposed in accordance with the APFO. It should be noted that both residential and commercial uses are currently permitted on Main Street in Grasonville. The requests submitted by residents for the County to consider rezoning from GNC to GVC did not require a change to the land use category on the existing land use map.	No change needed.

Queen Anne's County Comprehensive Plan
Comments Received During 60-Day Public Comment Period: No Changes Needed/No Changes Proposed

ORDERED BY CHAPTER

Updated: January 5, 2022

No.	Name	Comment Category	Affiliation	Chapter	Page	Comment	Notes	Addressed
53	Comments received by: Charles & Edith Breeding, FRC Properties, LLC.; Larry Romjue, Ron and Julie Bennett, Robert Krampitz, Brigitte Barbee, Charles Lawhead, DeSales Ward, Robert Berra, TDSM, LLC, TDSM, LLC, Dawn and Earl Eber, and Kathy Gascon	Public	Grasonville	Land Use	Page 22	Paragraph 8: I would not like to see housing programs along the Main Street corridor. I believe Commercial land use and Open Space/Recreation classifications would better serve the County.	The strategies outlined in the Comp Plan present a platform to have this conversation during the Zoning Code and Map update to follow the adoption of the Comp Plan. The points raised are valid and should be considered specifically in Grasonville and generally in all communities in which streamlined zoning is considered to address and incentivize mixed use development/infill. Any zoning changes must take into account infrastructure constraints and the impact of uses within the communities in which zoning changes are proposed in accordance with the APFO. It should be noted that both residential and commercial uses are currently permitted on Main Street in Grasonville. The requests submitted by residents for the County to consider rezoning from GNC to GVC did not require a change to the land use category on the existing land use map.	No change needed.
54	Lindsay Garland	Public		Land Use		<p>These are my comments. Rezoning would not be in the best interest of the year round property owners on Main Street in Grasonville. This is a terrible idea to develop Grasonville to commercial properties as Main Street extends from the outlets in Queestown to the bay bridge. It is one solid long road with little to no exits available to switch back on to route 50 in an emergency. During traffic in the summer, it is absolutely unbearable to live around here on weekends. I can't get out of my driveway at all. So to develop the land more for commercial purposes would be absolutely detrimental and would also lead to a lot of property owners to leave this area. If the county cares at all about keeping the residents that have been here for decades upon decades, they would not rezone.</p> <p>My property on Main Street is subject to traffic congestion in the summer due to beach traffic. For this reason, I do not believe residential medium or high density land use would be a benefit to Main Street residents or the County. Medium and high density land use would create more local traffic and increase summer beach traffic congestion.</p> <p>If the County were to implement a Main Street redevelopment project, this would be detrimental as it would offer beach travelers more opportunity to stop henceforth the residents of Grasonville will have less access to the roads for travel themselves or God forbid an emergency. We can't get out of our driveways as it is currently with summer traffic, to add to that will be the demise of Grasonville residents. The Grasonville fire company can't respond to emergencies quick enough due to the summer traffic and you want to add more? That would be absolutely asinine.</p> <p>If a Main Street project included parking, sidewalks, a bike lane would be detrimental to properties as it would decrease the property frontage.</p> <p>If the county goes forth with the Main Street project as a hub of commercial services for locals and beach travelers, it will lead to worse traffic congestion and will lead to the demise of Grasonville residents.</p>	The strategies outlined in the Comp Plan present a platform to have this conversation during the Zoning Code and Map update to follow the adoption of the Comp Plan. The points raised are valid and should be considered specifically in Grasonville and generally in all communities in which streamlined zoning is considered to address and incentivize mixed use development/infill. Any zoning changes must take into account infrastructure constraints and the impact of uses within the communities in which zoning changes are proposed in accordance with the APFO. It should be noted that commercial uses are currently permitted on Main Street in Grasonville. The requests submitted by residents for the County to consider rezoning from GNC to GVC did not require a change to the land use category on the existing land use map.	No change needed.
55	Cheryl Huyck	Public		Land Use	Page 19	BMP Tools: Another use of the words "should be" in the sentence that reads: These sustainability indicators "should be" measured and evaluated' over time to determine community impact with respect to meeting the land use vision and goals." The Plan needs to say that the indicators "must be measured and evaluated."	Language used is consistent with typical comprehensive plan terminology and is directive.	No change needed.
56	Gayle Jayne	Public		Land Use	Page 20	For forested lands, acreage preserved and acres increased REQUIRES a no net loss policy for forested lands. This is not something to be considered; it is a requirement.	Addressed in Chapter 5 (Environment) in several ways: a no net loss directive (page 5-23) and an implementation recommendation (Goal 5-1, Strategy 2, Rec 4--page 5-25). Further, the Local Conservation Fund is outlined on page 5-12 and prioritizes a plan of action to maintain a viable Forest Conservation program by exploring land acquisition, forest banking, GIS tracking, and an increased forest conservation fee in lieu rate. Protection of the viability of the maritime industry is addressed in Chapters 4, 5, and 8 and in the WRE.	No change needed.
57	Charles Boyd	Agency	Maryland Department of Planning	Land Use	Page 21	Goal 4-1, Strategy 3, Recommendation 5. It is not clear if Strategy 3 is contemplating new County Growth Areas along Route US 301. It appears that no, or limited public facilities are available or planned for this area. See related comments in Chapter 6.	This strategy is related to zoning and not to adding a Growth Area along US 301.	No changes proposed.
58	Charles Boyd	Agency	Maryland Department of Planning	Land Use	Page 21	Goal 4-1 [sic 2], Strategy 2, Recommendation 10. This strategy recommendation (included below) is unclear. Changes from other plans developed since the 2010 Plan adoption should be evaluated and incorporated into PlanQAC. "Spotlight changes and other plans that have developed since the 2010 Plan's adoption that work to limit the impacts of new growth and promote environmental protection (e.g., WIP, MS4 Permit, QAC Vulnerability Assessment, Draft Resiliency Planning & Financing Study, Septic Bill, more restrictive State Critical Area regulations, agricultural preservation)."	Plans are amended as needed.	No changes proposed.

Queen Anne's County Comprehensive Plan
Comments Received During 60-Day Public Comment Period: No Changes Needed/No Changes Proposed
ORDERED BY CHAPTER
Updated: January 5, 2022

No.	Name	Comment Category	Affiliation	Chapter	Page	Comment	Notes	Addressed
59	Charles Boyd	Agency	Maryland Department of Planning	Land Use	Page 21	Goal 4-1, Strategy 1, Recommendation 5. Consider indicating what major transportation corridors this recommendation refers to.	This is a recurring recommendation, and this language is likewise recurring throughout the Plan. The subjectivity is intentional and guided by both the definition of arterials road and the design and construction standards identified in Chapter 23 (Roads).	No change needed.
60	Comments received by: Charles & Edith Breeding, FRC Properties, LLC,; Larry Romjue, Ron and Julie Bennett, Robert Krampitz, Brigitte Barbee, Charles Lawhead, DeSales Ward, Robert Berra, TDSM, LLC, TDSM, LLC, Dawn and Earl Eber, and Kathy Gascon	Public	Grasonville	Land Use	Page 21	Strategy 2: Recommendations, Paragraph 1 and 2: I would like to see some sewer allocations reserved for a Main Street redevelopment project to promote infill, renovation and revitalization for new development. I support a County decision to provide monetary incentive for infill development.	The current Allocation Policy and the proposed policy prioritize commercial and infill development. See Goal 4-1, Strategies 1 and 2.	No change needed.
61	Frank DiGiallenardo	Public	Corsica River Conservancy	Land Use	Page 21	Strategies and Actions: Goal 4-1 Growth management, regulations, design/land use Strategy 1: Strategy 1 must apply to commercial as well as residential developments. The recommendation should not be limited to review of current "site design standards," if the outcomes in this strategy are to be achieved. The Code itself needs to be modified to ensure those outcomes.	The zoning code and other planning and policy documents hold specific design and bulk standards that are extremely prescriptive. This strategy is specific to ensure that viewsheds are considered.	No change needed.
62	Elle Bassett/Anne Richards	Public	ShoreRivers	Land Use	Page 21	Goal 4-1, Strategy 1: The first strategy under the first goal says "review current site design standards to further promote environmental protection," but the recommendations only prioritize scenic byways, vistas, farmland, and yards. Preserving critical areas, unfragmented forests, and wetlands should also be included.	This is incorporated in Recommendation 2 (as well as numerous recommendations found in Chapter 5 (Environmental Protection), starting on p. 5-25.	No change needed.
63	Elle Bassett/Anne Richards	Public	ShoreRivers	Land Use	Page 21	Implementing best management practices is mentioned a number of times throughout the chapter under preservation, conservation, growth management, rural agriculture, impacts on water resources, sensitive areas, and agricultural and rural preservation. Therefore, prioritizing these BMPs should also be mentioned within the strategies and actions.	Related BMPs discussed/referenced throughout the entire draft; intent was not to mandate specific BMP usage. See also the WRE.	No change needed.
64	Jay Falstad	Public	Queen Anne's Conservation Association	Land Use	Page 21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given the threats to Queen Anne's County as a quintessential rural community, the Plan should identify those threats and set out clear commitments to oppose them. -- The draft Plan properly notes the "concerns about the types of commercial uses that are permitted or may be allowed by conditional use with[in] the Agricultural (AG) District", but it fails to address these concerns. The Plan should contain a clear direction to the Planning Commission to identify and eliminate (or narrow) current permitted and conditional uses of AG and CS land that are unrelated to agriculture, with particular attention to eliminating uses that may interfere with successful family farming or is incompatible with the surrounding rural community. -- Route 301 cuts through the heart of Queen Anne's County, and commercial development along this now more heavily used highway threatens farming in the adjacent areas. QACA supports the farming community's recommendation of County Scenic Byway designation for this route (not state or federal as on p. 4-21), a designation that would (contra p. 4-13) "carry specific land use implications" prohibiting non-farm-related development in the viewsheds adjacent to the highway. 	Addressed: Goal 4-1, Strategy 1 recommendations support maintaining the existing agricultural and countryside zoning. Language within the Land Use Chapter further supports the intention of the purpose of the districts. See Issues and Challenges (page 4-7), Opportunities (page 4-8), and Benefits and Challenges (page 4-12). This language outlines that commercial uses and the growing agritourism industry must be evaluated.	No change needed.
65	Barry Waterman	Public		Land Use	Page 21-22	Strategy 1 recommendation 1 and Strategy 3 recommendation 5: These are contradictory recommendations. The Sage study, done at significant cost, concluded that there would be commercial development opportunities along the 301 corridor that would benefit the County. A 301 Scenic Byway as encouraged by some is the opposite. True, they could be blended and an effort to preserve "some/most" of the scenic beauty while allowing "some" commercial development is an option – that's not what the recommendations indicate.	Goal 4-1, Strategy 3 Rec 5 is related to zoning and not to adding a Growth Area along US 301. It provides an opportunity to contemplate options in accordance with the Sage Study that would be consistent with the recommendations in the strategies which precede it.	No change needed.

Queen Anne's County Comprehensive Plan
Comments Received During 60-Day Public Comment Period: No Changes Needed/No Changes Proposed
ORDERED BY CHAPTER
Updated: January 5, 2022

No.	Name	Comment Category	Affiliation	Chapter	Page	Comment	Notes	Addressed
66	Comments received by: Charles & Edith Breeding, FRC Properties, LLC,; Larry Romjue, Ron and Julie Bennett, Robert Krampitz, Brigitte Barbee, Charles Lawhead, DeSales Ward, Robert Berra, TDSM, LLC, TDSM, LLC, Dawn and Earl Eber, and Kathy Gascon	Public	Grasonville	Land Use	Page 22	Strategy 3: Recommendations, Paragraph 1-5: I concur with these Recommendations.	Noted.	No changes proposed.
67	James Parker	Public	QAC Democratic Club	Land Use	Page 22	Recommendations 9-11 are critical to improved citizen involvement. For example, findings of the Sea Level Rise report (March 2016), while technical in nature, must be understood by QAC residents, officials and developers, to prepare us for climate crises. Funds are typically not available to deal with these challenges (current and future). More houses = more tax revenues is not the only (nor best) way to increase County funds. Resiliency must become a top priority.	Agreed.	No changes proposed.
68	Elle Bassett/Anne Richards	Public	ShoreRivers	Land Use	Page 22	Strategy 2, Recommendation 7: Recommendation 7 under Strategy 2 (4-21) states: "Contemplate hazard resiliency." This is not a strong enough action to achieve the strategy of managing thoughtful growth that reflects the County's vision. ShoreRivers suggests the County instead use language such as "adopt a recognized practice such as Coast Smart; Environmental Site Design to the Maximum Extent Possible; use permeable pavers to prepare its vulnerable communities for hazard resiliency."	Addressed: See Environment Chapter, Goal 5-2, Strategy 2, Recommendations 1-4.	No change needed.
69	Comments received by: Charles & Edith Breeding, FRC Properties, LLC,; Larry Romjue, Ron and Julie Bennett, Robert Krampitz, Brigitte Barbee, Charles Lawhead, DeSales Ward, Robert Berra, TDSM, LLC, TDSM, LLC, Dawn and Earl Eber, and Kathy Gascon	Public	Grasonville	Land Use	Page 22-23	Strategy 4: Recommendations, Paragraph 1-5: I concur with these recommendations with particular emphasis on the development of a Main Street corridor zoning district.	Noted.	No changes proposed.
70	Elle Bassett/Anne Richards	Public	ShoreRivers	Land Use	Page 22-23	More accountability is required under the Strategies & Actions section. Words such as "consider" hold no actual weight towards action. For example, under Strategy 4, the words "establish" or "develop" would actually result in tools that promote preservation and sustainability as opposed to the county just "considering" such tools. If such tools already exist, they should be referenced within the Plan.	Langugage used is consistent with typical comprehensive plan terminology and is directive.	No change needed.
71	Charles Boyd	Agency	Maryland Department of Planning	Land Use	Page 23	The goal, strategies, and following recommendations for agricultural land preservation are noteworthy: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Conduct analysis of benefits of TDRs to County and Municipal Growth Areas and evaluate the County's Noncontiguous Development Rights (NCD) program" [The implementation section repeats this recommendation. Some elaboration about potential changes to these important land preservation tools would be helpful.] •ollaborate with the municipalities as they explore the annexation potential of their short and long-term Growth Areas. •As these Growth Areas are finalized in the towns' Municipal Growth Elements, promote the designation of greenbelts as part of the County's Priority Preservation Area (PPA). However, the Page 4-23, Goal 4-2, Strategy 2, Recommendations 1 and 2 suggest that Municipal Growth Areas, and their associated greenbelts, are not finalized. Greenbelts have already established, or not, in the currently adopted Municipal Comprehensive Plans, and as reflected in Map 4-6, Priority Preservation Map. The strategies should reference Municipal Growth Areas, for consistency. The county is encouraged to integrate municipal greenbelts within their PPA and develop strategies for incentivize the use of Transfer of Development Rights (TDRs).	Agreed that Greenbelts are already defined and identified; however, they may be relocated/reidentified throughout the updates to the MGEs within the Towns. Further, staff has used the term Growth Area deliberately to remain consistent with the MGE. Staff does not see a need to also note Municipal and County to introduce this nomenclature.	No change needed.
72	Barry Waterman	Public		Land Use	Page 23	Recommendation 2 is an impossibility due to the minimal ag transfer tax collected annually	Comment noted.	No changes proposed.
73	Barry Waterman	Public		Land Use	Page 23	Preserving farmland permanently around towns is short sighted and problematic. While greenbelts are a nice idea, if they are permanently preserved, how does a town continue to accommodate growth 50, 100, or more years in the future? They will be hemmed in eventually and then what???	The intent of greenbelt identification is to identify more appropriate areas for development to occur. These have (and will continue) been evaluated in concert with growth area and municipal annexation areas in mind.	No changes proposed.

