

Queen Anne's County Comprehensive Plan
Comments Received During 60-Day Public Comment Period: Recommendations for PC Consideration
ORDERED BY TOPIC
Updated: January 6, 2022

No motions or decisions will be made at the January 11, 2022 joint County Commissioners and Planning Commission meeting. During the January 13, 2022 Planning Commission Comprehensive Plan Workshop, the Planning Commission will review, discuss, and provide further guidance and recommendations to address the comments below. The comments are grouped by topic due to the fact that they are similar in nature. The following recommendations can be made: concur with Planning Staff and Wallace Montgomery means of addressing or the Planning Commission can provide a different means of addressing the comment. After recommendations are made, one motion for the Comment Document can be made and is suggested as follows:

The Planning Commission has reviewed, considered, and made recommendations for all comments in the Comment Document (Recommendations for Planning Commission Consideration) for the 2022 Queen Anne's County Comprehensive Plan and the Kent Narrows Community Plan. Therefore, the Planning Commission concurs with [all/specific comment numbers] means of addressing comments provided by the Planning Staff and Wallace Montgomery. Expect that [specific comment numbers] should be addressed as discussed by the Planning Commission as follows: [see specific detailed Planning Commission recommendations in the Comment Document as reviewed and discussed during the meeting].

Grp.	No.	Name	Comment Category	Affiliation	Chapter	Page	Comment	Notes	Addressed	PC Recommendations
1	A	Scott Gutschick	Public		Community Facilities & Services	Page 6	General comment: The sections addressing fire-rescue, emergency medical services (EMS), and law enforcement largely describe the current levels of service but do not identify future trends, challenges and needs requiring attention over the next 10-year period of the Comprehensive Plan to effectively and efficiently serve the public. As the plan looks to the 10-year future, it should address future trends, challenges and needs of the emergency services.	Requested information from DES.	Address pending DES comment.	
1	B	Scott Gutschick	Public		Community Facilities & Services	Page 6	Need to identify future EMS-related trends, challenges, and needs.	Requested information from DES.	Address pending DES comment.	
1	C	Scott Gutschick	Public		Community Facilities & Services	Page 8-9	Need to identify future law enforcement-related trends, challenges and needs.	Requested information from DES.	Address pending DES comment.	
1	D	Scott Gutschick	Public		Community Facilities & Services	Page 9	There is limited description of the County's volunteer fire departments whereas the EMS and Sheriff departments are described in greater detail. For the volunteer fire departments, need to describe the specific services provided, capabilities to address fire-rescue related risk in the County, and future trends, challenges and needs facing the volunteer fire departments. In addition, the plan should make mention of the ongoing effort by the Grasonville Volunteer Fire Department to raise funds for the construction of a replacement fire station at the current site.	Requested information from DES.	Address pending DES comment.	
2	A	Sara Ramotnik	Public	Eastern Shore Land Conservancy	Community Facilities & Services	Page 20	Under Goals & Initiatives, the fourth bullet should include a verb and say "Establish recreation land and facilities located in proximity to population centers." The sixth bullet should acknowledge the need for new recreational open space as well and should read "Create new recreational open space and protect recreational open space at appropriate levels compared to developed land."	Updating language.	Revise p. 3-20 to reflect ESLC's comments.	
3	A	Barry Waterman	Public		Community Facilities & Services	Page 21	Last paragraph: Reserving sewer for Marling Farms and Dominion is only a worthwhile idea if the County ACTUALLY installs it. This issue has been identified and known for about 40 years with no action by the County. Reserving capacity for this area, if not served in very near future, is a waste of resources and will in the loss of alternative worthwhile cash positive development opportunities that could benefit the County taxpayers.	Two areas of Public Health Areas of Concern (PHAC) are SKI and the two communities at the end of MD 552 (Dominion & Marlin Farms), see page 3-12. SKI was the primary concern due to reasons listed on page 3-12.	Update page 3-12 to provide more details as to when Dominion and Marling Farms will be serviced.	