Queen Anne's County Comprehensive Plan
Comments Received During 60-Day Public Comment Period: No Changes Needed/No Changes Proposed
ORDERED BY CHAPTER
Updated: January 5, 2022

No.	Name	Comment Category	Affiliation	Chapter	Page	Comment	Notes	Addressed
74	Sandi Olek	Agency	Maryland Department of Natural Resources	Land Use		The expansion of Rt. 301 will increase traffic in the county and increase accessibility to rural areas. Again, we encourage the county to limit development creep in rural lands by applying conservation zoning. This will limit the impervious footprint, but also centralize traffic to main transportation arteries. Road runoff is becoming a greater concern as more studies are reporting impacts of toxins found in runoff. Limiting transportation to major arteries will reduce the potential for widespread effects of pollutants that can harm streams and water resources.	Agreed. Addressed in Chapter 3 (Community Facilities)--GOAL 3-2: Provide sustainable smart growth management inside and outside Growth Areas; Chapter 4 (Land Use)--Sustainability Indicators; Chapter 5 (Environmental Resources)--GOAL 5-3: Implement a growth management strategy to direct new and infill development to existing County and Town Growth Areas; and Chapter 10 (Town Planning)--GOAL 10-2: Direct growth to incorporated municipalities.	No changes proposed.
75	Charles Boyd	Agency	Maryland Department of Planning	Land Use		Comments received during public outreach indicate that the public is not interested in "solar farm" or large-scale utility solar installations. Consider discussing this issue in the land use section and any recommended strategies the county would like to pursue.	This Plan update does not consider renewable energy; though the Zoning Code outlines applicable permitted and conditional uses. The 2010 Plan identified the "Incorporation of solar and other alternative energy conservation methodologies" in the Community Facilities Issues and Opportunities. As this issue has been addressed by the implementation of solar energy system provisions, it is a goal that has been met.	No change needed.
76	Amy Moore	Agency	Queenstown Town Manager	Land Use		The Queenstown Planning Commission met with the owners of the above property, as well as their attorney, at their October meeting on 10/6/21. Upon review and discussion of the owner's request to the County to rezone the 10 +/- acre parcel, which lies within the Town's growth area, the Queenstown Planning Commission has no objection with that parcel being rezoned to County Zone SC – Suburban Commercial, with a Comprehensive Plan Land Use change to Rural Business Employment Area and a Detailed Land Use to Commercial Mixed Use.	Noted. Does not change information in Draft. See CRR 32.	No changes proposed.
77	Centreville Town Council	Agency	Town of Centreville, Town Council	Land Use		The undersigned/unanimous members of the Centreville Town Council appreciate this opportunity to comment on the draft update for the 2021 Queen Anne's County Comprehensive Plan. We appreciate the effort that the County's Planning Commission has put into this Comprehensive Plan refresh and look forward to working with the County in the years ahead to implement the municipal and county partnership implied throughout the current draft. This plan rightly continues the practice of prioritizing the siting of new growth within the current and future planned boundaries of our county's municipalities, in order to reduce farmland conversion, protect natural resources and open space, and take advantage of existing infrastructure networks. In the case of Centreville, the county seat and a dedicated growth area, the infrastructure to accommodate such growth simply does not currently exist and will not exist without substantial new investment. Due to this reality, Centreville cannot afford to have commercial or industrial growth adjacent to, but outside of, current town boundaries or long-term town growth and annexation plans. The towns must be able to recover infrastructure investments from these adjacent commercial and light industrial locations, otherwise the towns will continue to struggle with making the infrastructure expansion investments necessary to meet the expectations of the County's Comprehensive Plan. More specifically, the Centreville Town Council unanimously requests that the Comprehensive Plan not include the growth areas located on the four corners of the intersection of Route 213 and 301 without first requiring those properties in question to be annexed into the town of Centreville and be appropriately connected to the Town's sewer and wastewater infrastructure.	This intersection is not noted as a growth area on the maps in Chapter 4. Refer to Chapter 10 - Town Planning: The Centreville Municipal Growth Element calls for the creation of a Phased Annexation Plan (page 10-8). Further, Goal 10-2, Strategy 1, Recommendation 1 addresses the mutual agreement and coordination of MGE implementation.	No change needed.
78	James Reilly	Public		Land Use		The Vision begins with: "Queen Anne's County will be a rural County that plans for orderly growth to protect and sustain a primarily agricultural, forested and maritime community within the limits of natural resources by concentrated future growth in existing towns and population centers..." And ends with: "Queen Anne's County is also a County that values and protects its water resources and is conscientious of its stewardship to the land and other natural assets and resources that make this a great place to live, work and play." 2. COMMENTS related to Vision and overall, to the Chapter: a. The Vision references "concentrated future growth in existing towns and population centers", but nowhere in the document does it provide any encouragement or resources to make this possible. It focuses almost entirely the limited infrastructure, and ways to contain or thwart any growth and live within the already over extended capacity of that infrastructure, principally wastewater treatment capacity. If we believe there is value in growth, shouldn't we be having a discussion on ways and means to improve and expand our infrastructure (wastewater, drinking water, stormwater management, transportation, schools, etc.).	There is limited/no known potential to expand WW capacity during the planning period so no direct recommendations other than what has already been incorporated.	No changes needed. Addressed in Town Planning Chapter: Goals 10-1 and 10-2 (pp10-22-23)
79	James Reilly	Public		Land Use		We all know growth will occur despite the efforts by some to stop all future growth. In fact, in Appendix D, table 1-8 Population Trends & Population Projections, supplied by the Maryland Department of Planning, Queen Anne's County is expected to grow by an estimated 11,230 between 2020 and 2040, or 22.1%. Based on these estimates, we need to urgently begin having discussions on how to increase, improve or otherwise expand our infrastructure capacity to accommodate that growth, or it will overtake us.	Addressed through Future Land Use Growth Management Strategy (page 4-13-20) and WRE (Appendix D).	No changes proposed.
80	James Reilly	Public		Land Use		b. The vision makes the statement that Queen Anne's County is a "great place to live, work and play", yet throughout the entire Land Use section there is at best lip-service reference to anything that creates affordable housing, good jobs, recreation beyond nature trails, or opportunities for our children to play or reasons to live here after High School. The term "smart growth", which is used extensively, reads more like code for restrictions and "growth is not welcome here." Words like promote, encourage, facilitate, expand, increase, etc. are almost non-existent throughout the document.	Items identified are addressed in Housing and Community Facilities and Services Chapters; not appropriate to the included discussion of land use	No changes proposed.

Queen Anne's County Comprehensive Plan
Comments Received During 60-Day Public Comment Period: No Changes Needed/No Changes Proposed
ORDERED BY CHAPTER

Updated: January 5, 2022

No.	Name	Comment Category	Affiliation	Chapter	Page	Comment	Notes	Addressed
81	James Reilly	Public		Land Use		c. In strategies, or the rest of the chapter for that matter, there is no additional reference to the "maritime community". Should this be interpreted to mean we don't support, or place value in, the maritime community? Should there be more expression of how this vital part of our community and heritage should be supported? Does the lack of discussion mean that no attention or resources need to be directed toward supporting our maritime community and businesses? I would assume that if it is important enough to reference in the Vision, we should be devoting some resources toward its preservation, growth and/or ensuring its' future. Maybe preservation of wetlands is considered support for the Maritime Community; however, the document does not make that connection obvious.	Addressed in Economic Development chapter and Goal 8-2.	No change needed.
82	James Reilly	Public		Land Use		None of this is a surprise when you look at the data expressed in "Public Input", Figure 4-2. This table could best be summarized as "we want to preserve everything as is, allow some limited growth for shopping, and discourage anything that would provide the affordable housing, good jobs, or opportunities for our children, young adults and the next generation of families/residents we all say we want. My concern is the Land Use section of the DRAFT Comprehensive Plan reads as a one-sided vision, almost hand-written by, or for, the more aggressive of the county's preservation groups, and ignores the need for strategies that will provide for the growth necessary to create a sustainable viable community for future generations as expressed in the vision.	This comment is not germane to the 60-day review draft and cannot be traced to the Plan. It is a reference to a survey included in a July draft document.	No changes proposed.
83	James Reilly	Public		Land Use		To make it a little less of an abstract discussion and bring some reality to it, take into consideration that in this county we have a recognized drug problem, particularly with our youth and good job opportunities beyond low paying fast food high school jobs are hard to come by. I would suggest that that is in-part because of the restrictive approach to growth there are no opportunities, no future, for our young people. The result is this is often not seen as a great place by them to live, work or play. As an example, my wife and I have 5 grandchildren, all but one of them live on Kent Island. The fifth, the oldest, graduated high school, turned 18 and moved to Florida with his uncle this year because he saw no future here. I suspect we are not the only family to experience this with our children/grandchildren. I would encourage the Planning Commission to find a way to strike a balance between the traditional approach to preservation that restricts any growth vs. ways to create opportunities for growth that will result in a sustainable and viable county and community without jeopardizing valuable natural resources and farmland we hold near and dear...A Great Place to Live, Work and Play. Thank you for your time and attention.	Draft included discussions of expanded affordable housing and taking advantage of new/niche markets. Believe the Housing & Economic Development sections are best areas to address, not Land Use.	No change needed.
84	Elle Bassett/Anne Richards	Public	ShoreRivers	Land Use		The first sentence of this chapter in the Vision states that the county plans "to protect and sustain a primarily agricultural, forested, and maritime community within the limits of natural resources." However, the outlined Goals, and Strategies & Actions only include preservation of agricultural land. How will the county protect and sustain forested and maritime communities if there are no goals, actions, or strategies identified within this plan to do so? Forested land preservation should be included as a Goal within the chapter. Furthermore, considering the recent pass of legislation that identifies a goal of 5 billion trees being planted in the state, the planting of street trees and prioritizing increasing tree canopy will put the county in a better position to receive funding for tree planting programs that will be coming in the near future. Increasing tree canopy is directly linked to a number of community benefits including: Reduced traffic speed; Safer walking environments; Lower crime rates; Improved business; Less runoff; Lower temperatures; Improved physical, emotional, and psychological health; Added property value	Addressed in Chapter 5 (Environment) in several ways: a no net loss directive (page 5-23) and an implementation recommendation (Goal 5-1, Strategy 2, Rec 4--page 5-25). Further, the Local Conservation Fund is outlined on page 5-12 and prioritizes a plan of action to maintain a viable Forest Conservation program by exploring land acquisition, forest banking, GIS tracking, and an increased forest conservation fee in lieu rate. Protection of the viability of the maritime industry is addressed in Chapters 4, 5, and 8 and in the WRE.	No change needed.
85	Elle Bassett/Anne Richards	Public	ShoreRivers	Land Use		More accountability is required under the Strategies & Actions section. Words such as "consider" hold no actual weight towards action. For example, under Strategy 4, the words "establish" or "develop" would actually result in tools that promote preservation and sustainability as opposed to the county just "considering" such tools. If such tools already exist, they should be referenced within the Plan. Additionally, Strategy 1 should include resiliency planning and prioritizing environmental practices for new development such as permeable pavement.	Such nomenclature is typical to all comprehensive planning and reflects commitment to overarching strategies (either in their infancy or as continued commitments).	No change needed.
86	Elle Bassett/Anne Richards	Public	ShoreRivers	Land Use		Public access to the County's natural resources, including its waterways, is intrinsic to promoting commerce, tourism, and quality of life for residents. It also fosters a deeper respect and concern for protecting these natural resources that lie at the heart of Queen Anne's Community Vision of being a great place to live. It appears that public access and land preservation for recreational opportunities are the overwhelming priority from County residents: 75.9% of the community participants ranked the natural environment and open space preservation as priority considerations related to future development (Environmental Resources, Figure 5.3). Strategies for prioritizing and preserving open space to meet both public access and reforestation goals should be discussed within both the Land Use and Environmental Resources Chapters.	Discussed in Environmental & Community Facilities chapters.	No action proposed.

Queen Anne's County Comprehensive Plan
Comments Received During 60-Day Public Comment Period: No Changes Needed/No Changes Proposed

ORDERED BY CHAPTER

Updated: January 5, 2022

No.	Name	Comment Category	Affiliation	Chapter	Page	Comment	Notes	Addressed
87	Scott MacGlashan/ Howard Dean	Public		Land Use		<p>1- Queen Anne's County must continue to preserve our agricultural heritage and protect "every" available acre of tillable farm land that will continue to produce and provide food for our nation.</p> <p>2. Recognize that climate change is a reality that further demonstrates the need to protect the production of agricultural products in support of feeding our nation.</p> <p>3. Recognize the importance of maintaining the Route 301 Queenstown to Middletown corridor as a Scenic Byway/Open Space for both the agricultural necessity and quality of life enjoyments.</p> <p>4. Recognize that agriculture represents the largest economic sector in our county.</p> <p>5. Continue to support "All" farmland preservation programs for the benefit of both our Heritage and Future Farmers.</p> <p>Additionally, please find attached the signed VISION STATEMENTS (over one hundred farmer signatures) and Miscellaneous Supporting Documentation that Howard and I plan to present to our County Commissioners when they discuss this plans Final Adoption.</p>	Draft already includes related recommendations: Goal 4-1, Strategy 1; Goal 4-2. Further, the Land Use Chapter addresses the points raised throughout.	No change needed.
88	Frank DiGiallenardo	Public	Corsica River Conservancy	Environmental Resources	Page 1	<p>Vision: The "key issues" stated here are right on. However, the associated "plan themes" are too weak (e.g., "encourage reduction of impervious surface). The vision to restore resources, not just conserve them, should be carried throughout this Chapter. Additionally, we agree that a "no net loss of forests" policy should be established in county regulations. Tree buffers protect streams and rivers, enhance public health, clean air, provide habitat and more. The recent clear cut of 40 acres of forest in Grasonville demonstrates the conflict between development and natural resources preservation objectives. Another step that needs to be taken to support the Vision is a process to screen and evaluate development proposals in terms of their contribution to the percent of impervious surface in their respective watersheds. Part of this process should be an ongoing accounting of the impervious surface that will be added by each approved development. (see more on impervious below)</p>	Plan themes serve to identify how various themes addressed in each chapter. Goal 5-1, Strategy 1, Recommendation 3 references tracking and limiting impervious surface percentages: specifics will be identified during implementation.	No change needed.
89	Barry Waterman	Public		Environmental Resources	Page 3	<p>Recommendation 4: without any alternative or suggestions to seek alternatives is more concerning. What if they do exceed percentages and whos "recommendations" are we to consider? There is very little science on this, but assuming whatever standard one wants to accept as appropriate - will be just shut down those areas? Will we then create new areas? Or will we just sterilize the population?</p>	Specifics regarding this recommendation will be developed during implementation.	No change needed.
90	Katherine Schinasi	Public		Environmental Resources	Page 8	<p>Data in Table 5-8 is inaccurate. Updated flyover data from the State has been available for two years yet is not being used here. Considerable development has occurred since 2016, when two watersheds were well beyond recommended limits and others close to the danger zone. As a consequence, this draft cannot do an adequately assess current threats and recommend effective conservation or restoration actions. As it stands, inaccurate data will lead to ill-advised recommendations by the Planning Staff on any future project proposals.</p>	Latest data available has been used. ID of impervious surface not as easy as suggested. Had conversations with County staff & WM's GIS Director-no easy way accomplish this. Updating data identified as recommendation. See Goal 5-1, Strategy 1, Recommendation 2.	No change needed.
91	Susan Buckingham	Public		Environmental Resources	Page 21	<p>This cart (5-12) is from 2016. Since then, many developments and building projects have been completed. Four Seasons for one. But also other parts of Kent Island, Kent Narrows and Queenstown, etc. At the very least, an updated estimate of additional impervious surface should added since 2016 be made available in the plan for areas where significant changes have occurred since 2016. The problem seems to also be evident in map 5-11</p>	Latest data available has been used. ID of impervious surface not as easy as suggested. Had conversations with County staff & WM's GIS Director-no easy way accomplish this. Updating data identified as recommendation. See Goal 5-1, Strategy 1, Recommendation 2.	No change needed.
92	James Parker	Public	QAC Democratic Club	Environmental Resources	Page 21	<p>Table 5-8 If this Table does not include new residential developments of the past 2 years, it should be updated. Kent Island Watershed is the highest % of all Watersheds in QAC. Since we are not incorporated, our resource options are limited. Should KI residents think about establishing a Hazard Mitigation Fund to better prepare for climate change?</p>	Latest data available has been used. ID of impervious surface not as easy as suggested. Had conversations with County staff & WM's GIS Director-no easy way accomplish this. Updating data identified as recommendation. See Goal 5-1, Strategy 1, Recommendation 2.	No change needed.
93	Frank DiGiallenardo	Public	Corsica River Conservancy	Environmental Resources	Page 21	<p>Stormwater, Table 5-8: Impervious Surface: This section contains a good exposition of impervious surface growth and its negative impact on stormwater control and on aquatic habitat. It's explanation of the available science regarding the latter needs to be expanded to reference the accepted limits of danger zone of 5-10% impervious in a watershed, beyond which irreparable harm is done to aquatic habitat and fisheries.</p> <p>The data on impervious surface in Table 5-8 is at least five years old. Updated flyover data from the State is available every three years. Data for 2019 has been available for two years now. Customizing that data for QAC is not a big expense It is extremely disappointing that more current data is not being used in the PlanQAC. Considerable development has occurred since 2016. So we are left not knowing more precisely the condition of our watersheds that the plan says are so highly valued. The draft cites two watersheds that were well beyond recommended limits in 2016. There are others including the Corsica River which now are very probably in the danger zone. As a consequence, this draft cannot do an adequate job of assessment and recommendation for effective action.</p>	Latest data available has been used. ID of impervious surface not as easy as suggested. Had conversations with County staff & WM's GIS Director-no easy way accomplish this. Updating data identified as recommendation. See Goal 5-1, Strategy 1, Recommendation 2.	No change needed.

Queen Anne's County Comprehensive Plan
Comments Received During 60-Day Public Comment Period: No Changes Needed/No Changes Proposed
ORDERED BY CHAPTER
Updated: January 5, 2022

No.	Name	Comment Category	Affiliation	Chapter	Page	Comment	Notes	Addressed
94	Elle Bassett/Anne Richards	Public	ShoreRivers	Environmental Resources	Page 21	Impervious surface percentage should be updated to include more current data. This should be a feasible exercise to complete given the Existing Land Use/Land Cover table reflected a more recent date in the Land Use chapter of the draft.	Latest data available has been used. ID of impervious surface not as easy as suggested. Had conversations with County staff & WM's GIS Director-no easy way accomplish this. Updating data identified as recommendation. See Goal 5-1, Strategy 1, Recommendation 2.	No change needed.
95	Sara Ramotnik	Public	Eastern Shore Land Conservancy	Environmental Resources	Page 21	Data used in Table 5-8 should be more recent than 2016. We cannot create and implement effective policies and comprehensive plans if they solely rely on outdated data from five years ago.	Latest data available has been used. ID of impervious surface not as easy as suggested. Had conversations with County staff & WM's GIS Director-no easy way accomplish this. Updating data identified as recommendation. See Goal 5-1, Strategy 1, Recommendation 2.	No change needed.
96	Elle Bassett/Anne Richards	Public	ShoreRivers	Environmental Resources	Page 9	MD Department of Natural Resources (DNR) and Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE) have developed the new mapping layer Coast Smart Climate Ready Action Boundary (CS-CRAB). This boundary of the 100-year floodplain plus a three-foot vertical extent addresses the footprint of a Category 2 storm surge and includes areas inundated by an at least 2-foot rise in sea level. This new boundary should be included in the plan so that the county can better plan for projected sea level rise. **The CS-CRAB should also be included in the Water Resource Appendix**	The Land Use and Environment Chapters call out all of the County's resiliency and hazard planning documents and direct the County to implement them and review development plans in accordance with them. The individual plans outline increased floodplain, swm, and resiliency standards specifically.	These suggestions have been addressed and folded into resiliency planning efforts referenced throughout the draft and found within various planning documents (HMP, Nuisance Flood Plan, Vulnerability Plan, and draft Climate Resilience Planning and Financing Study). See Goal 5-2, Strategy 2, Recommendation 3.
97	Charles Boyd	Agency	Maryland Department of Planning	Environmental Resources	Page 10	Table 5-7 – Public Sewer Systems Demand and Capacity Summary, would benefit from including new columns to indicate “Committed Capacity”, “Equivalent Dwelling Units (EDUs)”, and “Nitrogen Limits”. See similar comment in the Water Resources Element review section.	This data resides within the Water and Sewer Plan, Schedule A. Land Use goals and strategies specifically point to this capacity commitment and the limit with short and long term options relative to this matter. Town data will be updated, as will County data during the W&S Plan update which will follow the Comp Plan adoption.	No change needed.
98	Elle Bassett/Anne Richards	Public	ShoreRivers	Environmental Resources	Page 10	Although the chapter notes that aquatic habitats, such as those for shellfish and fisheries are resources for the county's maritime industry, aquatic habitats should also be included within the Environmental Resources chapter. These habitats, including oyster reefs and submerged aquatic vegetation beds should be discussed within the Species Habitat section and recommendations including the preservation and conservation of such aquatic habitats should be included within the Strategies & Actions section. These habitats, along with marsh and wetlands, are also vital resources for the County's resiliency in the face of climate change, and should be further highlighted as critically important for not only the protection of our waterways and the biodiversity it sustains, but also for the protection of the County's infrastructure, housing, and economy.	Already addressed. See WRE Table 1-6; Environmental Strategies (Goal 5-3, Strategy 3).	No change needed.
99	James Parker	Public	QAC Democratic Club	Environmental Resources	Page 13	Table 5-4 After the flooding on October 29, 2021 we might think about raising that risk factor. That was a surprise but given the nature of swift climate change we need to be better prepared. Listing Tornado at 2.5 seems low, after our Level 2 event 4 years ago, also a surprise.	Risk ranking completed during development of Multi-Jurisdictional All-Hazard Mitigation Plan (updated every 5 years per federal requirements). Outside scope of comprehensive plan.	No change needed.
100	Sara Ramotnik	Public	Eastern Shore Land Conservancy	Environmental Resources	Page 17	Heavy Precipitation Events: Reads “The County's infrastructure and its ability to handle such events plays a contributing role in how effectively the area can be evacuated and how it can prevent damage from these events.” Important to note that having less impervious surfaces can better empower the County to handle heavy precipitation events.	Already discussed in WRE Appendix D.	See Appendix D, p. 11.
101	Frank DiGiallenardo	Public	Corsica River Conservancy	Environmental Resources	Page 18	Water: This essential element of life is not being adequately managed today and the plan update does not point to specific actions to correct this going forward. For example, two service areas, Bayside and Thompson Creek, are already over capacity. The Plan simply says “New development in these areas should be carefully considered.” Why not say “restricted” and develop the necessary criteria to better screen proposals? Residents will directly feel the impact of inadequate and delayed action to curb supply usage in terms of increased cost for drinking water treatment and well replacement. There are also environmental impacts of not carefully managing water table levels.	Outright restriction without detailed analysis is not appropriate in a comprehensive plan and has specific property rights implications. Recommendation 3 of Goal 5-1, Strategy 1 reflects limiting impervious surface percentages.	No change needed.
102	Charles Boyd	Agency	Maryland Department of Planning	Environmental Resources	Page 19	Table 5-6 - GAP Well Water Limits Comparison. As applicable, Planning suggests that the county include a new column to indicate withdrawal limits from the Aquia Aquifer. See similar comment in the Water Resources Element review section.	The GAP identifies the withdrawal limits. Limits are established by MDE and are not within the purview of the County. See WRE Table 1-16 which identified watert supply and demand.	No change needed.
103	Elle Bassett/Anne Richards	Public	ShoreRivers	Environmental Resources	Page 21	While the draft discusses the amount of impervious surface within subwatersheds, it fails to contextualize the significance of measuring the amount of impervious. During a past presentation to the Planning and Zoning Commission, the presenters noted that percentages of 10% or higher have dramatic consequences to the environment. According to the EPA, more than 10% impervious surface will impair a stream beyond what can be fixed within modern restoration practices. That context should be included in the Stormwater section and a specific action to ensure that watersheds do not reach the 10% threshold should be included within the Strategies & Actions section.	Already discussed in WRE Appendix D, page AD-11.	No change needed.
104	Barry Waterman	Public		Environmental Resources	Page 23	3rd paragraph: "No net loss" policies are fraught with future unintended consequences that cannot be foreseen. Seeking for preserve wetlands and forests is a good goal - but a no net loss policy will come back to bite the County at some point and should be removed from this and from Strategy 2 recommendations 1 and 4	Implementation of any recommendation will involve more specific and detailed analysis, including effects of enactment.	No change needed.

Queen Anne's County Comprehensive Plan
Comments Received During 60-Day Public Comment Period: No Changes Needed/No Changes Proposed
ORDERED BY CHAPTER

Updated: January 5, 2022

No.	Name	Comment Category	Affiliation	Chapter	Page	Comment	Notes	Addressed
105	Elle Bassett/Anne Richards	Public	ShoreRivers	Environmental Resources	Page 23	Fisheries Element – This section does nothing to discuss species populations or threats, and there is little mention of aquaculture. Only threats discussed include lack of seasonal migrant workers and dredging to keep channels open. Additional threats that should be addressed include population sustainability of species being harvested, aquatic habitat degradation, quality and health of species and waterways, and the potential impacts to human health associated with poor water health.	Shellfish are included within fisheries according to the first sentence. More thorough review of aquatic resource protection is addressed in the WRE.	No change needed.
106	Elle Bassett/Anne Richards	Public	ShoreRivers	Environmental Resources	Page 23	BMPs, Tools, & Techniques - Change the word may to shall. "The following indicators shall be measured, evaluated, and traced over time to determine community impact with respect to meeting preservation and water resources goals contributing to County's overall sustainability." Or, include this practice as a recommendation within the Actions & Strategies section (5-25).	Such nomenclature is typical to all comprehensive planning and reflect commitment to overarching strategies (either in their infancy or as continued commitments).	No change needed.
107	Frank DiGiallenardo	Public		Environmental Resources	Page 25	Strategy 1 includes "implement watershed based planning". This definitely should be done and is sorely needed if the county is truly committed to stewardship and protecting our natural resources and waterways. At this point in QAC's development, the latter won't happen with out the former. I believe the 2010 also included this intent. But it was not implemented. What will be different this time?	Implementation occurs as funding and political will allow. Continued inclusion as recommendation highlights desire to revisit.	No change needed.
108	Cheryl Huyck	Public		Environmental Resources	Page 25	Goal 5-1: The 2010 Plan includes Strategy 1 "implement watershed based planning" yet this was not implemented to the best of my knowledge. Why not? What action will be taken to assure it occurs with this update as watershed based planning is critical.	Implementation occurs as funding and political will allow. Continued inclusion as recommendation highlights desire to revisit.	No change needed.
109	Frank DiGiallenardo	Public	Corsica River Conservancy	Environmental Resources	Page 25	Goal 5-1: This is a good set of recommendations, though they would benefit from a more specific proposal on how to limit impervious surface growth. But the key is Strategy 1 - "implement watershed based planning". This recommendation was included in the 2010 plan, but was not ever implemented. What is in this update to assure it occurs this time around? This step would mean substantive change to the Planning Commission process and is sorely needed.	Will be determined during implementation; inappropriate to identify without additional research/analysis.	No change needed.
110	Elle Bassett/Anne Richards	Public	ShoreRivers	Environmental Resources	Page 25	In Actions and Strategies - Words such as "consider" and "contemplate" should be replaced with action words: develop, establish, address, etc.	Such nomenclature is typical to all comprehensive planning and reflect commitment to overarching strategies (either in their infancy or as continued commitments).	No change needed.
111	Elle Bassett/Anne Richards	Public	ShoreRivers	Environmental Resources	Page 25	Goal 5-1, Strategy 1: Be more specific on the threshold under recommendation number 3 - what is the threshold? Include specifics in the Water Resources Appendix.	Will be determined during implementation; inappropriate to identify without additional research/analysis.	No change needed.
112	Sara Ramotnik	Public	Eastern Shore Land Conservancy	Environmental Resources	Page 25	Goal 5-1, Strategy 1, Recommendation 3: Part of this tracking should include the replacement of current impervious surfaces to pervious surfaces when possible. These limits should be based upon recent data.	Already identified as part of MS4 permit requirements, referenced on p. AD-14.	No change needed.
113	Sara Ramotnik	Public	Eastern Shore Land Conservancy	Environmental Resources	Page 25	Goal 5-1, Strategy 2, Recommendations: Include a recommendation which will address permanently protecting portions of these Sensitive Areas.	No net loss policies recommended under Goal 5-1, Strategy 2.	No change needed.
114	Barry Waterman	Public		Environmental Resources	Page 26	1st Paragraph: Exceeding FEMA requirements makes no sense. The County lacks the expertise available to FEMA when the floodplain management ordinances were developed. No house built to the floodplain management ordinance in QAC flooded during Hurricane Isabelle - the worst flooding event anyone alive in QAC had ever experienced. The current ordinance is working just fine.	Exceeding FEMA requirements is basis for FEMA/NFIP's Community Rating System (CRS), to which County is already applying.	No change needed.
115	Frank DiGiallenardo	Public	Corsica River Conservancy	Environmental Resources	Page 27	Goal 5-3 - Growth Management: The plan should recognize that the goal of directing "new and infill development to existing towns and growth areas", while the right approach, can act opposite to Goal 5-1. This is due to most of our towns being located at head of tide of key tributaries and watersheds (e.g., Centreville and the Corsica). That is, they tend to be smack in the middle of environmentally sensitive areas. This may call for extraordinary measures to counter detrimental effects on these watersheds. An example of such measures is the change that the Town of Centreville is making to its ordinances to accommodate alternatives to traditional curb and gutter streets.	Goal 5-3 strategies more clearly indicate meeting growth management goals while respecting public water supplies, wastewater facilities, stormwater treatment, etc.	See more detailed strategies and recommendations listed as part of Goal 5-3.
116	Barry Waterman	Public		Environmental Resources	Page 28	#13 "reducing the potential for development" this is euphemistic language for downzoning. Unless it is the intent of the PC to downzone the entire Ag district (where there is already near ZERO development pressure) this language should be removed	Directing growth to PFAs and applying the APFO is longstanding and does not equate to a taking outside of the growth areas. The goals and strategies in the Plan update do not alter longstanding support and direction to encourage growth in the growth areas.	This is a long-term growth policy - believe OK to stand as is.No changes needed.
117	Sandi Olek	Agency	Maryland Department of Natural Resources	Environmental Resources		The County is aware of the impacts of development on natural resources and we support the application of impervious thresholds to limit impacts to aquatic habitats. We encourage the county to adopt and apply zoning consistent with the thresholds. We would especially support conservation zoning in watersheds where resources are less stressed. The Department of Natural Resources has numerous mapping tools available to assist the county in identifying those areas and would be glad to assist in identifying key areas for conservation.	Noted. Will be addressed during plan implementation, see Goal 5-1, Strategy 1, Recommendation 2 and 3.	No changes proposed.
118	Sandi Olek	Agency	Maryland Department of Natural Resources	Environmental Resources		Consistent with limiting development, we support the County's intentions to target development to existing towns. Some of these towns lie in the headwaters of tributaries identified as anadromous spawning grounds. Our studies show that anadromous spawning declines with increased impervious cover, with a tipping point around 10-15% impervious where spawning subsides. We urge the County to consider these impacts to key spawning areas and limit the impervious footprint where possible to avoid loss of these habitats.	Noted. Will be addressed during plan implementation, see Goal 5-1, Strategy 1, Recommendation 2 and 3.	No change needed.

Queen Anne's County Comprehensive Plan
Comments Received During 60-Day Public Comment Period: No Changes Needed/No Changes Proposed
ORDERED BY CHAPTER

Updated: January 5, 2022

No.	Name	Comment Category	Affiliation	Chapter	Page	Comment	Notes	Addressed
119	Sandi Olek	Agency	Maryland Department of Natural Resources	Environmental Resources		Because rural watersheds are the most productive anadromous spawning areas in Maryland, we endorse maintaining the rural character of the county. Statewide development trends since the 1970's have shown urbanization has been centered mostly on farmland. Maps of the Land Use plans over time show this trend in the County is consistent with statewide trends. We are concerned that continued development of agricultural lands will impact aquatic resources. To date, there are few studies showing BMP's and restoration of urban streams can provide enough ecological lift to push them back to a pre-disturbance state, while agricultural BMP's have proven effective. Because of this, we would caution against over-reliance on restoration and BMP's to address aquatic habitat losses in urban areas. Conservation of rural lands continues to be the most effective management approach to maintaining productive aquatic habitats.	Already addressed under Goal 4-2 (p. 4-23).	No change needed.
120	Charles Boyd	Agency	Maryland Department of Planning	Environmental Resources		PlanQAC recommends finalizing the 2019 County Climate Resilience Planning and Financing Study. When complete, the county should consider updating the comprehensive plan or adding the study as an addendum to the comprehensive plan to include any new recommendations or financing strategies.	See chapter 5. Goal 5-2, Strategy 2, Recommendation 3 recognizes contemplating the prioritization of resiliency projects and capital improvements would be the strategies/outcome of completing this study. Other environmental plans are mentioned and incorporated into the Comprehensive Plan by mention of the plan.	No change needed.
121		Public		Environmental Resources		While this chapter acknowledges sewerage capacity; preserving open space and critical environmental areas; and applying low-impact design or Environmental Site Design - it is woefully lacking on including climate change projections and resiliency. Sustainable smart growth guiding principles that support land use policy and regulation should include climate change planning and resiliency. Additionally, although the 100-year floodplain is referenced frequently, but the state now considers "coast-smart" boundaries as 100-year floodplain plus a three-foot vertical extent to better plan for sea-level rise.	The Land Use and Environment Chapters call out all of the County's resiliency and hazard planning documents and direct the County to implement them and review development plans in accordance with them. The individual plans outline increased floodplain, swm, and resiliency standards specifically.	These suggestions have been addressed and folded into resiliency planning efforts referenced throughout the draft and found within various planning documents (HMP, Nuisance Flood Plan, Vulnerability Plan, and draft Climate Resilience Planning and Financing Study). See Goal 5-2, Strategy 2, Recommendation 3.
122	Sandy Huffer	Public		Environmental Resources		I am extremely concerned about the amount of development that has occurred in the County (especially on Kent Island) over the last past several years. The treasure of the Eastern Shore are the natural surroundings which support the health and economics of the residents of the County. The QAC Comprehensive Plan addresses this to preserve the natural treasure of the County, but much more specifics need to be included to address the following- 1. Specific "actions" outlined to conserve and protect wetlands, critical area, forests and open space. These habitats are the lifeline to a strong ecosystem and economy of the County. 2. The County has to address the projected sea level rise and higher rainfall that will impact the County and the residents given the large amount of waterfront. 3. The waterways in the County are all impaired as defined by the EPA. These waterways support agriculture, commercial and recreational fishing and tourism. Specific actions must be addressed to elevate the management practices for agriculture and stormwater runoff to restore and protect local waterways. 4. Public access to the waterways and land preservation for recreational activities is a major priority for County residents. Stronger "actions" should be addressed in the plan. 5. Sustainable "planned growth" and preserving rural character are top priorities for residents. Stormwater runoff, wastewater treatment plant capacity and environmentally sensitive site designs needs to be specifically addressed. Without concrete actionable plans I fear we will not achieve the strategy of preserving our way of life and the environment we all love which would be a tragedy. Thank you very much for providing the opportunity for public comment.	Specifics regarding how to implement recommendations are developed after plan adoption. It is inappropriate to contain this level of detail in the comprehensive plan, especially without specific research/analysis of potential implementation impacts.	No changes proposed.
123	Jay Falstad	Public	Queen Anne's Conservation Association	Environmental Resources		As the Eastern Shore's oldest conservation organization, QACA strongly supports the Plan's fundamental commitment to maintaining Queen Anne's County as a "quintessential rural community." <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given the County's location in the heart of the uniquely diverse natural environment of the Eastern Shore -- with its productive farms, unfragmented forest areas, wetlands, rivers, and the Bay -- protecting these mutually dependent resources from destructive development should remain, as the draft Plan pledges, the County's highest priority. The phrase "quintessential rural community" captures very well what it is that we must maintain, and QACA applauds its firm reiteration in the draft Plan. Given the effects of climate change, maintaining our rural community and its family farms becomes a national as well as a County priority. Three-fourths of our nation's food production comes from the areas of the U.S. that are drying out and burning up. Here in the Delmarva, as described in the United Nations IPCC Report, we will have more storms and floods, but we will not have agriculture-killing drought and fire. Our farms will not be destroyed by climate change but will see more demand for what they can produce. In the national interest as well as our own, this quintessential rural community should commit to not losing a single acre of farm or forestland for the duration of this Comprehensive Plan. 	Noted.	No changes proposed.
124	Elle Bassett/Anne Richards	Public	ShoreRivers	Environmental Resources		While stormwater runoff pollution from impervious surfaces continues to increase, we cannot ignore the fact that the predominant land use within the county is agriculture. Therefore, environmental impacts from agriculture should be discussed and agricultural conservation practices that reduce nutrient and sediment pollution should be included within the Environmental Resources chapter, particularly within the Strategies & Actions section.	Already addressed.	See WRE Table 1-6; Environmental Strategies (Goal 5-3, Strategy 3)

Queen Anne's County Comprehensive Plan
Comments Received During 60-Day Public Comment Period: No Changes Needed/No Changes Proposed