3	B	Barry Waterman	Public		Implementation	Page 5	2.2c: QAC has ignored the septic issues of Marling Farms and Dominion for 40 years - reserving capacity in case that ever changes is a waste of resources	Marling Farms and Dominion are a documented PHOC.	Update page 3-12 to provide more details as to when Dominion and Marling Farms will be serviced.	
4	A	Darren Brown	Agency	Centreville Planning & Zoning Commission	Community Facilities & Services	Page 21, Goal 3-2, Strategy 1	Recommendation 3 under Strategy 1 states: "Adequate Public Facilities testing for all municipal developments should be part of Annexation Agreements". Because annexations are decided by towns and annexation agreements are contracts between a town and a landowner/developer, we respectfully ask that this statement be modified. As you know, Maryland statutes require towns to prepare "annexation plans" for each annexation fully describing the availability of facilities and the means for extending or expanding them as needed. They also require towns to provide counties a 30-day formal review and comment period prior to the hearing on an annexation. These provisions are, of course, secondary to the required town-county consultation on municipal growth planning (the Land Use Article of the Annotated Code). We therefore suggest alternative wording that builds on the spirit of cooperative planning that is evident elsewhere in the draft comprehensive plan such as, "The Plan encourages towns to evaluate the adequacy of public facilities when considering annexations and annexation agreements and coordinate with the County as provided for under Maryland land use planning and annexation statutes".	This strategy is longstanding and consistent with Goal 10-2, Strategy 1 which directs growth to incorporated municipalities. It is also consistent with MGE Goal 10-2, Strategy 1, Rec 1. This strategy to review compliance with APFO and management of remaining county and town capacity will require close collaboration.	Planning Commission may wish to discuss further.	
4	B	Janet Rochester	Agency	Church Hill Planning & Zoning Commission	Community Facilities & Services	Page 21, Goal 3-2, Strategy 1	Recommendation 3 under Strategy 1 notes that "Adequate Public Facilities testing for all municipal developments should be part of Annexation Agreements". Church Hill is experienced with annexations and understands the importance of balancing growth with the availability of public facilities. Annexations are uniquely within the authority of municipal governments to decide and annexation agreements, being contracts between a city or town and a landowner/developer, are important municipal tools. Maryland statutes provide that sufficient information on public facilities be developed and shared with the County and the State as part of the annexation process, prior to any public hearing on any annexation. Thus, the adequacy of public facilities and of plans to address facility needs is studied before annexations are approved. For these reasons, we suggest alternative wording such as: "Realizing that entering into annexation agreements is an option that towns may choose to do, the Plan encourages towns to contemplate the adequacy of public facilities when considering annexations and coordinate with the County as provided for under Maryland annexation statutes".	This strategy is longstanding and consistent with Goal 10-2, Strategy 1 which directs growth to incorporated municipalities. It is also consistent with MGE Goal 10-2, Strategy 1, Rec 1. This strategy to review compliance with APFO and management of remaining county and town capacity will require close collaboration.	Planning Commission may wish to discuss further.	
4	C	Darren Brown	Agency	Centreville Planning & Zoning Commission	Town Planning Framework	Page 22, Goal 10-1, Strategy 1	Recommendation 3 states "County funding for town infrastructure should be conditioned on compliance with the County's Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance (APFO). As a Planning Commission, we feel it is important not to foreclose opportunities for planning cooperation by implying that funding decisions, which could achieve mutual goals, should be leveraged to compel municipal compliance with County laws and regulations. The County APFO is not intended to advance the Town of Centreville's interests and is not reflective of the Town's development processes or the conditions the Town and its property owners must address. This letter is not the place to assess the County's APFO, but it is not well matched to the Town's needs. Perhaps the most obvious incongruity is the authority it provides the Board of County Commissioners to approve or deny a development. The prospect of compliance with the County APFO is not even remotely legal unless the Town were to abandon its own zoning authority which is granted to the Town and County on equal terms in State enabling legislation. Recommendation 3 is objectionable to us, on its face, and inconsistent with the spirit of cooperation and joint planning that otherwise admirably flows through the document. Please consider as an alternative something like this: "County participation with towns in funding municipal infrastructure, when it can advance mutual interests in planning and growth management, is supported by this Comprehensive Plan".	This strategy is longstanding and consistent with Goal 10-2, Strategy 1 which directs growth to incorporated municipalities. It is also consistent with MGE Goal 10-2, Strategy 1, Rec 1. This strategy to review compliance with APFO and management of remaining county and town capacity will require close collaboration.	Planning Commission may wish to discuss further.	