ORDERED BY CHAPTER

Updated: January 5, 2022

No.	Name	Comment Category	Affiliation	Chapter	Page	Comment	Notes	Addressed
125	Elle Bassett/Anne Richards	Public	ShoreRivers	Environmental Resources		While the draft discusses the amount of impervious surfaces within subwatersheds, it fails to contextualize the significance of measuring the amount of impervious. During a past presentation to the Planning and Zoning Commission, the presenters noted that if these percentages are 10% or higher, there are dramatic consequences to the environment. In fact, according to the EPA, more than 10% impervious surface will impair a stream beyond what can be fixed within modern restoration practices. That context should be included in the Stormwater section and a specific action to ensure that watersheds do not reach the 10% threshold should be included within the Strategies & Actions section. Additionally, to ensure the county meets such a goal, the Impervious Surface Coverage-Existing Conditions table should be updated to reflect current Impervious Surface percentages. This should be a feasible exercise to complete given the Existing Land Use/Land Cover table reflected a more recent date in the Land Use chapter of the draft.	Included as part of WRE (pg AD-11); can include language in Env chapter or refer to WRE. See all references in WRE Appendix and Environment Chapter (Key issue and Plan theme and Goal 5-1, Strategy 1, recommendations 2 and 3)	No change needed.
126	Elle Bassett/Anne Richards	Public	ShoreRivers	Environmental Resources		Finally, green infrastructure, an approach to water management that protects, restores, or mimics the natural water cycle within the built community is missing from the current draft and is an effective tool and strategy that will assist the county in achieving the visions outlined in this chapter. Green infrastructure provides co-benefits of increasing the resilience of a community while also reducing the amount of nutrients and sediment that enter downstream systems. Green infrastructure should be listed as a specific Action & Strategy that the County should implement whenever possible.	Identified in WRE Table 19.	See specific references to both green infrastructure, greenbelts, and FCFund in Environment Chapter (pg 5-12).
127	Janet Rochester	Agency	Church Hill Planning & Zoning Commission	Environmental Resources	Map 5-1	This map shows the Town of Church Hill and its designated growth area as a "Targeted Ecological Area". This term is defined on the Map 5-1 as, "Lands and watersheds of high ecological value identified as conservation priorities by DNR". It goes on to say that "The land includes large blocks of forests and wetlands, rare species habitat, aquatic biodiversity hotspots and area important for protecting water quality". While we agree the Church Hill area has unique ecological value as do areas throughout the County, we do not believe it is appropriate to broadly generalize and map the entire Town and its growth area with this statewide data set. As presented in the draft Plan, Map 5-1 is intended to reflect recommended policy in that it purports to show sensitive environmental features to be protected. But the intent of DNR's Targeted Ecological Area map layer is not to set policy or to categorically signal that any area of the State is somehow off-limits to planned development. The Town of Church Hill Comprehensive Plan provide an assessment of the environmental features and resources in and around the Town and includes policies for protecting them, but the Planning Commission does not support the use of this broad based designation in this way. An alternative way of communicating this DNR map content would be to show only the boundary of the area and to indicate that within the boundary sensitive environmental areas may be found. We encourage the County to make this change or remove this content from within the boundary of Church Hill and its growth area, or to remove this map layer from Map 5-1 altogether.	The statewide (Source: MD iMap) data set is used to map the general locations of sensitive areas for the entire County. It is not the intent to base policy specifically on map 5-1. Environmental policy based on ecological areas are created in local and state regulations. Regulations do not live within the comprehensive plan. The County does not hold sway over environmental regulations within the Town of Church Hill. During development review confirmation of these ecological areas would be reviewed with delinations, see page 5-8.	No change needed.
128	Todd Redpath	Public		Transportation	Page 1	Traffic congestion could negatively affect the quality of life in the County.	Noted. Discussed in Draft. See Chapter 6 Key Issues (Pg 1), Guiding Principles (Pg 2), County Transportation Priorities (Pg 15), multiple plans, Goal 6-1, Strategy 1, Recommendation 1 and Goal 6-1, Strategy 4;	No changes proposed.
129	Peter Johnston	Agency	Town of Queenstown	Transportation	Page 1, 2, 5, 15	The draft plan should recognize the strategic importance of extending trails onto Queenstown as this connection is the critical link from the Bay Bridge to several regional travel corridors, including the American Discovery Trail, the Captain John Smith National Historic Trail, the Chesapeake, Country Scenic Highway, and the Queen Anne's County Cross County connector. Besides the benefits these connections offer residents, they play an essential role in user experience, a key to promoting the region's culture, heritage, recreation, and natural features.	Extending trails identified in Goal 6-2, Strategy 2, Recommendation 18. Further addressed in Chapter 11 (Goal 11B-3, Strategy 4).	No change needed.
130	Cheryl Huyck	Public		Transportation	Page 2	Guiding Principals: The 8th bullet contains the only reference to Noise Pollution that I could find in the Draft Comp Plan. Noise pollution is a growing problem in QAC. Pick-up trucks can be outfitted with Headers, Mid-Pipes, Catbacks and Air Intakes all for the purpose of making them louder. Live near a Town where the speed limit goes from 25 in Town limits to County road one now has an almost constant roar of irritating vehicle noise. The peace and quiet that was common place in our County is disappearing and threatens to get worse as more vehicles use our roadways. The single reference to Noise Pollution in Chapter 6 with no substance nor recommendations for enforcing existing noise regulations demonstrates the lack of attention to this issue and is an oversight in the Plan.	See Guiding Principals (page 6-2). Note: Noise regulations for the County are outlined at the State level. In addition, through development review and conditional uses noise is considered.	No change needed.
131	Queenstown Commissioners	Agency	Town of Queenstown	Transportation	Page 3	A County trails master plan should identify critical links/corridors between Grasonville and Queenstown and other destinations, e.g., Centreville, Chesapeake College. Once identified, the implementation should be reflected in related policies, plans, and ordinances, including mandatory dedications by developers where their projects intersect these corridors and in the Highway Needs Inventory, where corridors are part of the State system. A County trails master plan should identify immediate opportunities to partner with the municipalities to develop local trails that support countywide non-motorized mobility. For example, the Queenstown Harbor Golf Course and Cottages property owners have expressed a willingness to consider a trail segment installed across the property frontage. This project is an example of "low hanging fruit" that would allow the County and Queenstown to collaborate on a project providing a needed linkage from the east end of Winchester Creek Road (east of Nesbit Road overpass on the northern side) thru to Queenstown. Likely, this linkage could be accomplished relatively quickly since the property owner has suggested support for a trail that would run through an undeveloped wooded section of their property.	See Goal 6-2, Strategy 2, Rec 1 which directs the County to create a pedestrian and bicycle plan. This plan would become a part of the LPPRP.	No change needed.
132	Heather Murphy	Agency	MDOT	Transportation	Page 5	The MDOT encourages the County to work with MDOT SHA to identify opportunities for traffic calming, sidewalks, bike paths, street lighting, crosswalks, and pedestrian amenities. Please coordinate with Mr. Derrick Sexton, MDOT SHA Regional Planner, at 410-545-5560, or via email at DSexton@mdot.maryland.gov.	County will work with MDOT for relevant implementation items.	No changes proposed.

Queen Anne's County Comprehensive Plan
Comments Received During 60-Day Public Comment Period: No Changes Needed/No Changes Proposed
ORDERED BY CHAPTER

Updated: January 5, 2022

No.	Name	Comment Category	Affiliation	Chapter	Page	Comment	Notes	Addressed
133	Peter Johnston	Agency	Town of Queenstown	Transportation	Page 5, BPAC Recommendations	Why not include 3/15/2021 Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee recommendations, including recommendation #5 to extend Cross Island Trail past Long Point Park to Chester River Beach community (Sadler/Chester River Beach road) and onward to Queenstown.	Page 6-6 mentions the June 2020 recommendations provided from the BPAC identifying connectivity and safety priorities including both long term and short term items. The plan references the LPPRP.	No change needed.
134	Charles Boyd	Agency	Maryland Department of Planning	Transportation	Page 6	Existing Trails. The text states that "In June 2020, the BPAC [Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee] identified connectivity and safety priorities including both long-term aspirational items and short-term tactical opportunities (see the County's LPPRP [Land Preservation, Parks and Recreation Plan]). The County is already actively pursuing some of these items." This indicates that the LPPRP currently underway somehow includes the BPAC's priorities. Planning recommends that the county make sure that this is the case.	Noted.	No change needed.
135	Charles Boyd	Agency	Maryland Department of Planning	Transportation	Page 8	The Chester River is identified as a goods movement corridor with general waterway dredging issues (page 6-9). However, PlanQAC doesn't include any strategy or recommendation on the waterway issue. A strategy or recommendation will clarify the county's position on this subject.	Goal 6-2, Strag 3 does promote efficient freight and goods movement. The current goal, as stated, seems may be sufficient in expressing the Countys position on this issue.	No change needed.
136	Charles Boyd	Agency	Maryland Department of Planning	Transportation	Page 10	Related to US 301 Corridor, Chapter 4 - Land Use, Chapters 6 – Transportation, and Chapter 8 – Economic Development & Tourism alternatively discuss the corridor as an agricultural Scenic Byway (page 4-13); a Major Freight Corridor (page 6-10), and an economic corridor (page 8-3). Planning suggests Chapter 6 -Transportation include a strategy and recommendation calling for developing a US 301 corridor plan to address the balance of using US 301 as an agricultural Scenic Byway, an economic development corridor, and a freight route.	The points raised are valid. As noted, this Plan addresses these items throughtout and in a broad context to allow flexibility (namely see Goal 6-3, Strategy 2).	No change needed.
137	Charles Boyd	Agency	Maryland Department of Planning	Transportation	Page 10	The county should consider including a section on connected and automated vehicles (CAV) and how these emerging technologies would affect local transportation, land use, economic development, and other planning element policies. Many jurisdictions either monitor, prepare, or proactively consider CAV technologies. In recent years, freight related CAV technologies are gaining more attractions. In 2021, the Maryland General Assembly passed legislation to accommodate truck platooning in Maryland. Having US 301 and other truck routes, the county could deal with CAV technology-related truck safety and travel efficiency issues. PlanQAC may include a recommendation covering the CAV topic. As a reference, the State developed the Connected & Automated Vehicle Toolkit for Maryland Local Jurisdictions to assist local CAV technology planning and implementation efforts. In addition, the Maryland CAV website provides the information on various CAV actions in Maryland.	Noted. This is too specific for the Comprehensive Plan.	No change needed.
138	Charles Boyd	Agency	Maryland Department of Planning	Transportation	Page 10	The county may want to include a recommendation to address electric vehicles (EV) charging facility needs for residents and visitors. The county can also consider establishing EV charging ready building codes for new commercial and residential developments. Maryland EV, a Maryland State EV website, provides various EV and EV infrastructure topics and resources.	See Page 6-2, Guiding Principles, promote environmentally friendly transportation policies.	No change needed.
139	Charles Boyd	Agency	Maryland Department of Planning	Transportation	Page 10	Chapter 6 includes a discussion of the freight system and includes recommendations to address freight issues. Planning suggests that the plan include an additional recommendation calling for preserving the railway and industrial lands as valuable freight and economic development resources and implementing compatible land use and safety measures (if needed) along the railroad corridor.	See Chapter 8, Economic Development and Tourism page 8-20 and Goal 6-2, Strategy 3.	No change needed.
140	Jon Mullarky	Public		Transportation	Page 12	The section on Air Transportation should point out that the FAA has jurisdiction over air space needed for safe takeoffs and landings and requires that airport operators hold air rights easements over these airspace areas. The County must take the requirement into account in the future development plans or risk loss of federal grants for airport projects.	This level of detail exceeds the scope of the Comp Plan and occurs at the staff level through FAA coordination during project review.	No change needed.
141	Charles Boyd	Agency	Maryland Department of Planning	Transportation	Page 15	Map 6-2, Average Annual Daily Traffic. Consider incorporating the traffic counts being collected by the county, or a table of similar count stations. These traffic counts are described on page 6-15, column two, paragraph two.	The traffic counts referenced on page 6-15 relate to the County's Kent Island Tranportation Plan and are not generated by the State iMAP. The AADT data set may not be congruous with the County's data..	No change needed.
142	Charles Boyd	Agency	Maryland Department of Planning	Transportation	Page 15	Planning strongly encourages the county to develop a countywide transportation plan to address overall transportation issues, prioritize improvement needs, and identify funding resources and agency and developer responsibilities for projects. Planning suggests PlanQAC include a recommendation calling for creating a countywide transportation plan. Chapter 6 – Transportation discusses multiple state and local transportation plans and studies such as the State Highway Administration's Highway Needs Inventory, the 2016 Kent Island Transportation Plan, the 2015 Delmarva Freight Plan, and the FY 21-FY25 County Ride Transit Development Plan. It is unclear if PlanQAC would endorse all or some projects in these plans and studies. Projects within Municipal Growth Areas, such as the Route 213 widening from US 301 to Centreville, identified in the Highway Needs Inventory, should be coordinated with the towns, as this improvement is not currently identified in the adopted Centreville Comprehensive Plan. This type of improvement may or not be supported by the municipality or have impacts with other local road improvement priorities and future transportation goals.	Identified as Goal 6-1, Strategy 5.	No change needed.
143	Charles Boyd	Agency	Maryland Department of Planning	Transportation	Page 15	Chapter 6 discusses transit needs and plans. However, there are no specific transit improvement recommendations in the Strategies & Actions section. Consider including specific priority transit improvement recommendations in PlanQAC, which may help augment state funding support on transit.	See page 6-15 for County transportation priorities. See Goal 6-1, Strategy 1, Recommendation 2.	No change needed.
144	Heather Murphy	Agency	MDOT	Transportation	Page 15	It is recommended that any proposed transportation projects on state roads in the plans be considered for inclusion in future updates to Queen Anne's County's Annual Transportation Priority Letter.	Noted.	No changes proposed.
145	Jon Mullarky	Public		Transportation	Page 15	In the section MD 18, I agree with the top priority being given to the section of MD 18 inward from Castle Marina Road. The roundabout at Castle Marina Road needs attention to accommodate the large, dominate flow of rush-hour and summers weekend traffic through the intersection and the safety issues involved with lack of pedestrian and bicycle accommodations in and intersection leading to the Cross Island Trail.	Noted.	No changes proposed.

Queen Anne's County Comprehensive Plan
Comments Received During 60-Day Public Comment Period: No Changes Needed/No Changes Proposed
ORDERED BY CHAPTER
Updated: January 5, 2022

No.	Name	Comment Category	Affiliation	Chapter	Page	Comment	Notes	Addressed
146	Sara Ramotnik	Public	Eastern Shore Land Conservancy	Transportation	Page 15	Bay Bridge: The environmental impacts listed in the Tier 1 NEPA study should be included in the plan and also should be brought to the attention of this department and community members once those environmental impacts are made known in the Tier 2 NEPA study.	It is not the intent to discuss this level of specificity in this section, particularly as the FEIS and ROD aren't anticipated to be complete until March 2022, after plan adoption.	No change needed.
147	Heather Murphy	Agency	MDOT	Transportation	Page 16	Network Improvements – The Plan envisions implementation of the 2019 Transportation Development Plan. The MDOT supports continued improvements to expand and enhance transit options. Please continue to coordinate with the MDOT Maryland Transit Administration (MDOT MTA) for the ongoing expansion of regional transit and the coordination of MDOT supported locally-operated transit services (LOTS). The MDOT MTA also supports park and ride (with MDOT SHA), demand response services, paratransit, medical services, and senior-center transportation options. For local transit service planning, please contact Mr. Jason Kepple, MDOT MTA Regional Planner at 410-767-7330, or via email at JKepple@mdot.maryland.gov.	Noted.	No changes proposed.
148	Peter Johnston	Agency	Town of Queenstown	Transportation	Page 16, 22, 31	The Queenstown Trails Master Plan Recommendations included developing a County Trails Master Plan that integrates with the Queenstown Trails Master Plan, and that prioritizes funding and construction of the "connector trails" and "developer" trails identified in the Plan and coordination with the Maryland Transportation Authority so that funding for pedestrian overpass trail bridges can be funded and constructed to allow for safe passage across both Maryland Rt. 50 and Rt. 301 in Queenstown. Such a master planning effort should act as an on-ramp to the Highway Needs Inventory. If the County truly understands and has concern for the quality of life and economic potential of a serious commitment to alternative travel modes, future capital programming for transportation infrastructure will include funding for trail connection, especially in the urban corridor from the Bay Bridge to Queenstown.	On page 6-16, Bicycle & Pedestrian improvements, the plan mentions how the county continues its successful partnership with MDOT by providing local funds to leverage the support of State and federal grants toward development of capital trail improvements. This section does state the importance of alternative modes of transportation. Additionally, please see Goal 6-2: Strag 2 discusses create, review, and update a bicycle and pedestrian plan consistent with PlanQAC.	No change needed.
149	Charles Boyd	Agency	Maryland Department of Planning	Transportation	Page 17	Table 6-6, Highway Needs Inventory, identifies nearly \$2.6B in projects. There are additional county priorities for a variety of transportation improvements that will increase this estimate. Other than the Chester River Bridge reconstruction, which is scheduled to begin Spring 2022, it is unclear which transportation projects are expected to move forward, versus projects that have been proposed, studied, supported, or not supported.	Implementation of various projects dependent on available funding.	No changes proposed.
150	Jon Mullarky	Public		Transportation	Page 17	Planners should be aware of the fact that public transportation will operate mostly on the current road system. Route 8 and 18 will require upgrades to accommodate buses. A continuation of the frontage road from Route 8, across Cox Creek to Postal Road would give Kent Island a true circulator route.	Noted. See County Ride Transit Development Plan as mentioned on page 6-17. See Goal 1, Strategy 2, Recommendation 1 and Goal 6-2, Strategy 1, Recommendation 1 that address pubic transporation.	No change needed.
151	Jon Mullarky	Public		Transportation	Page 19	The recommended improvements list includes a Pedestrian Bridge over US 50/301 in the vicinity of Thompson Creek Service Road. The paragraph mentions County owned land, but fails to note that facilities located in that area also include a high school, middle school, two elementary schools, and a recently enlarged public library. That could be accusable [accessible?] to bikers and pedestrians via the bridge.	These are very brief/high-level improvements and are intended as such.	No changes proposed.
152	Elle Bassett/Anne Richards	Public	ShoreRivers	Transportation	Page 21	More detail on the potential environmental impacts identified in the Tier 1 Draft Environmental Impact Statement should be incorporated into this section of the Transportation chapter, as well as throughout the Environmental Resources chapter.	It is not the intent to discuss this level of specificity in this section, particularly as the FEIS and ROD aren't anticipated to be complete until March 2022, after plan adoption.	No changes proposed.
153	Sara Ramotnik	Public	Eastern Shore Land Conservancy	Transportation	Page 21	Chesapeake Bay Crossing Study: Under the last bullet, the plan reads "Potential for fewer environmental impacts, particularly to Chesapeake Bay aquatic resources." As mentioned above, those environmental impacts from the crossing should be included. The County should then advocate for the Tier 2 NEPA study and also demand that environmental impacts be completely and appropriately explored. The County should then act upon these findings.	It is not the intent to discuss this level of specificity in this section, particularly as the FEIS and ROD aren't anticipated to be complete until March 2022, after plan adoption.	No change needed.
154	James Parker	Public	QAC Democratic Club	Transportation	Page 21	Corridor 7 would only cause more problems. Constructing it would disable QAC for years. Traffic would only increase. Pandemic challenges/solutions will likely change traffic patterns and possibly reduce Bay Bridge volume. It's a real question whether a new bridge will be necessary in the near/medium future.	Text only indicates corridor alternatives where study continued.	No changes proposed.
155	Queenstown Commissioners	Agency	Town of Queenstown	Transportation	Page 22	The Queenstown Planning Commission and the Town Commissioners of Queenstown believe the Queen Anne' County Comprehensive Plan ("Plan") should place more emphasis on non-motorized transportation facilities, especially in the urbanizing corridor stretching from the Bay Bridge to beyond Queenstown. Specifically, we are disappointed the draft Plan that Queen Anne's County prepared did not recommend the County undertake a trails master planning process like the one conducted by volunteers in Queenstown, culminating in the adoption of the Queenstown Trails Master Plan earlier this year. We believe a trails master planning process at the County level will reveal residents' sentiments concerning the importance of trails. In addition, a survey like the one conducted in Queenstown will validate committing more county resources to this topic.	Chapter 6 outlines the importance of trails to the community and is discussed extensively. The chapter highlights the importance of working with the State to secure funding. It is also important to note that other documents outline aspirational projects as dicated from the elected official. These types of priorities may also be outlined in the LPPRP.	No change needed.
156	Charles Boyd	Agency	Maryland Department of Planning	Transportation	Page 23	Planning suggests the county explore micro-transit strategies to help address transit needs and gaps identified in transit dependent population analysis (pages 6-23 to 6-26). Communities have used micro-transit to address rural and urban transit needs. Here are some website links on micro-transit and its practices: (1) the APTA's Micro-transit resources; (2) the FTA's How Can Micro-transit Help Rural Mobility presentation; and (3) the National Center for Mobility Management's How Do We Move Older Citizens in Rural Areas Using New Technologies?	Noted. See Complete Streets descriptions and Goal 6-3, Strategy 1, Rec 1.	No change needed.