4	D	Barry Waterman	Public		Implementation	Page 4	1.3: APFO should not apply in Growth Areas - those are areas where we are supposed to ENCOURAGE growth, not seek to limit it.	This strategy is longstanding and consistent with Goal 10-2, Strategy 1 which directs growth to incorporated municipalities. It is also consistent with MGE Goal 10-2, Strategy 1, Rec 1. This strategy to review compliance with APFO and management of remaining county and town capacity will require close collaboration.	Planning Commission may wish to discuss further as noted above.	
5	A	Sara Ramotnik	Public	Eastern Shore Land Conservancy	Land Use	Page 13	While Chapter 4 repeatedly argues that there is "insufficient funding available to take advantage of opportunities for preservation", there are no solutions listed in this document to address this ongoing challenge. Under Goal 4-2, Strategy 1, Recommendation 3, it reads to "Continue to aggressively apply for preservation funding including POS, MALPF, MET, Rural Legacy Program, CREP and CRP funds." While this plan is adequate and suggested, advocating for larger funding sources for these programs can help address the challenge repeatedly described.	Updating language.	Revise language to reflect identified recommendation.	

Queen Anne's County Comprehensive Plan
Comments Received During 60-Day Public Comment Period: Recommendations for PC Consideration
ORDERED BY TOPIC
Updated: January 6, 2022

Grp.	No.	Name	Comment Category	Affiliation	Chapter	Page	Comment	Notes	Addressed	PC Recommendations
6	A	Elle Bassett/Anne Richards	Public	ShoreRivers	Land Use	Page 14	We agree with the statement that "increasing population, development pressures, lack of land use planning, and competition for water resources can contribute to degradation of water resources; therefore, the combination of regulations, best management practices, and a strong sense of stewardship ethic is important in minimizing impacts of land use on water resources." The sentence immediately following should be expanded upon. Agricultural land preservation is not the only key to environmental, economic, and cultural sustainability. Preservation of forested and sensitive areas such as wetlands and critical areas play a significant if not larger role in environmental stewardship considering the uptake of nutrients and sediment these environments provide (of which agriculture does not).	The language which supports the Future Land Use: Growth Management Strategy should be read in complete context (pages 4-13-14).	No changes needed; however, the PC may wish to revise language on p. 4-14 to strengthen what seems clearly intended to reflect broader preservation and stewardship efforts.	
7	A	Elle Bassett/Anne Richards	Public	ShoreRivers	Land Use	Page 15	This section notes that "it is important to stress that any new development and some types of redevelopment within unincorporated areas will be very limited due to the county's current sewer capacity limitations." However, there is no associated recommendation or action associated with this.	Agreed. Goal 4-1, Strategy 2, Rec 1 identifies an amended Allocation Policy. It was intended that this strategy address both the both short and long-term capacity management options. It does not, and neither does the WRE.	Add a recommendation to Goal 4-1, Strategy 2 that points our 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.	
7	B	Wick I. Dudley	Public	Bay Area Association of Realtors	Land Use	Page 15 & 21; Labelled "Infill Development" & Stragey 3, Recommendation 3	Any language or recommendation that remaining sewer capacity should be directed towards commercial uses needs to be stricken from this Plan. Currently, the demand for commercial space is remarkably low. This is perhaps largely in part attributable to the post-Covid 19 world: more people are working from home and ordering goods online. In stark contrast, the demand for housing has perhaps never been higher. In this reality, to reserve remaining sewer capacity for commercial uses makes absolutely no sense and is entirely misguided. We have a housing shortage crisis in the country and this County, not a commercial space shortage. The remaining sewer capacity should not be restricted to commercial usage, but in fact should have a substantial portion allocated for future residential development.	Goal 4-1, Strategies 1 and 2 are intended to support infill development/redevelopment adn to address both the both short and long-term capacity management options. They are not as clear as staff intended.	Revise Goal 4-1, Strategies 1 and 2 to clearly address infill/redevelopment as a priority and points our 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.	
7	C	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	Public		Land Use	Page 15 & 22	Labelled "Infill Development" and Strategy 3; Recommendation 3: Any language or recommendation that remaining sewer capacity should be directed towards commercial uses needs to be stricken from this Plan. Currently, the demand for commercial space is remarkably low. This is perhaps largely in part attributable to the post-Covid 19 world: more people are working from home and ordering goods online. In stark contrast, the demand for housing has perhaps never been higher. In this reality, to reserve remaining sewer capacity for commercial uses makes absolutely no sense and is entirely misguided. We have a housing shortage crisis in the country and this County, not a commercial space shortage. The remaining sewer capacity should not be restricted to commercial usage, but in fact should have a substantial portion allocated for future residential development.	The overarching strategies and actions identified in the Land Use Chapter are intended to support infill development/redevelopment and to address both the both short and long-term capacity management options. The Plan points to a need to support redevelopment and streamlined zoning. This overarching goal is a direct response to the need to revisit how mixed use development should be reviewed during the Zoning Code update. The Comp Plan is guiding that next step.	Revise Goal 4-1, Strategies 1 and 2 to clearly address infill/redevelopment as a priority and points our 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.	
7	D	Charles Boyd	Agency	Maryland Department of Planning	Land Use	Page 21	Goal 4-1, Strategy 2, Recommendations 1 and 2. Planning supports these strategies to immediately address current sewer capacity limitations. Comments related to the 5-Year Mid Cycle Review are intended to support the creation of specific actions and timeframes, as provided for in Recommendations 1 and 2. Revise Recommendation 5 (page 4-22) to reference County Growth Areas, for consistency with the term used throughout the plan.	Agreed.	These strategies are being amended to outline long and short term options (both within this goal and the WRE).	
7	E	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	Public		Land Use	Page 21	Strategy 2; Recommendations 1 and 2: Language needs to be added to the Plan urging the County to work to alleviate the sewer capacity issue, as opposed to merely stating we are at capacity and effectively giving up on the matter. The short and long-term problems this County will face from running out of sewer capacity cannot be overstated. Everything from the size of the tax base, to housing affordability and availability, to having an adequate workforce, and businesses to employ our population will be severely and adversely affected by reaching sewer capacity. It is for this reason the Plan cannot simply tell us there is a problem, it must also direct the County to work to do something about it. To that end, I urge that language be included in this Plan directing the County to seek answers to the sewer capacity issue, and to make regular progress reports available to the public and presented to the Planning Commission and County Commissioners. Relatedly, language should be added in the Plan making it clear that if and when a solution to the sewer capacity issue is discovered and implemented, these capacity limitation concerns will have been alleviated, and the County should resume its pursuit of a market-based approach to residential and commercial development.	Goal 4-1, Strategies 1 and 2 are intended to support infill development/redevelopment and to address both the both short and long-term capacity management options. They are not as clear as staff intended.	Revise Goal 4-1, Strategies 1 and 2 to clearly address infill/redevelopment as a priority and points our 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.	

Queen Anne's County Comprehensive Plan
Comments Received During 60-Day Public Comment Period: Recommendations for PC Consideration
ORDERED BY TOPIC
Updated: January 6, 2022

Grp.	No.	Name	Comment Category	Affiliation	Chapter	Page	Comment	Notes	Addressed	PC Recommendations
7	F	Barry Waterman	Public		Land Use	Page 21	This is my single most significant comment about the plan – it is abundantly clear that the County sewer plant is at capacity but there is not one single mention of the County making any effort whatsoever to address that issue – the Plan can be paraphrased accurately as “we are at capacity and we give up”. The recommendations in strategy #2 should include “The County staff will aggressively investigate technological, political, economic, and legal options to expand capacity at the County sewer plant as possible.	Agreed. Goal 4-1, Strategy 2, Rec 1 identifies an amended Allocation Policy. It was intended that this strategy address both the both short and long-term capacity management options. It does not, and neither does the WRE.	Add a recommendation to Goal 4-1, Strategy 2 that points our 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.	