Queen Anne's County Comprehensive Plan
Comments Received During 60-Day Public Comment Period: No Changes Needed/No Changes Proposed
ORDERED BY CHAPTER
Updated: January 5, 2022

No.	Name	Comment Category	Affiliation	Chapter	Page	Comment	Notes	Addressed
157	Elle Bassett/Anne Richards	Public	ShoreRivers	Transportation	Page 26	Minority Populations - The first sentence states "It is important to ensure that areas with a higher-than-average concentration of racial or ethnic minorities are not negatively impacted by proposed alterations to existing public transportation services." ShoreRivers recommends more context about existing impacts of transportation services. The sentence only addresses impacts of new alterations, but does not address whether current transportation services adequately meet the needs of these communities or of the communities referenced in the below poverty populations section. It also does not provide actions and strategies for how to address the transportation needs of these communities, or how to better connect them to public water access and or recreational open spaces.	Needs are addressed in section pp. 6-23 - 6-27.	No change needed.
158	Queenstown Commissioners	Agency	Town of Queenstown	Transportation	Page 29	The County Commissioners and Planning Commission are aware of the long and laborious process of shepherding transportation capital improvement projects through the State planning, design, and funding process. These projects, including non-motorized transportation facilities, all begin with a commitment in policies and plans leading to improvements that meet a need and benefit the public. Failure to initiate serious planning for on and off-corridor pedestrian and bicycle systems runs the risk of having access options lost and missed opportunities to add incremental improvements when new developments and significant transportation projects are planned and executed. This latter consideration is especially critical considering the potential for a third Chesapeake Bay Bridge crossing adjacent to the two existing bridges.	Noted.	No change needed.
159	Frank DiGiallenardo	Public		Transportation	Page 29	This comment is in regard to Strategy 1 and 2 referencing the study and prospect of a new (or expanded) Bay Bridge. This draft plan, and our current Commissioners take the position of prioritizing the interest of residents over through traffic. I very much agree that should be the priority. Therefore I was very surprised to see that the County Commissioners recently supported expansion of the current bridge. This would only bring long years of misery to current residents who need or want to travel in that area. I do not believe that projections of local impact from either an expanded or additional bridge through the existing corridor have been realistically or adequately assessed. The plan should reflect the need for a better, more comprehensive assessment of likely impact and potential revision of the Commissioners stance based on results of that assessment and public reaction to it.	Noted. The issues surrounding the Chesapeake Bay Bridge are predominant in the Comp Plan update--discussed in the following sections: Key Issues in the Transportation Chapter, a freight corridor, part of the scenic byway, a priority for the County in the annual priority letter, and engagement in the Bay Crossing Study. That engagement is identified as Goal 6-1, Strategy 2, Rec 1. Although the study is being conducted outside of the County's jurisdiction and control the County is committed to being at the table throughout the process in order to advocate in the community's best interest. Please note that the next phase of the study which is supported in this Plan to occur in a timely fashion is meant to further quantify the points raised in this comment.	No change needed.
160	Charles Boyd	Agency	Maryland Department of Planning	Transportation	Page 30	Goal 6-1, Strategy 5, Recommendation 2. It is unclear what the statement, "Support studies and leverage resources that create and mandate alternate truck traffic routes," means. What alternate truck traffic routes is the county considering? Please clarify the statement's intent.	Noted. See Kent Island Transportation Plan (pages 6-18 and 19).	No change needed.
161	Cheryl Huyck	Public		Transportation	Page 30	Goal 6.2 - Transportation Strategies & Actions: Today's pickup trucks are bigger and longer in length than ever. They serve a purpose for commercial business, emergency services, hauling and towing to name a few. However, their sheer size can exceed standard parking space capacity by extending several feet beyond a space creating a safety issue. I strongly suggest that the Plan include within the Strategies & Action section a commitment to study the impact oversized pickup trucks have on public parking followed by sensible recommendations on addressing this growing problem (for example parking areas with for longer vehicles separate from vehicles that fit in standard parking spaces).	The County Code addresses a standard size for parking spaces.	No change needed.
162	Charles Boyd	Agency	Maryland Department of Planning	Transportation	Page 31	Planning also suggests the county create a countywide bicycle and pedestrian plan to address the county's overall active transportation facility needs. PlanQAC discusses existing and planned bicycle routes, trails, water trails, and pedestrian facilities in several chapters. Chapter 6 – Transportation includes a series of pedestrian and bicycle recommendations in Goal 6-2, Strategy 2 (page 6-31). These recommendations and other pedestrian and bicycle facility needs discussed in other chapters can be thoroughly addressed in a countywide pedestrian and bicycle plan. Having a pedestrian and bicycle master plan can be instrumental to build and improve walkability and bicycle-friendliness in communities. A countywide plan will help facilitate agency collaboration to address bike-friendliness and walkability issues, needs, and improvements.	See Goal 6-2, Strategy 2, Recommendation 1 to create, review, and update a bicycle and pedestrian plan.	No change needed.
163	Queenstown Commissioners	Agency	Town of Queenstown	Transportation	Page 31	The first step to realizing the benefits of trails expansion across the County, including any comprehensive planning for the future of the US 50 and 301 corridors by the Maryland Department of Transportation (MD DOT) should the third span of the Bay Bridge become a reality, is establishing official policies and plans. An official expression of the local commitment to developing non-motorized transportation systems is required to influence MD DOT's planning process. For this reason, we believe the draft Queen Anne's County Comprehensive Plan would be strengthened by acknowledging the need for a countywide pedestrian and bicycle master plan.	See Goal 6-2, Strategy 2, Rec 1 which directs the County to create a pedestrian and bicycle plan. This plan would become a part of the LPPRP. Also see Goal 6-2, Strategy 2, Rec 7 and 12 for further support of this initiative.	No change needed.

Queen Anne's County Comprehensive Plan
Comments Received During 60-Day Public Comment Period: No Changes Needed/No Changes Proposed
ORDERED BY CHAPTER
Updated: January 5, 2022

No.	Name	Comment Category	Affiliation	Chapter	Page	Comment	Notes	Addressed
164	Queenstown Commissioners	Agency	Town of Queenstown	Transportation	Page 31	The following recommendations are in addition to the comments provided on Queen Anne's County Draft Comprehensive Plan Request for Review & Comment form. Action Item Requests: 1. Establish a team of County staff to work jointly with the Town of Queenstown and the Queenstown Harbor Golf Course owners to assess the feasibility and cost of constructing a trail segment from the east end of Winchester Creek Road thru to Queenstown via the Queenstown Golf Course Property. 2. Establish and enact development policy requiring developers to design and fund public trail access (to adjacent County public trails or proposed trails) as part of conceptual and final design approvals. 3. Include preparation of a Queen Anne's County Trails Master Plan as a committed action item in the Queen Anne's County Comprehensive Plan. Incorporate recommended projects from the Trails Master Plan into the Transportation element of the Comprehensive Plan when completed. Request MD DOT include priority trail projects when located in or along State corridors in their capital project planning and design processes.	Development review often evaluates pedestrian access and potential walkway tie ins to existing trails where appropriate and consistent with existing code/regulations. The LPPRP may be the document that contains what they are looking for. In addition to Goal 6-2, Strategy 2, Rec 4 for further support of coordination between the County and Towns relative to this issue.	No change needed.
165	William Mackey	Agency	Kent County, Maryland Planning Commission	Transportation	Page 31, 2nd ¶, 8.	The Planning Commission noted Kent County has a preferred, specific alignment for the Chestertown Bridge, as shown in the 2018 Kent County Comprehensive Plan on page 100, Figure 37.	So noted. The byway is noted on Table 6-6 as a priority in the MDOT Highway Needs Inventory and Goal 6-2, Strategy 1, Rec 8 articulates support to replace the Chester River Bridge.	No changes proposed.
166	Charles Boyd	Agency	Maryland Department of Planning	Transportation	Page 32	Goal 6-3, Strategy 1. Consider amending the existing recommendations, or adding an additional recommendation, to update the county's Road Design and Construction Standards, referenced on Page 6-2, to incorporate appropriate Complete Street standards, identified on Page 6-5. Related to Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance (APFO) standards, inadequate transportation facilities become barriers for development. The county should assess if and how the current APFO supports the county's land use and multimodal transportation goals. Other local jurisdictions have applied multimodal APFOs to encourage Complete Streets and/or used different Level of Service (LOS) standards for growth or rural areas to support their growth management goals. The county may want to explore if a multi-modal transportation APFO standard and a lower LOS roadway standard for growth areas would help build context sensitive roadway infrastructure and walkable neighborhoods.	Goal 6-3, Strategy 1, Recommendation 2 addresses this comment in a general sense.	No change needed.
167	Nancy	Public	Historic Sites Consortium	Historic & Cultural Resources	Page 1	Should we include under fiscal responsibility - planned themes development of County and municipal funding streams, to go hand in hand with the leveraging of state and federal preservation funding	This is specific to support for state and federal grants.	No change needed.
168	Sara Ramotnik	Public	Eastern Shore Land Conservancy	Historic & Cultural Resources	Page 12	Environmental Benefits: The first sentence of this section reads "Preservation not only reduces the amount of waste that goes into nearby landfills but also reduces the amount of energy needed to produce and transport new materials." There are different types of preservation and the type that is being referred to here should be included in the above sentence. Otherwise, it takes away from the environmental benefits of historic rehabilitations because it is a sentence that does not make sense as written. This is also an excellent place to include the rehabilitation of brownfield sites if there are any in the County. They are extremely appropriate to this portion of the plan.	Noted. The next sentence includes a quote from the NTHP about how this is done. Brownfield redevelopment is not appropriate to the discussion of historic resources.	No change needed.
169	Sara Ramotnik	Public	Eastern Shore Land Conservancy	Historic & Cultural Resources	Page 14	MHT Easements: This section appropriately highlights the positive benefits of holding land in easements in perpetuity. In other parts of the plan (such as Chapter 4) there is a very different tone around conservation easements that could be improved throughout.	Unsure of issue. Chapter 4 also discusses benefits and programs?	No change needed.
170	Sara Ramotnik	Public	Eastern Shore Land Conservancy	Historic & Cultural Resources	Page 19	Goal 7-2, Strategy 1: Include a recommendation that will include the restoration of brownfield sites if Queen Anne's County has any.	Brownfield site restoration not germane to discussion of historic preservation.	No change needed.
171	Steven Allan	Agency	Maryland Historical Trust	Historic & Cultural Resources		While it is clear that the County values historic preservation at the outset of the plan by affirming that connections to the past create a sustainable future, it seems that the regulatory part is missing. Overall, the document is voluminous in scope, clearly written, and presents a logical path forward while respecting and acknowledging the historic past in the context of current and emerging growth and economic development indicators. Historic and cultural resources are an important part of the plan, as evidenced by its inclusion as a separate element in Chapter 7.	Local, state, and federal regulations and processes are listed throughout Chapter 7. See Guiding Principles & Legislation beginning on page 7-4. BMPs, Tools & Techniques on page 7-17 addresses an approach for an HPC and Goal 7-1, Strategy 1 to establish a local HPC.	No changes proposed.
172	Steven Allan	Agency	Maryland Historical Trust	Historic & Cultural Resources		The Historic and Cultural Resources element provides an excellent description of the context, value and importance of historic preservation in the County. The discussion opens with references to Holocene Epoch prehistory and the potential for archaeological investigations, settlement patterns linked to transportation in the early colonial period, and the good number of historic properties of the Revolutionary War era. Of particular note is the acknowledgement of the enslavement of African American labor and their contribution to the economic wealth of the County, and the interesting fact on Page 7-3 that the Black population numbered in the majority in the first Census of 1790, while noting that only 4% were free.	Noted.	No changes proposed.
173	Steven Allan	Agency	Maryland Historical Trust	Historic & Cultural Resources		Overarching principles of preservation are discussed in detail next, followed by legislation, the state context, which includes MDP and MHT roles, responsibilities, programs and plans.	Noted.	No changes proposed.
174	Steven Allan	Agency	Maryland Historical Trust	Historic & Cultural Resources		The Stories of the Chesapeake Heritage Area is discussed in depth, and noted that its associated management plan is incorporated by reference into the plan on Page 7-9. However, to be precise, please amend the statement with the following language: "The Stories of the Chesapeake Heritage Area Management Plan was adopted and made a part of the comprehensive plans of Caroline, Kent, Queen Anne's and Talbot counties in 2005. This update of the comprehensive plan, when adopted by the County, incorporates by reference all portions of the Stories of the Chesapeake Heritage Area Management Plan, except those portions solely relating to other jurisdictions within the Heritage Area, as part of the comprehensive plan."	According to the the 2010 Plan the Chesapeake Heritage Area Management Plan was certified in 2005 and incorporated by reference into the 2010 Comp Plan. Technically the Comp Plan was not amended in 2005 to include the Chesapeake Heritage Area Management Plan as mentioned in the comment from MHT.	No change needed.
175	Steven Allan	Agency	Maryland Historical Trust	Historic & Cultural Resources		At the local level, the delay of demolition provision in the County Code is discussed in detail, while lamenting the lack of regulatory authority to implement preservation options recommended by County staff and the Heritage Partners.	Noted. Based on prior discussions, this is the level appropriate to political will.	No changes proposed.