7	G	Wick I. Dudley	Public	Bay Area Association of Realtors	Land Use	Page 21; Strategy 2, Recommendations 1 & 2	Language needs to be added to the Plan urging the County to work to alleviate the sewer capacity issue, as opposed to merely stating we are at capacity and effectively giving up on the matter. The short and long-term problems this County will face from running out of sewer capacity cannot be overstated. Everything from the size of the tax base, to housing affordability and availability, to having an adequate workforce, and businesses to employ our population will be severely and adversely affected by reaching sewer capacity. It is for this reason the Plan cannot simply tell us there is a problem, it must also direct the County to work to do something about it. To that end, I urge that language be included in this Plan directing the County to seek answers to the sewer capacity issue, and to make regular progress reports available to the public and presented to the Planning Commission and County Commissioners. Relatedly, language should be added in the Plan making it clear that if and when a solution to the sewer capacity issue is discovered and implemented, these capacity limitation concerns will have been alleviated, and the County should resume its pursuit of a market-based approach to residential and commercial development.	Agreed. Goal 4-1, Strategy 2, Rec 1 identifies an amended Allocation Policy. It was intended that this strategy address both the both short and long-term capacity management options. It does not, and neither does the WRE.	Add a recommendation to Goal 4-1, Strategy 2 that points our 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.	
7	H	James Reilly	Public		Land Use		3. SUGGESTIONS: I suggest there be some attempt to be positive about the need for growth and effective ways to encourage it and provide adequate infrastructure to support it. One simple way would be referencing the need for a strong economy in the Vision, and more extensive discussion on how to improve or expand infrastructure. Should we be aggressively pursuing ways and means of expanding our wastewater treatment capacity to adequately address the anticipated population growth? Does the County need to appointment a taskforce to develop recommendations for the County Commissioners consideration? I also think it would be useful to balance the use of positive words such as encourage, facilitate, and promote with the use of language devoted to restricting, limiting, regulating, or living within existing infrastructure capacity. To give you sense of how out of balanced use of these words are, consider that in the current draft positive words are used less than 10 times, and only in marginally positive context vs. the restrictive words or statements used more than 60 times.	Don't believe there is a way to do this beyond the recommendations already included. Only way to expand would be a change in federal legislation, which is unlikely. However, see updated Goal 4-1, Strategy 2, Rec 1 identifies an amended Allocation Policy. It was intended that this strategy address both the both short and long-term capacity management options. It does not, and neither does the WRE.	Add a recommendation to Goal 4-1, Strategy 2 that points our 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.	
7	I	Barry Waterman	Public		Implementation	Page 5	Strategy 2: The very first strategy should be “County Government throughout the coming planning period shall continuously investigate technological innovations and alternatives, political solutions, legal options, and economic avenues to expanding capacity at the county sewer plant.”	Goal 4-1, Strategy 2, Rec 1 identifies an amended Allocation Policy. It was intended that this strategy address both the both short and long-term capacity management options (including investigate technological innovations and alternatives, political solutions, legal options, and economic avenues). It does not, and neither does the WRE.	Add a recommendation to Goal 4-1, Strategy 2 that points our 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.	
7	J	Charles Boyd	Agency	Maryland Department of Planning	Appendix D: WRE	Page 9	Table 1-3 – Public Sewer Systems Demand and Capacity Summary, would benefit from including new columns to indicate “Committed Capacity”, “Equivalent Dwelling Units (EDUs)”, and “Nitrogen Limits”. The paragraph above the table indicates that wastewater treatment at the KNSG WWTP is approaching capacity for flow and nitrogen. However, it is not clear if the comments accurately reflect the potential deficit of 110,000 gallons.	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.	Land Use strategies are being amended to outline long and short term options (both within the LU goal and the WRE).	
7	K	Charles Boyd	Agency	Maryland Department of Planning	Appendix D: WRE		Planning recommends that the county include specific approaches to obtain new water sources and to increase public sewer capacity to help decision-makers decide how feasible those approaches will be; and, before adopting the land use plan, the county should discuss with the Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE) the feasibility of the planned approaches to obtain new water sources and increase wastewater treatment plant capacity. If MDE indicates that the approaches are not feasible, then the county should consider scaling back its land use plan and accommodate less growth.	Agreed. Goal 4-1, Strategy 2, Rec 1 identifies an amended Allocation Policy. It was intended that this strategy address both the both short and long-term capacity management options. It does not, and neither does the WRE.	Add a recommendation 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.	
7	L	Charles Boyd	Agency	Maryland Department of Planning	Appendix D: WRE		Planning recommends that the WRE incorporate information regarding the current demand for public water and public sewer, increases in water supply and wastewater discharges that would result from the projected maximum growth potential, and the county’s plan to accommodate the projected growth through 2040. Including this information in the WRE would add clarity to the appendix. Including a table to show public water and sewer capacity compared to projected demand would also add clarity.	Understood. This information resides in the County Water and Sewer Plan, but the County will consider adding this table to the WRE.	Consider adding table as suggested.	
8	A	Frank DiGiallenardo	Public	Corsica River Conservancy	Land Use	Page 19	BMP’s, Tools and Techniques: The Plan rightly reflects that land use decisions, carried out under the zoning code, may or may not have the effect of actually achieving Plan goals by listing a number of sustainability goals and measures. It notes that: “These sustainability indicators “should be” measured and evaluated’ over time to determine community impact with respect to meeting the land use vision and goals.” If there is to be any accountability among County decision makers in the coming decade, the Plan needs to say that the indicators “must be measured and evaluated.” It would also be helpful to lay out who is responsible for doing so, how often, what resources will be committed, and what transparency will be reflected in that process.	Language used is consistent with typical comprehensive plan terminology and is a directive.	Add to Implementation Chapter (pg 12-2) an action to provide annual status updates on prioritized implementation efforts and actions. This will be an addition to the MDP Annual Report.	
8	B	Elle Bassett/Anne Richards	Public	ShoreRivers	Land Use		In general, we recommend the Plan adopt a more accountable implementation process that includes: specific actions for implementation; established indicators, benchmarks and targets; regular evaluation and reports on implementation progress; and adjusted plans as necessary based on evaluations. (PDF copy of comments saved separately)	These comments are not germane to current 60-day review draft. We need specific examples of strategies which lack specificity.	Add to Implementation Chapter (pg 12-2) an action to provide annual status updates on prioritized implementation efforts and actions. This will be an addition to the MDP Annual Report.	
8	C	Frank DiGiallenardo	Public	Corsica River Conservancy	Implementation	Page 1-2	Page 12-1 says “Continued action to implement PlanQAC will be needed for it to have lasting impact.” Page 12-2 says, “To monitor progress “” the Planning Commission and Planning Director may establish a process to review the effectiveness of ... tools” and make recommendations to the QACC which they may or may not approve. This is inconsistent and weak. If continued action is truly needed to implement the plan (as we know), then why wouldn’t a process to review such action also be needed? Isn’t that required by the State anyway in its call for an annual report on plan implementation? The role of the Planning and County Commissioners is key and their decisions and reasons for decisions that do not support the Plan’s vision should be made transparent. To say that “The final responsibility for the implementation of PlanQAC lies with the County’s citizens and elected officials.” is somewhat misleading since in fact the Planning Commission, the Appeals Board, their attorneys and county staff have as much or more impact than citizens or even the county commissioners.	Such nomenclature is typical to all comprehensive planning and reflect commitment to overarching strategies (either in their infancy or as continued commitments).	Add to Implementation Chapter (pg 12-2) an action to provide annual status updates on prioritized implementation efforts and actions. This will be an addition to the MDP Annual Report.	