Queen Anne's County Comprehensive Plan
Comments Received During 60-Day Public Comment Period: No Changes Needed/No Changes Proposed
ORDERED BY CHAPTER

Updated: January 5, 2022

No.	Name	Comment Category	Affiliation	Chapter	Page	Comment	Notes	Addressed
176	Steven Allan	Agency	Maryland Historical Trust	Historic & Cultural Resources		We appreciate that the state's historic sites inventory is prominently mentioned, and that National Register listed properties are included in Table 7-1, and MHT Easement properties are listed in Tables 7-2 and 7-3.	Noted.	No changes proposed.
177	Steven Allan	Agency	Maryland Historical Trust	Historic & Cultural Resources		For clarity, the heading on Page 7-17 should be spelled out to read, "Best Management Practices, Tools and Techniques."	Language is the same as used throughout the plan - most chapters have same heading.	No change needed.
178	Steven Allan	Agency	Maryland Historical Trust	Historic & Cultural Resources		In summary, we strongly endorse the County's desire to establish a historic preservation commission with the authority to designate and protect historic properties. This would provide the needed regulatory framework, as well as access to benefits of the Certified Local Government program, should the County decide to apply. We are happy to assist with these efforts.	Noted.	No changes proposed.
179	Charles Boyd	Agency	Maryland Department of Planning	Economic Development & Tourism	Page 6	Excellent choice using the Census Bureau's LEHD OnTheMap tool to describe commuting patterns in the County. Consider including a footnote describing the distinction between 'all jobs' and 'primary jobs', as that selection affects the commuting statistics.	Data used does not make this distinction; would likely confuse issue since not referenced.	No changes proposed.
180	Charles Boyd	Agency	Maryland Department of Planning	Economic Development & Tourism	Page 10	Tables 8-6 and 8-7 are not comparable. The source information is different—the ACS for Table 8-6 and the Commerce Department's use of QCEW for Table 8-7. The QCEW and ACS use different methodologies to count employment. Also, it is important to note that the ACS captures employment by place of residence (workers where they live) while QCEW is jobs by place of work (persons where they work). Consider using QCEW or BEA (Bureau of Economic Analysis) statistics when presenting jobs information. Contact your regional planner if you need assistance with this issue.	Understood that data sources are different, which is noted. There was no attempt in text to provide a comparison between the two tables, just offer different pieces of information.	No changes proposed.
181	Sara Ramotnik	Public	Eastern Shore Land Conservancy	Economic Development & Tourism	Page 13	Land preservation can also "ensure continued agricultural viability and generational continuity" and that should be listed.	Agricultural preservation already discussed extensively in Chapter 4.	No change needed.
182	Charles Boyd	Agency	Maryland Department of Planning	Economic Development & Tourism	Page 24	Strategies 7 and 8. It is not clear what has been inconsistent with town annexation policies, or how future municipal growth areas have been inconsistent with their Municipal Growth Elements. All annexations are reviewed by Planning for consistency with the Municipal Growth Element.	This just notes a handful of ways to achieve preserving and supporting traditional economic development, not calling out that any municipalities have done anything in contrast with these statements.	No changes proposed.
183	Charles Boyd	Agency	Maryland Department of Planning	Economic Development & Tourism	Page 27	Goal 8-1, Strategy 2. Consider adding "County and Municipal Growth Areas" to the strategy, for clarity. In Strategy 3, Recommendation 4, consider removing the word "around"	Staff has used the term Growth Area deliberately to remain consistent with the MGE. Staff does not see a need to also note Municipal and County to introduce this nomenclature.	No change needed.
184	Bobbie Weaver	Public		Economic Development & Tourism	Page 27	<p>I have reviewed Chapters 4,5, and 8 and agree with most of the stated goals and strategies in each. I have concerns about Land Use and Environmental Resources, but I am limiting my short comments to Economic Development and Tourism. As a new county resident, I moved to Centreville to take advantage of the uniquely rural and picturesque qualities outlined in this planning document. I have already begun serving my community by volunteering in many capacities for QAC residents. I'm grateful for the opportunity to comment on this plan and look forward to new efforts to implement it.</p> <p>I hope there exists the political will to move the City of Centreville towards planned growth, especially in emerging business areas. Since I've moved here, however, I have only seen one new business occupy a vacant storefront in town, Ink or Dye Studio. I recognize I don't have the historical view of the economic challenges facing residents and businesses here, I do bring fresh eyes to my adopted town. I am hopeful that new perspectives, involvement, and input will be welcomed and encouraged as this process moves forward.</p> <p>Every effort should be made to create state and local tax incentives (PFAs, arts & entertainment areas, SBA loans and grants) so downtown Centreville can attract and retain business in vacant storefronts. I would be more than willing to spend money in Centreville instead of in Easton, Kent Island, and Chestertown but there are few to no business alternatives in town. (Goal 8-1, Strategy 1:2)</p> <p>In addition to vacant commercial space, I'd love to see innovative approaches for community input on reusing the old BOE building on Chesterfield Ave (Goals 8-2 and 8-3). Fortunately, the County voted to retain the building for future use. What about giving it new life under a multi-use zoning permit for arts and entertainment (art gallery, artist workspaces?), government (trades training and workforce readiness) along with some commercial and/or eco or environmentally-based tourism businesses?</p> <p>I've also heard of a proposed development on Chesterfield Ave that has a Community Supporter Agriculture or CSA component as part of its plan. Should the developer meet the environmental concerns raised by the community, I'd like to see the County approve the necessary codes/legislation for a CSA. (Goal 8-2, Strategy 1:4)</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Appears that comments are more germane to be addressed in the Town of Centreville's Comprehensive Plan update, which is currently underway. However, many County Economic Development resources are called out in Goal 8-1 which are available to municipalities and address many of the points herein raised.	No changes proposed.

Queen Anne's County Comprehensive Plan
Comments Received During 60-Day Public Comment Period: No Changes Needed/No Changes Proposed
ORDERED BY CHAPTER
Updated: January 5, 2022

No.	Name	Comment Category	Affiliation	Chapter	Page	Comment	Notes	Addressed
185	Charles Boyd	Agency	Maryland Department of Planning	Economic Development & Tourism	Page 28	Strategy 4 Consider incorporating the recommendations of the US 301 Corridor Study within the Economic Development Element, or as an appendix. The strategy to expand uses in the Agricultural Zoning District would appear, on face, to be generally inconsistent with the Community Vision and Guiding Principles identified on Page 1-2, and Page 8-20, Town Centers and Growth Areas, which state in part, "Directing commercial, retail, and housing development to these [growth] areas is a central element in strengthening economic vitality in the county, and an important counterpart to policies designed to preserve the county's rural land". Expanding uses in the Agricultural District may detract from the county's ability to direct them to growth areas, and impact the rural character envisioned for areas outside of growth areas. Furthermore, as identified in Chapter 10 – Town Planning Framework, Centreville, Queenstown, and Sudlersville have over 8,600 acres within their existing Municipal Growth Areas.	Complementation of the Sage Study does not equate adding a Growth Area along US 301. It provides an opportunity to contemplate options in accordance with the Study that would be consistent with the recommendations in the strategies which precede it.	No change needed.
186	Comment received by: Jim Davidson, David Dauses, Darlene Winegardner, Stephen Strothe, Diana Waterman, Brian Chupek, Barry Waterman, Kevin Waterman, Karen Marshall, Mario Bonnani, Jodi Baker, Corneila Fallon, Jonothan Olsavsky, Ed Beres, Fran Long, Wynel Neall, Gretchen Wichlinsky, Mary Julie, Sharon Crew, Jennifer Norfolk; Merry Tobin, Courtney Chiporous, Jeanne Kent, Jason Brewster; Donna Turing, Kiersten Clark, Tina Merrill, Penny Hope, Julie Orsini, Cecilia	Public		Housing	Page 4	"Moderately Priced Housing Fund": My understanding of the MPDU program in the County is that it is a failed policy. Virtually no MPDU units have been created throughout the program's 20-year history. Language in this plan suggesting that MPDU funding should be increased via increased recordation and transfer taxes would only serve to make housing less affordable for the overwhelming majority of homebuyers. If the County feels having an MPDU program is a public good worth subsidizing, then like most County expenditures, such funding should come from the General Fund, where all taxpayers in the County chip in. However, it remains my position that the best way to create affordable dwelling units is not through the County's MPDU program, but rather by easing zoning and other regulations, taxes, and restrictions on builders trying to increase the housing stock in the County. As supply is increased, demand will fall, and homes will become more "moderately priced." I applaud the innovative, more market-based solutions the Plan provides, such as the recommendation to provide density bonuses where developers offer to build MPDUs in exchange. But trying to alleviate the affordability crisis by increasing the price of purchasing most homes via increased closing costs should absolutely not be a part of this Plan.	In accordance with the April 2021 housing strategy for QAC, MPDUs are supported as a viable affordable housing tool with a potential for incentivizing through increased density. Goal 9-1, Strategy 1, Rec 4 supports that initiative though exploring ways to improve the County's MPDU program.	No change needed.
187	Wick I. Dudley	Public	Bay Area Association of Realtors	Housing	Page 4 - "Moderately Priced Housing Fund"	My understanding of the MPDU program in the County is that it is a failed policy. Virtually no MPDU units have been created throughout the program's 20-year history. Language in this plan suggesting that MPDU funding should be increased via increased recordation and transfer taxes would only serve to make housing less affordable for the overwhelming majority of homebuyers. If the County feels having an MPDU program is a public good worth subsidizing, then like most County expenditures, such funding should come from the General Fund, where all taxpayers in the County chip in. However, it remains my position that the best way to create affordable dwelling units is not through the County's MPDU program, but rather by easing zoning and other regulations, taxes, and restrictions on builders trying to increase the housing stock in the County. As supply is increased, demand will fall, and homes will become more "moderately priced." I applaud the innovative, more market-based solutions the Plan provides, such as the recommendation to provide density bonuses where developers offer to build MPDUs in exchange. But trying to alleviate the affordability crisis by increasing the price of purchasing most homes via increased closing costs should absolutely not be a part of this Plan.	In accordance with the April 2021 housing strategy for QAC, MPDUs are supported as a viable affordable housing tool with a potential for incentivizing through increased density. Goal 9-1, Strategy 1, Rec 4 supports that initiative though exploring ways to improve the County's MPDU program.	No change needed.
188	John Papagni	Agency	Maryland Department of Housing & Community Development	Housing	Page 8	Thank you for the opportunity to review the proposed Queen Anne's County Comprehensive Plan Update 2020, Kent Narrows Community Plan (the Plan). The comments below are based on a review of the Plan by staff in the Maryland Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) Division of Neighborhood Revitalization. In general, staff felt that the Plan does a good job of identifying challenges related to affordable housing including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overcrowded housing • Rental housing shortage/less affordable rental housing • Single family homes are less affordable • Lack of affordable and workforce housing • Projected need of housing assistance to homeless families 	Noted.	No changes proposed.
189	Barry Waterman	Public		Housing	Page 12	Paragraph 4: The first sentence misses the most expensive part of new housing costs – government fees and mandates. It is acknowledged later – but this sentence is in need of adding this fact.	Already addressed in same paragraph.	No change needed.
190	Charles Boyd	Agency	Maryland Department of Planning	Housing	Page 15	Planning is encouraged that PlanQAC includes an analysis of the 2020 Maryland Housing Needs Assessment & 10-Year Strategic Plan and that many of that plan's strategies, based on the homeowner and renter stability indices, are reflected in PlanQAC's recommendations.	Noted.	No changes proposed.

Queen Anne's County Comprehensive Plan
Comments Received During 60-Day Public Comment Period: No Changes Needed/No Changes Proposed

ORDERED BY CHAPTER

Updated: January 5, 2022

No.	Name	Comment Category	Affiliation	Chapter	Page	Comment	Notes	Addressed
191	Charles Boyd	Agency	Maryland Department of Planning	Housing	Page 15	The need for additional senior housing is addressed but no recommendations are discussed. Goal 9-1, Strategy 3 includes important recommendations to support gaining in place, but the county should consider incorporating recommendations and strategies to address the provision of senior housing, perhaps through land use policies that can expand areas for senior housing, like other recommendations that promote expanding areas for multi-family, affordable, workforce, and attainable housing.	Senior housing is addressed in multiple places throughout Chapter 9. Goal 9-1, "Support opportunities for County citizens to age in place", supports senior living.	No change needed.
192	Comment received by: Jim Davidson, David Dauses, Darlene Winegardner, Stephen Strothe, Diana Waterman, Brian Chupek, Barry Waterman, Kevin Waterman, Karen Marshall, Mario Bonnani, Jodi Baker, Corneila Fallon, Jonothan Olsavsky, Ed Beres, Fran Long, Wynel Neall, Gretchen Wichlinsky, Mary Julie, Sharon Crew, Jennifer Norfolk; Merry Tobin, Courtney Chiporous, Jeanne Kent, Jason Brewster; Donna Turing, Kiersten Clark, Tina Merrill, Penny Hope, Julie Orsini, Cecilia	Public		Housing	Page 17	Table 9-14 "Renters": The paragraph following "Expand Rental licensing Programs" needs to be stricken from the Plan. I am unaware of any serious concerns raised about the quality or condition of rental properties in the County. Rather, the issue with rentals I encounter is their availability and affordability. This Plan should work to increase the rental supply, not shrink it. By implementing yet another regulation on landlords, most of whom are local citizens with only a couple rental properties, the County would add another cost burden, which in turn would be borne by the tenants themselves. Additionally, I am not aware of any issues locally stemming from unlicensed vacation rental properties. Where there is no problem, a solution should not be ginned up to "fix it". Such a licensing regime for rental owners, both residential and vacation, would lead only to the unintended consequence of increasing rents and discouraging rental ownership.	This section is within an overview of the MD Housing Needs Assessment, providing information and priority needs/actions identified by stakeholders. The action referenced is not duplicated in the County's list of recommendations.	No change needed.
193	Wick I. Dudley	Public	Bay Area Association of Realtors	Housing	Page 17; Table 9-14 - "Renters"	The paragraph following "Expand Rental licensing Programs" needs to be stricken from the Plan. I am unaware of any serious concerns raised about the quality or condition of rental properties in the County. Rather, the issue with rentals I encounter is their availability and affordability. This Plan should work to increase the rental supply, not shrink it. By implementing yet another regulation on landlords, most of whom are local citizens with only a couple rental properties, the County would add another cost burden, which in turn would be borne by the tenants themselves. Additionally, I am not aware of any issues locally stemming from unlicensed vacation rental properties. Where there is no problem, a solution should not be ginned up to "fix it". Such a licensing regime for rental owners, both residential and vacation, would lead only to the unintended consequence of increasing rents and discouraging rental ownership.	This section is within an overview of the MD Housing Needs Assessment, providing information and priority needs/actions identified by stakeholders. The action referenced is not duplicated in the County's list of recommendations.	No change needed.
194	John Papagni	Agency	Maryland Department of Housing & Community Development	Housing	Page 19	The Plan identifies resources and strategies for increasing the supply of affordable housing, including financing programs administered by the Maryland Department of Housing and Community Development that can support both single and multifamily development. Local government staff are encouraged to contact DHCD staff regarding programs that support local housing strategies and developments. In addition to the strategies outlined in the Plan, the County should consider a County-wide or County sponsored weatherization program and utility replacement program to help with some of the cost burdened housing issues. Again, DHCD financing programs may be able to assist.	The QAC Division of Housing & Community Services provides a number of additional programs that are not outlined in the text. Information on specific programs can be found on the County's website.	No changes proposed.
195	John Papagni	Agency	Maryland Department of Housing & Community Development	Housing	Page 19	The Plan is generally consistent with the local Sustainable Community Plan. The Plan identifies the Main Street Maryland program and Sustainable Community designation as potential resources for community revitalization. However, the designations are not linked to specific revitalization strategies or priorities in the plan. Local officials are encouraged to incorporate state revitalization programs and into local revitalization strategies. Staff in DHCD's Division of Neighborhood Revitalization are available to discuss programs and resources that can support implementation of specific projects and revitalization strategies.	Revitalization strategies are already called out in the plans referenced. Duplication in the comprehensive plan isn't necessary.	No change needed.

Queen Anne's County Comprehensive Plan
Comments Received During 60-Day Public Comment Period: No Changes Needed/No Changes Proposed

ORDERED BY CHAPTER

Updated: January 5, 2022

No.	Name	Comment Category	Affiliation	Chapter	Page	Comment	Notes	Addressed
196	Barry Waterman	Public		Housing	Page 22	Strategy 1 recommendation 3: The incentive for growth to go into the Growth Areas instead of outside them has always been that the APFO does not apply there. This is the ONLY tool the County has to actually encourage development inside municipalities. All other "tools" deal with taking away rights currently enjoyed by landowners outside the growth areas. Taking away rights via downzoning and other "tools" is not encouraging – it is a taking.	Through land use regulation a government can not deprive an owner of all substantial, beneficial use of a property. Uses are still permissible despite a change in zoning therefor this does not equate a taking. Supporting housing/development in growth areas and applying the APFO is longstanding and does not equate to a taking outside of the growth areas. The goals and strategies in the Plan update do not alter longstanding support and direction to encourage growth in the growth areas	No change needed.
197	Janet Rochester	Agency	Church Hill Planning & Zoning Commission	Town Planning Framework	Page 11	we ask that you consider using the current 2020 Census population estimate for Church Hill on Pg.10-11	Population data needs to be consistent throughout.	No change needed.
198	Elle Bassett/Anne Richards	Public	ShoreRivers	Community Plans	Page 6	ShoreRivers does not support Kent Narrows retaining a separate community plan, and furthermore they should be held accountable to the same standards set for all of Queen Anne's County.	The Kent Narrows wished to retain a separate community plan due to the nature of the growth area. It has specific zoning (WVC) for the entire growth area and a special taxing district. The Kent Narrows is held to all the same standards and regulations as the County.	No change needed.
199	Barry Waterman	Public		Community Plans	Page 16	End of 4th bullet: "over time, if property owners...wish to rezone...County ...recommend favorably" . Problem is zoning does not work that way – the only opportunity to request re-zoning is at Comprehensive Updates (12-15 year intervals by time plans are adopted) or by proving mistake or change of character. If the PC wants to allow zoning changes to the SI areas of Stevensville – you need to either change the zoning now, or change the SI allowable uses to include residential	Property owners can submit for a map amendment every February if they wish. Yes, a mapping error or change of neighborhood would need to be addressed. This sentence just merely provides support from the Comprehensive Plan.	No change needed.
200	Barry Waterman	Public		Community Plans	Page 17	Land conservation 2nd paragraph: This plan seeks the easy route, not the right one by not suggesting that existing residents and properties need to be encouraged or required to install or follow environmentally friendly practices. Only requiring such a high bar from what limited new development can take place, and giving all existing development and residents a free pass is incomprehensible for any entity concerned with the environment. All waterfront properties can easily establish some amount of buffer, certainly there would be objection to imposing the same standards required of new development...but nothing – no effort at all- mowing to the edge of the water adjacent to new development that has to install 100' buffers...or not instituting speed limits on shallow waterways where sediment is stirred up by every passing boat and shorelines eroded by every wake – that just makes no sense. Everyone should contribute to achieve any greater good. Beating up the new kid at school just because there are more kids from last year does not make it right.	The only trigger the County has for implementation is through new or redevelopment. It is always encouraged that these processes be undertaken, but the County does not have the jurisdiction to require outside of specific events.	No changes proposed.
201	James Parker	Public	QAC Democratic Club	Community Plans	Page 28	Smart Growth Management -especially for Kent Island- has been less than smart, given the over population of South Kl. Rt 8 is overcrowded with cars and trucks day and night. Traffic to and from beaches and Delaware through-traffic are stifling and dangerous.	Development and its impacts have already been addressed throughout the plan. Section referenced highlight future intent.	No change needed.
202	Barry Waterman	Public		Implementation	Page 6	3.3: In a post Covid world, reserving sewer for commercial and institutional uses may not prove to be a valid objective. The demand for many such uses has plummeted and may never return. Instead this strategy should be "Consider the economic and societal benefits of various development sectors" For example - a development of million dollar residential properties would have far less chance of becoming obsolete or vacant and would produce far more taxes than many commercial uses.	The strategies outlined in the Comp Plan present a platform to have this conversation during the Zoning Code and Map update to follow the adoption of the Comp Plan. The points raised are valid and should be considered in all communities in which streamlined zoning is considered to address and incentivize mixed use development/infill. Any zoning changes must take into account infrastructure constraints and the impact of uses within the communities in which zoning changes are proposed in accordance with the APFO.	No change needed.
203	Barry Waterman	Public		Implementation	Page 7	2.1: Remove - "going beyond FEMA requirements." We have neither the resources nor the expertise to know more than FEMA does about the impacts of sea level rise.	The recommendation indicates "evaluate the appropriateness of going beyond FEMA requirements". Much thought and consideration would go into this process. This is merely guidance to use scientific resources outside of FEMA to account for sea level rise/indundation. FEMA does not account for storm surge, nuisance flooding, rising sea level and climate change.	No change needed.
204	Barry Waterman	Public		Implementation	Page 14	Goal 9-2/1.3: The MPDU program is a dismal failure and has created virtually no affordable units in over 20 years. The only thing it has accomplished is making ALL housing in communities where it applies more expensive for everyone. It is not in need of more money, it is in need of being scrapped and replaced with market based solutions that will allow the private sector to create attainable housing	Strategies vetted and endorsed by the Technical Committee and recent County Housing Study.	No change needed.
205	Barry Waterman	Public		Implementation	Page 14	Goal 9-2/1.3: Making most housing more expensive to subsidize other housing is just making most housing less expensive. Raising the closing costs on housing is a very bad idea.	Strategies vetted and endorsed by the Technical Committee and recent County Housing Study.	No change needed.