8	D	Sara Ramotnik	Public	Eastern Shore Land Conservancy	Implementation	Page 2	Reads “To monitor progress in achieving the goals and strategies of PlanQAC, the Planning Commission and Planning Director may establish a process to review the effectiveness of regulatory and non-regulatory tools and make recommendations to the County Commissioners when appropriate, which they may or may not approve as they see fit. This process should be established in order to monitor progress in achieving the goals and strategies of PlanQAC and so that “may” should be changed to “will”.	Such nomenclature is typical to all comprehensive planning and reflect commitment to overarching strategies (either in their infancy or as continued commitments).	Add to Implementation Chapter (pg 12-2) an action to provide annual status updates on prioritized implementation efforts and actions. This will be an addition to the MDP Annual Report.	

Queen Anne's County Comprehensive Plan
Comments Received During 60-Day Public Comment Period: Recommendations for PC Consideration
ORDERED BY TOPIC
Updated: January 6, 2022

Grp.	No.	Name	Comment Category	Affiliation	Chapter	Page	Comment	Notes	Addressed	PC Recommendations
8	E	Frank DiGiallenardo	Public		Implementation	Page 2	A ten year cycle for substantive public review and involvement in the County's growth and its implications for our quality of life is simply not adequate in these fast changing times. The public deserves a better, clearer, and more frequent picture of the substantive changes happening to QAC as well as an opportunity weigh-in on them when these changes or trends threaten the County's Vision. Past annual implementation reports to the state are virtually indecipherable and to my knowledge have not been publicized to the public.	10-year cycle is that required by the State. 5-Year Mid-Cycle Review also required, in addition to submission of annual reports to the State. Reports are discussed publicly at Planning Commission and Board of Commissioner meetings and are also available from the Planning & Zoning Department.	Add to Implementation Chapter (pg 12-2) an action to provide annual status updates on prioritized implementation efforts and actions. This will be an addition to the MDP Annual Report.	
8	F	Cheryl Huyck	Public		Implementation	Page 18	As documented the Actions along with Lead Agencies & Partners offers helpful insight but how do we know if any action has been taken on any of the Goals? Is progress made or are there concrete barriers/findings that make the Goal unattainable? There needs to some reference to how the Public will be kept up to date on the Implementation of the Plan and achievement, delay or failure of meeting Plan Goals.	10-year cycle is that required by the State. 5-Year Mid-Cycle Review also required, in addition to submission of annual reports to the State. Reports are discussed publicly at Planning Commission and Board of Commissioner meetings and are also available from the Planning & Zoning Department.	Add to Implementation Chapter (pg 12-2) an action to provide annual status updates on prioritized implementation efforts and actions. This will be an addition to the MDP Annual Report.	
8	G	Elle Bassett/Anne Richards	Public	ShoreRivers	Implementation		We recommend the Plan adopt a more accountable implementation process that includes timeline and goal date deadlines for actions, regular evaluation and reports on implementation progress, and adjusted plans as necessary based on evaluations.	10-year cycle is that required by the State. 5-Year Mid-Cycle Review also required, in addition to submission of annual reports to the State. Reports are discussed publicly at Planning Commission and Board of Commissioner meetings and are also available from the Planning & Zoning Department. Language used is typical to all comprehensive planning and reflects commitment to overarching strategies.	Add to Implementation Chapter (pg 12-2) an action to provide annual status updates on prioritized implementation efforts and actions. This will be an addition to the MDP Annual Report.	
8	H	Frank DiGiallenardo	Public	Corsica River Conservancy	Appendix D: WRE	Page 4	The Conclusions and Recommendations section states that "The use of best practices and innovative technologies are key implementation strategies to strengthen the sustainability of the County." This Comprehensive Plan update, like the 2010 version, makes a good faith effort to advance the overwhelming position of County residents to maintain the overall vision for QAC. Yet, as can be seen from decisions made between 2010 and now, without a firm commitment to implementation that includes penalties as well as incentives, the Plan has little to no chance of being effectively implemented.	DUPLICATIVE COMMENT.	Add to Implementation Chapter (pg 12-2) an action to provide annual status updates on prioritized implementation efforts and actions. This will be an addition to the MDP Annual Report.	