Queen Anne's County Comprehensive Plan
Comments Received During 60-Day Public Comment Period: No Changes Needed/No Changes Proposed
ORDERED BY CHAPTER
Updated: January 5, 2022

No.	Name	Comment Category	Affiliation	Chapter	Page	Comment	Notes	Addressed
206	Charles Boyd	Agency	Maryland Department of Planning	Implementation		PlanQAC does not appear to have a clear, standardized plan horizon, such as 2030 or 2040. School projects project to year 2030, the Water Resources Element projects land uses to 2040, and school analysis projects to year 2030. Planning suggests that the county consider framing the issue areas into short and long-term horizons. For example, transportation projects can be categorized into shorter time horizons, such as the Chester River Bridge replacement. While the Chesapeake Bay Bridge replacement phases may likely extend beyond the 5-Year Mid Cycle review timeframe. See associated comment to the 5-Year Mid Cycle Review in the Introduction Section, Page 1-3.	Information on particular conditions identify time periods, when known. Implementation highly dependent on available funding.	No change needed.
207	Charles Boyd	Agency	Maryland Department of Planning	Implementation		For each strategy, consider including a column that identifies how the strategy will be measured by the county, as part of the 5-Year Mid Cycle Review, pursuant to §1-207(c)(6)(ii) and (iii): (ii). The status of comprehensive plan implementation tools, such as comprehensive rezoning, to carry out the provisions of the comprehensive plan; and (iii). Identification of any significant changes to existing programs, zoning ordinances, regulations, financing programs, or State requirements that will be necessary to achieve the visions and goals of the comprehensive plan during the remaining planning timeframe.	Format of implementation matrix already vetted and endorsed by the Technical Committee.	No change needed.
208	Scott Gutschick	Public		Appendix A: Acronyms & Definitions	Page 17	Suggest adding a definition of "public safety" (since it is used often in Chapter 3) as follows: Protection of the public from natural, technological and societal hazards including, but not limited to, crime, civil uprising, terrorism, disease, fire, flood, tornado, tropical storm /hurricane, winter storm, transportation accident, utility outage, and commodity shortage.	Concept discussed in Chapter 3 in noted section.	No change needed.
209	Scott Gutschick	Public		Appendix A: Acronyms & Definitions	Page 19	Suggest a more comprehensive definition of "safe" as follows: Free of hazards/dangers that may result in death, injury, illness, property damage and/or environmental damage.	Reflects definition used elsewhere by the County.	No change needed.
210	Katherine Schinasi	Public		Appendix D: WRE	Page 1	Whether it's required by law or not, the Kent Narrows Development Foundation should also prepare a WRE assessment, as the Towns of Centreville, Queenstown, and Church Hill have, or else this Appendix will not "provide a complete assessment of projected growth and public facility availability." KNDF is pushing for the most and most potentially damaging growth to the County's natural resources and has the least expansion for wastewater capacity, the most destructive stormwater runoff, and makes a significant demand on groundwater resources. As the entity has been given authority to have a separate plan, they must also be required to have a WRE to direct future land use decisions. Holding the Plan separate and apart from the overall County Plan and Vision should not be a strategy that allows it to be amended to avoid TMDL targets or other environmental requirements.	This does not fall under KNDF's purview. The County WRE already includes Kent Narrows. Kent Narrows is not its own governmental agency - all requirements such as TMDL, environmental regulations fall under County purview.	No changes proposed.
211	Frank DiGiallenardo	Public		Appendix D: WRE	Page 2	To say that "surface and ground water are generally sufficient" is an insufficient assessment given the conditions that are cited elsewhere on this same page. For example, thousands of residents depend on water from the Aquia aquifer - the best of the aquifers on the Eastern Shore. The draft notes that brackish water intrusion to this precious resource is occurring now. Contamination or level reductions in the Aquia could cost residents dearly as previously pointed out. Yet several large developments drawing on this resource are yet to be built out and others are proposed. Agricultural use of well irrigation has also expanded in recent years. The county is fortunate not to have experienced serious drought conditions in recent years. PlanQAC should recommend that a better county assessment and water supply management process be developed to address this serious vulnerability.	Such nomenclature is typical to all comprehensive planning and reflect commitment to overarching strategies (either in their infancy or as continued commitments). However, the WRE will be updated to note that Water Supply Capacity Management Plans will be developed to prevent capacity over-allocation.	No change needed.
212	Elle Bassett/Anne Richards	Public	ShoreRivers	Appendix D: WRE	Page 3	First bullet under Water Resource Goals and Objectives: "Adopt policies, regulations, legislation, enforcement procedures and appropriate funding for programs and projects necessary to restore, enhance, protect and conserve our land, air and water resources; and establish programs designed to generate an awareness of and support for these measures." This is the strong, active language we want to see throughout all chapters of the draft plan. The third bullet says: "Identify a variety of land management practices, best management practices and other tools and techniques that protect surface water and groundwater quality and quantity..." We request that these be identified with more detail in the plan.	Such nomenclature is typical to all comprehensive planning and reflect commitment to overarching strategies (either in their infancy or as continued commitments). The terminology is directive.	No change needed.
213	Elle Bassett/Anne Richards	Public	ShoreRivers	Appendix D: WRE	Page 4	Bullet 2: "Educate and engage the general public in watershed conservation and stewardship." ShoreRivers does not believe this goal can be met until improved and adequate public access is provided to communities. We cannot protect what we do not love, and we cannot love what we do not know. This should be included in the objectives listed to support the County's water resource goals.	Public access discussed in Chapters 5, 6, and 11.	No change needed.
214	Charles Boyd	Agency	Maryland Department of Planning	Appendix D: WRE	Page 5	Groundwater/Drinking Water, Conclusions, bullet one, indicates that there is adequate drinking water supply; however, the source will be at a deeper depth and require additional treatment. Bullet two indicates that additional growth will result in more pumping beyond established limits of the Aquia Aquifer. The established limits of the Aquia Aquifer should be identified, and the county should establish a policy to restrict pumping of the Aquia Aquifer beyond those limits, as decreases in water levels are identified to increase brackish-water intrusion and regional water level issues.	MDE is already dealing with matter (has been doing so since 1986). It is a state function and regulation; the County has no authority.	No change needed.
215	Elle Bassett/Anne Richards	Public	ShoreRivers	Appendix D: WRE	Page 6	Wastewater Conclusions and Recommendations - This table names Sudlersville WWTP as the most probable plant to absorb new residential growth in the county. It also concludes that the County should have "continued compliance with State and federal requirements with respect to permitting and reaching nitrogen reduction standards (use ENR technologies) for the purpose of contributing to maintaining acceptable levels of water quality." However, many of the County's WWTPs have violations documented on their current permits. Sudlersville in particular is currently in noncompliance, according to EPA's ECHO database. This data should be included in the conclusions section, and strategies to upgrade and address these noncompliance issues should be included in the recommendations section.	MDE has enforcement authority over WWTPs. Compliance with State and Federal requirements is outlined in the recommendations column. Upgrading is also called out as recommendation.	No change needed.

Queen Anne's County Comprehensive Plan
Comments Received During 60-Day Public Comment Period: No Changes Needed/No Changes Proposed

ORDERED BY CHAPTER

Updated: January 5, 2022

No.	Name	Comment Category	Affiliation	Chapter	Page	Comment	Notes	Addressed
216	Elle Bassett/Anne Richards	Public	ShoreRivers	Appendix D: WRE	Page 8	Stormwater Conclusions and Recommendations - The new Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) permit should be mentioned by name in the conclusions section, as should the key changes that will be required of the County as a result. For example, in AD14, the county has included a wonderful description of the requirements under MS4 phase II: "Queen Anne's County is a Phase II MS4 community. The newly mandated MS4 Phase II permit will add another lens and funded resource layer to approach comprehensive watershed studies to focus future restoration and conservation efforts. The County will be required to restore 200 acres of impervious area within Kent Island's Urban Area that are untreated or are without modern day, maintained stormwater BMPs. Initial restoration requirements will be met by septic elimination efforts on Kent Island, while future restoration efforts will be informed by findings in watershed studies showing critical preservation areas and areas vulnerable to climate change. Many of the minimum control measures add an additional reporting layer to already mandated stormwater controls such as inspecting and maintaining private and public stormwater Best Management Practices (BMPs) on a regular basis. These include many older stormwater ponds that were built prior to ESD mandates and practices. Educating homeowners on how to regularly maintain their BMPs will be an important outcome of the permit. Outfall inspections will be a new layer of regulation brought on by the MS4 permit. In the coming years, the County will need to develop an outfall inspection program to monitor water quality at mapped outfalls throughout the County. The MS4 permit provides an opportunity for the County to stay informed of the latest innovations in stormwater controls and their corresponding estimates on pollution reduction to the Chesapeake Bay." These action items (highlighted in bold) should be included in the conclusion sections of the Stormwater table and added as recommendations within the Strategies and Actions.	These recommendation items are already covered under numerous strategies identified in Chapter 5.	No change needed.
217	Elle Bassett/Anne Richards	Public	ShoreRivers	Appendix D: WRE	Page 8-9	It's difficult to tell if the percentage of impervious in the critical area is acceptable to the County based on the wording of the critical area section. More clarity is needed throughout this section.	This section and its counterpart in Chapter 5, along with the recommendation to track and limit impervious surfaces address County's intent.	No change needed.
218	Elle Bassett/Anne Richards	Public	ShoreRivers	Appendix D: WRE	Page 9	Table 1-3: In addition to the current capacity table included in this section, the County should also include a table of how old each WWTP is, what systems and technologies they currently operate with, and their compliance history over the past 10 years to encompass compliance under the term of the previous comprehensive plan.	These details reside in the County Water and Sewer Plan (though compliance history, again, is managed at the State and Federal levels). The W&S Plan will be updated in accordance with the Comp Plan update.	No change needed.
219	Elle Bassett/Anne Richards	Public	ShoreRivers	Appendix D: WRE	Page 11	Table 1-5: This table should be updated to reflect development through 2021. As one of the largest environmental impacts uncovered throughout this Comprehensive Plan update, this warrants further investigation, and would be a useful tool for the County as it navigates its first years under the new MS4 permit.	Latest data available has been used. ID of impervious surface utilizing land use/land cover data not as easy as suggested. Had conversations with Sam Stanton & WM's GIS Director-no easy way to do this. Updating data identified as recommendation.	No changes proposed. See Goal 5-1, Strategy 1, Recommendation 2.
220	Frank DiGiallenardo	Public		Appendix D: WRE	Page 11	Planning and the Planning Commission needs to start tracking and limiting the growth of impervious surface by watershed and to account for natural limits to its growth based on the best available science. It is not enough to rely on existing limits on percent of impervious by land use category as applied to individual properties. QAC should obtain an updated baseline of impervious cover for all its watersheds as soon as possible and should begin a process of updated this baseline with impervious data from each approved development. The review process for new development should include a review of impact the development will have on the respective watershed. Proposals to develop in watersheds that are in or near to the "danger zone" of five to ten percent impervious should be restricted or modified to include extraordinary stormwater features to limit impact. The overall growth of percent impervious by watershed will be a most critical factor in determining how the County will fare in future severe weather events and whether its water quality and natural resources will be preserved for future generations. Not only is the Planning Commission not making decisions based on timely data in this case, but even the current draft Update document uses impervious data that is five years old. The county cannot make wise development decisions on such out of date information.	Acknowledged. See Environment Chapter BMPs, Tools & Techniques that direct the County to measure, evaluate, and track changes in impervious surfaces on at the 8-digit watershed level and to update the existing Countywide impervious surface analysis. These actions are also directed through Environment Goal 5-1, Strategy 1, Recs 2 and 3.	No change needed.
221	Frank DiGiallenardo	Public	Corsica River Conservancy	Appendix D: WRE	Page 11	Table 1-5 We have addressed the issue of impervious surface growth and the outdated information being used to assess it in this report several times already. CRC wrote to the then Director of planning in July 2020 asking him to address this deficiency back then. It is unfortunate that our effort did not result in more timely impervious data being available for this plan. As a result, the County is driving through the rearview mirror in assessing the criticality of this issue. It is also missing the opportunity to use impervious surface data to make planning decisions that are more in line with the goals and values stated in its comprehensive plan with regard to stewardship of our natural resources. There is no good reason to wait for completion of impervious surface assessment for QAC's urbanized areas under MS-4 before getting updated impervious data for the rest of the county's watersheds. Flyover data from 2019 is currently available from the state. The next flyover will be conducted in the Spring of 2022 with availability some months later. Contractor services to customize comparative analyses was readily obtained by the QAC IT department at a reasonable cost in the past and should be even easier to do given advances in technology since then.	Latest data available has been used. ID of impervious surface utilizing land use/land cover data not as easy as suggested. Had conversations with Sam Stanton & WM's GIS Director-no easy way to do this. Updating data identified as recommendation.	No changes proposed. See Goal 5-1, Strategy 1, Recommendation 2.

Queen Anne's County Comprehensive Plan
Comments Received During 60-Day Public Comment Period: No Changes Needed/No Changes Proposed
ORDERED BY CHAPTER

Updated: January 5, 2022

No.	Name	Comment Category	Affiliation	Chapter	Page	Comment	Notes	Addressed
222	Charles Boyd	Agency	Maryland Department of Planning	Appendix D: WRE		Planning recommends that the county conduct and include a full build-out impervious surface coverage analysis and forest cover change analysis in the WRE based on the Future Land Use Plan. Planning notes that the county does describe the impervious surface coverage within each watershed based on the 2016 measurements, which the county could use to help conduct this analysis. These analyses support the requirement to identify suitable receiving waters.	There are recommendations in Chapter 5 which address impervious surfaces (See Chapter 5: Goal 5, Strategy 1, Recommendations 2 and 3; Goal 3, Strategy 3, Recommendations 4 and 9). In addition, the Land Use Chapter acknowledges the diversity of land uses in the County but emphasizes the management and protection of water resources and climate impacts (See Chapter 4: Goal 4-1, Strategy 2, Recs 7 and 10). Forest cover is addressed in Chapter 5 (Environment) in several ways: a no net loss directive (page 5-23) and an implementation recommendation (Goal 5-1, Strategy 2, Rec 4--page 5-25). Further, the Local Conservation Fund is outlined on page 5-12 and prioritizes a plan of action to maintain a viable Forest Conservation program by exploring land acquisition, forest banking,	The County will pursue a build out impervious surface analysis and forest cover change analysis once the affiliated recommended actions are completed.
223	Elle Bassett/Anne Richards	Public	ShoreRivers	Appendix D: WRE	Page 21	Surface Water, Streams - Paragraph 3 of this section states that: "All surface waters of Queen Anne's County have been classified as Class I or Class II. Class I waters are to be maintained as suitable for contact recreation and aquatic life. Class II waters are to be maintained as suitable for shellfish harvesting." However there does not seem to be a table or list detailing which bodies of water are class I or II.	As this is an MDE function, that level of detail is maintained by the State (See MD Designated Uses for Surface Waters Map at https://mdewin64.mde.state.md.us/WSA/DesigUse/index.html). See AD-15 for tier designations (which is a different classification but germane).	No change needed.
224	Elle Bassett/Anne Richards	Public	ShoreRivers	Appendix D: WRE	Page 22	Wetlands and Ponds: The County should include a goal of wetland preservation in this section. This would also be an appropriate section to include a visual, or table, illustrating projected sea level rise as a reference for marsh migration, and vulnerable areas that require proactive community planning.	Wetland no net loss policy support is outlined in the Environment Chapter, Goal 5-1, Strategy 1, Recs 1 and 2. Further, wetlands protection is addressed throughout that Chapter.	No changes needed (see Environment Chapter).
225	Charles Boyd	Agency	Maryland Department of Planning	Appendix D: WRE	Page 23	Page AD-23 indicates that the county should revise the County Water and Sewerage Plan (WSP) to incorporate land use changes identified in this Plan. However, no specific land uses changes have been identified in this element. Presumably, the future land uses should already be identified in the various adopted Municipal Growth Elements. Queenstown, Sudlersville, and Barclay have relatively recently adopted amendments to their municipal growth boundaries. The Water and Sewerage should be revised based on water resource capacity as compared to projected population growth and zoning-based development capacity. The WSP should also take into account municipal annexations.	Agreed. However, that is a required function which will follow the adoption of the Comp Plan.	No change needed.
226	Elle Bassett/Anne Richards	Public	ShoreRivers	Appendix D: WRE	Page 23	County Comprehensive Water and Sewerage Plan - The County should include the following actions in addition to the four currently listed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluate performance and compliance history for local wastewater facilities and make necessary upgrades to achieve compliance before adding new capacity. • Assess viability of residential septic systems in relation to the local water table, and prioritize nonfunctioning systems before capacity for new development • Assess and identify threats from climate change such as sea-level rise, increased temperatures and dry spells, more frequent extreme rainfall events, and more frequent and heavier coastal flooding to wastewater facilities. 	* MDE has enforcement authority over WWTPs. Compliance with State and Federal requirements is outlined in the recommendations column. Upgrading is also called out as recommendation. *The County has assessed areas of failing septic systems and identified them as priorities for hook up--these areas are noted in the Land Use Chapter and the Water and Sewer Plan). *These actions are called out in the Land Use and Environment Chapters. The specific analysis of these resources as they relate to resiliency and hazard planning reside in the the County's many vulnerabilty and hazard planning documents.	No change needed.
227	Elle Bassett/Anne Richards	Public	ShoreRivers	Appendix D: WRE	Page 26	Centreville Water System - The last sentence of this section states that: "During PlanQAC discussions, Town staff indicated a desire for the County to allow treated effluent for use on neighboring farms, which would be one step toward limiting utilization of high use aquifers." Due to their complexity, ShoreRivers does not support community-owned and operated spray irrigation systems.	Noted. Repeat comment: A recommendation will be added to Goal 4-1, Strategy 2 that points out the short and long term options to address the capacity limitations. Add Options 1 (rerating) and 2 (expanding capacity) to the WRE under the Treatment Capacity Limitations section on page AD-32. A discussion of long-term options (which may include the contemplation of spray irrigation) will be public and ShoreRiver's comments will be most welcome.	No change needed.

Queen Anne's County Comprehensive Plan
Comments Received During 60-Day Public Comment Period: No Changes Needed/No Changes Proposed
ORDERED BY CHAPTER
Updated: January 5, 2022

No.	Name	Comment Category	Affiliation	Chapter	Page	Comment	Notes	Addressed
228	Elle Bassett/Anne Richards	Public	ShoreRivers	Appendix D: WRE	Page 36	Table 1-18: Evaluation of Land Use Management Tools and Techniques: Within the Resiliency and Hazard Planning section of this table, The Key Advantages and Implementation strategies need to be strengthened. The County should replace words like "contemplate" with utilize, prioritize, or require.	Such nomenclature is typical to all comprehensive planning and reflect commitment to overarching strategies (either in their infancy or as continued commitments). The terminology is directive. Specificity regarding these tools resides within the County's many vulnerability and hazard planning documents.	No change needed.
229	Elle Bassett/Anne Richards	Public	ShoreRivers	Appendix D: WRE	Page 39	In addition to Chesapeake Bay Foundation's five most cost-effective conservation practices, the plan should also prioritize implementation of conservation drainage practices such as bioreactors, denitrification walls, reconstructed wetlands, two-stage ditches, and natural filters.	Numerous BMPs are already listed/referenced throughout the section beginning on p. AD-35. Not intended as a complete list.	No changes proposed.
230	Elle Bassett/Anne Richards	Public	ShoreRivers	Appendix D: WRE		Within the Farm Conservation BMPs section, in addition to Chesapeake Bay Foundation's five most cost-effective conservation practices, the plan should also prioritize implementation of conservation drainage practices such as bioreactors, denitrification walls, reconstructed wetlands, two-stage ditches, and natural filters.	Farm Conservation BMPs already relocated and expanded in WRE Appendix (p. 39).	No changes proposed.
231	Charles Boyd	Agency	Maryland Department of Planning	Appendix D: WRE		In addition, Planning recommends that the county analyze more than one land use plan to demonstrate the difference in future impervious cover and future forest cover within the county's various watersheds. Depending on the land use plan, there might be one watershed that would be impacted more than others. Currently, the WRE does not discuss other land use plan options or potential forest loss. These analyses support the requirement to identify suitable receiving waters.	There are recommendations in Chapter 5 which address impervious surfaces (See Chapter 5: Goal 5, Strategy 1, Recommendations 2 and 3; Goal 3, Strategy 3, Recommendations 4 and 9). In addition, the Land Use Chapter acknowledges the diversity of land uses in the County but emphasizes the management and protection of water resources and climate impacts (See Chapter 4: Goal 4-1, Strategy 2, Recs 7 and 10). Forest cover is addressed in Chapter 5 (Environment) in several ways: a no net loss directive (page 5-23) and an implementation recommendation (Goal 5-1, Strategy 2, Rec 4--page 5-25). Further, the Local Conservation Fund is outlined on page 5-12 and prioritizes a plan of action to maintain a viable Forest Conservation program by exploring land acquisition, forest banking, GIS tracking, and an increased forest conservation fee in lieu rate.	No changes needed. The updated impervious surface report and the no net loss of forest recommendations lend themselves to conducting the analysis suggested.
232	Charles Boyd	Agency	Maryland Department of Planning	Appendix D: WRE		Planning recommends that the county conduct and include a full build-out impervious surface coverage analysis and forest cover change analysis in the WRE based on the Future Land Use Plan. Planning notes that the county does describe the impervious surface coverage within each watershed based on the 2016 measurements, which the county could use to help conduct this analysis. These analyses support the requirement to identify suitable receiving waters.	There are recommendations in Chapter 5 which address impervious surfaces (See Chapter 5: Goal 5, Strategy 1, Recommendations 2 and 3; Goal 3, Strategy 3, Recommendations 4 and 9). In addition, the Land Use Chapter acknowledges the diversity of land uses in the County but emphasizes the management and protection of water resources and climate impacts (See Chapter 4: Goal 4-1, Strategy 2, Recs 7 and 10). Forest cover is addressed in Chapter 5 (Environment) in several ways: a no net loss directive (page 5-23) and an implementation recommendation (Goal 5-1, Strategy 2, Rec 4--page 5-25). Further, the Local Conservation Fund is outlined on page 5-12 and prioritizes a plan of action to maintain a viable Forest Conservation program by exploring land acquisition, forest banking,	The County will pursue a build out impervious surface analysis and forest cover change analysis once the affiliated recommended actions are completed.
233	Candi Thomas	Public		Kent Narrows Community Plan	Page 4	Kent Island has experienced irresponsible growth in the 27 years I've lived here. Where is the responsible growth? The traffic on Kent Island is beyond words. Preserving our community starts by eliminating growth and work with what we have. People live here because of the quality of life. But we are turning into a densely populated county here on Kent Island and the narrows. Our wild life is diminishing because of development. There's no place for them to go. Nothing good comes from it! Think about the big picture and future generations and not what you can make off of development.	GIS tracking, and an increased forest conservation fee in lieu rate.	No change needed.
234	Craig Holberger	Public	Kent Island Resident; Piney Narrows Yacht Haven Marina Condominium	Kent Narrows Community Plan	Page 50	More of the undeveloped sites should remain undeveloped and incorporated into the public lands for access and recreation.	See Pg 50, Plan Concepts #2 and #4. The plans calls for preserving natural and scenic areas as open space. Any redevelopment or new development will be focused in the growth area identified for the area.	No change needed.

Queen Anne's County Comprehensive Plan
Comments Received During 60-Day Public Comment Period: No Changes Needed/No Changes Proposed
ORDERED BY CHAPTER

Updated: January 5, 2022

No.	Name	Comment Category	Affiliation	Chapter	Page	Comment	Notes	Addressed
235	Amanda Redmiles	Agency	Maryland Department of the Environment	Kent Narrows Community Plan		1.The Kent Narrows Community Plan indicates a potential re-rating of the capacity of the KNSG Wastewater Treatment Plant. Any re-rating to an increase beyond 3.0 MGD, should be reflected in the County's Comprehensive Water and Sewerage Plan prior to any NPDES discharge permit application submission.	Noted.	No changes proposed. A specific change was not proposed in the comment.
236	Sandi Olek	Agency	Maryland Department of Natural Resources	Kent Narrows Community Plan		The county recognizes the importance of Kent Narrows to the seafood industry and we encourage the county to develop a stronger plan to maintain Kent Narrows as a working waterfront. Often, commercial operations appear to be in conflict with other uses, because of noise and odors. We encourage the county to capitalize on the unique character of Kent Narrows as a key seafood operations center as they apply the expansion plan, by characterizing the area as a seafood hub and building associated businesses. For example, restaurants could feature local catch, hosting festivals to celebrate the waterman's heritage, developing water-based recreational businesses, etc.	Noted.	Added in or expanded acknowledgement of maritime industry and important in several areas throughout the plan.
237	Charles Boyd	Agency	Maryland Department of Planning	Kent Narrows Community Plan		Since Kent Narrows is not an incorporated municipality, relying on PlanQAC for WRE information is appropriate, and Planning does not have any recommendations to the water and sewer discussion in the community plan beyond those addressing PlanQAC.	Noted.	No changes proposed.
238	Cindy Carrier	Agency	Anne Arundel County Long Range Planning Section	General		Anne Arundel County appreciates the opportunity to review the Queen Anne's County draft Comprehensive Plan. Staff from the Long Range Planning Section of the Anne Arundel County Office of Planning and Zoning and the Office of Transportation have reviewed the draft plan. We commend you for the thorough analysis and the insightful goals, strategies and recommendations in the draft Plan. Based on our review of the draft Comprehensive Plan, there is strong alignment with the Anne Arundel County General Development Plan, Plan2040, which was adopted by County Council in May 2021. In particular, both plans affirm smart growth policies and address key regional issues including affordable housing, climate resilience, and balancing development and conservation. In the Land Use Element, both the draft Comprehensive Plan and Plan2040 establish goals and strategies to direct development to existing towns and communities, protect agricultural and rural lands, and conserve important natural areas. In the Housing Element, both the draft Comprehensive Plan and Plan2040 support increasing the diversity of housing options, include strategies to support infill development that is compatible with existing neighborhoods, and promote affordable housing through policy, regulation, and financial incentives. The Transportation Element references what is likely the most important area for continued inter-governmental coordination between Anne Arundel and Queen Anne's County - the Chesapeake Bay Bridge Crossing. The Chesapeake Bay Bridge connects Anne Arundel County and Queen Anne's County and provides benefits as well as challenges. Traffic congestion during peak travel times on the Bay Bridge has increased over years and solutions are needed to address this issue. Anne Arundel County remains committed to working with Queen Anne's County and the Maryland Transportation Authority, which owns and operates the Bay Bridge, to complete the National Environmental Policy Act study and develop viable solutions to address this issue. Thank you for the opportunity to review and provide comments on the draft Comprehensive Plan. We look forward to continued collaboration on issues of shared importance to our counties.	Noted.	No changes proposed.
239	Sandi Olek	Agency	Maryland Department of Natural Resources	General		On behalf of the Department of Natural Resources, thank you for offering an opportunity to comment on the Queen Anne's County Kent Narrows Community Plan. As development pressure increases and irreplaceable resource lands are lost, it is vital that Maryland grows smarter and more sustainably through a collaborative and informed public planning process. The plan includes many strong goals and objectives for the referenced area. DNR offers below a series of comments on the draft Plan for your consideration: DNR offers the following comments on the draft Plan for your consideration: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The Town included a strong public input process •The plan contains a lot of information about important coastal access issues such as water access, biking and recreational activities such as birding. •The County did a good job of incorporating the information that DNR provided on water access, water trails and outdoor recreation. •The Plans would benefit from an introduction and section that clearly frames out the issues and how the community is impacted by tidal surge, nuisance flooding and storms. 	Appears to be boilerplate language; last bullet comments already incorporated under Floodplain & Flood Hazards beginning on p. 5-8.	No changes proposed.
240	Charles Boyd	Agency	Maryland Department of Planning	General		As shown in the above checklist, the PlanQAC includes the required elements as identified in §1-406 of the Land Use Article of the Maryland Annotated Code.	Noted.	No changes proposed.
241	Charles Boyd	Agency	Maryland Department of Planning	General		A growth tier map was not adopted by the county. Because of this, new subdivisions utilizing on-site disposal systems in the county are limited to minor subdivisions, presumed to be five or less lots in the county. However, the county's 2020 Annual Report, approved by the Planning Commission on June 10, 2020, indicates that four major subdivisions, totaling 34 lots, were approved outside of the county's Priority Funding Area (PFA), and presumably outside of the county's designated growth area. Planning does not know if these major subdivisions were approved on septic or on sewer or if the subdivisions were grandfathered but suggests that the county evaluate its compliance with this requirement.	There were four major subdivisions in the 2020 annual report. One was on public sewer and the other three were amendments to major subdivisions, that started/originally recored before the passage of the 2012 sewer bill.	No changes proposed.
242	Charles Boyd	Agency	Maryland Department of Planning	General		When this plan is approved, please provide Planning updated GIS layers of the growth areas, Priority Preservation Areas (PPAs), locally protected lands, and existing and future land use.	Noted.	No change needed.

Queen Anne's County Comprehensive Plan
Comments Received During 60-Day Public Comment Period: No Changes Needed/No Changes Proposed
ORDERED BY CHAPTER
Updated: January 5, 2022

No.	Name	Comment Category	Affiliation	Chapter	Page	Comment	Notes	Addressed
243	Amanda Redmiles	Agency	Maryland Department of the Environment	General		<p>2. Any above ground or underground petroleum storage tanks, which may be utilized, must be installed and maintained in accordance with applicable State and federal laws and regulations. Underground storage tanks must be registered and the installation must be conducted and performed by a contractor certified to install underground storage tanks by the Land and Materials Administration in accordance with COMAR 26.10. Contact the Oil Control Program at (410) 537-3442 for additional information.</p> <p>3. If the proposed project involves demolition – Any above ground or underground petroleum storage tanks that may be on site must have contents and tanks along with any contamination removed. Please contact the Oil Control Program at (410) 537-3442 for additional information.</p> <p>4. Any solid waste including construction, demolition and land clearing debris, generated from the subject project, must be properly disposed of at a permitted solid waste acceptance facility, or recycled if possible. Contact the Solid Waste Program at (410) 537-3315 for additional information regarding solid waste activities and contact the Resource Management Program at (410) 537-3314 for additional information regarding recycling activities.</p> <p>5. The Resource Management Program should be contacted directly at (410) 537-3314 by those facilities which generate or propose to generate or handle hazardous wastes to ensure these activities are being conducted in compliance with applicable State and federal laws and regulations. The Program should also be contacted prior to construction activities to ensure that the treatment, storage or disposal of hazardous wastes and low-level radioactive wastes at the facility will be conducted in compliance with applicable State and federal laws and regulations.</p> <p>6. Any contract specifying “lead paint abatement” must comply with Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR) 26.16.01 - Accreditation and Training for Lead Paint Abatement Services. If a property was built before 1978 and will be used as rental housing, then compliance with COMAR 26.16.02 - Reduction of Lead Risk in Housing; and Environment Article Title 6, Subtitle 8, is required. Additional guidance regarding projects where lead paint may be encountered can be obtained by contacting the Environmental Lead Division at (410) 537-3825.</p> <p>7. The proposed project may involve rehabilitation, redevelopment, revitalization, or property acquisition of commercial, industrial property. Accordingly, MDE's Brownfields Site Assessment and Voluntary Cleanup Programs (VCP) may provide valuable assistance to you in this project. These programs involve environmental site assessment in accordance with accepted industry and financial institution standards for property transfer. For specific information about these programs and eligibility, please Land Restoration Program at (410) 537-3437.</p> <p>8. Borrow areas used to provide clean earth back fill material may require a surface mine permit. Disposal of excess cut material at a surface mine may require site approval. Contact the Mining Program at</p> <p>9. The project may cause contaminated runoff from an animal feeding operation (AFO). Please contact the AFO Division at (410) 537-4423 to determine if this AFO will require registration under the General Discharge Permit for Animal Feeding Operations.</p>	Appears to be boilerplate language from MDP related more to development plans.	No change needed.
244	Heather Murphy	Agency	MDOT	General		In general, the plans are consistent with MDOT plans and programs. The MDOT is in support of both of the plans' visions for Queen Anne's County to reduce the growth of new residential development in agricultural and rural areas and deliver adequate public services, including transportation and other infrastructure through community planning and design. The MDOT also supports the plans' directing growth to existing communities, within designated areas and improved connectivity.		No change needed.
245	Heather Murphy	Agency	MDOT	General		When referring to matters related to state-owned streets, roads, and highways in the plans, the phrase “Maryland Department of Transportation State Highway Administration” or “MDOT SHA” should be incorporated into the Plan.	Unclear why this additional distinction is necessary.	No change needed.
246	Kristopher Connelly	Agency	Kent County Levy Court (DE)	General		Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the QAC 2020 Comprehensive Plan Update. It appears that the roughly 7 miles of state line border we share are primarily agricultural/wooded land uses on both sides. The land in Kent County is outside our adopted Growth Zone so it seems both sides of the state line will remain land use compatible into the future. Good luck with your final approval and implementation.	Noted. Does not change information in Draft.	No changes proposed.
247	William Mackey	Agency	Kent County Maryland Planning Commission	General		The Planning Commission reviewed the Plan and expressed that the Plan was done well, especially in the area of agriculture.	Noted. Does not change information in Draft.	No changes proposed.
248	Jay Falstad	Public	Queen Anne's Conservation Association	General		In closing, QACA appreciates the substantial time, commitment and dedication by Planning Department Staff and its consultant in the creation of this Draft Plan. Under the extraordinary challenges of a global pandemic, the Staff and consultant made the very best of challenging circumstances by providing the public with ample opportunity to participate in this Comprehensive Planning Exercise. QACA, along with our friends and partners within the environmental/conservation community, (the Chesapeake Bay Foundation, the Eastern Shore Land Conservancy, Shore Rivers and Corsica River Conservancy), with each offering their substantial expertise, were pleased to participate in this Draft review and comment process. We support CBF's, ESLC's, SR's and CRC's submitted comments, and QACA stands ready to offer constructive input as the Plan undergoes further revisions towards the Implementation process.	Noted.	No changes proposed.