8	I	Marie McNurlan	Public		Environmental Resources		Incorporate stronger environmental protection and restoration strategies. We also need a stronger, more accountable process that includes specific action for implementation, establishes indicators and targets, and regularly evaluates progress toward Plan goals.	10-year cycle is that required by the State. 5-Year Mid-Cycle Review also required, in addition to submission of annual reports to the State. Reports are discussed publicly at Planning Commission and Board of Commissioner meetings and are also available from the Planning & Zoning Department. Language used is typical to all comprehensive planning and reflects commitment to overarching strategies.	Add to Implementation Chapter (pg 12-2) an action to provide annual status updates on prioritized implementation efforts and actions. This will be an addition to the MDP Annual Report.	
8	J	Frank DiGiallenardo	Public	Corsica River Conservancy	Implementation	Page 4-17	Implementation Matrix: This is an excellent, thorough delineation of actions needed to implement the plan. However, the level of commitment reflected in this chapter and in many of these implementation actions is weak with too many "maybe's". They need to be tightened up. Also, it appears that many of the actions have dual or triple 'leads' - probably not a good way to assure accountability. A regular review process to monitor progress is needed, identifying corrective actions where needed.. In addition to the annual report to the state, there should be a readable, clear, report of annual progress to the public to assure transparency and regular feedback.	10-year cycle is that required by the State. 5-Year Mid-Cycle Review also required, in addition to submission of annual reports to the State. Reports are discussed publicly at Planning Commission and Board of Commissioner meetings and are also available from the Planning & Zoning Department. Language used is typical to all comprehensive planning and reflects commitment to overarching strategies.	Add to Implementation Chapter (pg 12-2) an action to provide annual status updates on prioritized implementation efforts and actions. This will be an addition to the MDP Annual Report.	
9	A	Cheryl Huyck	Public		Land Use		Land Use & Environmental Protection: Nowhere in the 2021 Draft Plan Chapters 4 and 5 that I can find is there attention given to and specific actions or recommendations to address the growing amount of road side trash in QAC. The volume of garbage is increasing and especially noticeable now that crops have been harvested. It is obvious that many residents and visitors alike consider our land their private trash can. It is unsightly and hazardous. The very garbage that is tossed from vehicles into farm fields ends up being plowed into the soil and eventually leaches into our food. Further, I suspect that our farmers pay a price in farm equipment repairs caused by the garbage their equipment comes in contact with. Not to be overlooked is the trash that gets tossed into our waterways. Exit 42 on Kent Island is a perfect example of how highway exit ramps are used as garbage cans. Volunteers like myself spend countless hours trying to help keep road sides clean but it is an impossible task. To give you an example of the scope of this problem in my community I, along with a group of volunteers, filled 47 large bags with trash picked up in the area of Dulin Clark Road and Rt., 304 one October day. The following February we filled 28 more bags of garbage along the very same roadways! The Maryland Dept., of Transportation State Hwy Administration has a tool on their web site to submit requests for litter pick up (https://marylandsha.secure.force.com/customer-care/request_for_service). I recommend two actions to try to address the problem of road side trash: 1) Creation of a Trash Committee to monitor and address the growing Trash Problem and 2) Review and consider a web based tool comparable to the MD DOT SHA tool for Queen Anne's County.	There is a directive action in the Transportation Chapter to encourage public and private investment to improve the visual quality of the roadside environment (page 6-13). As littering is illegal, it is unclear that a Comp Plan strategy is necessary.	Staff does not suggest a change; however, the PC may wish to discuss.	
10	A	Church Hill Town Commissioners	Agency	Town of Church Hill Board of Town Commissioners	Land Use		As you may know by now, the Town's Planning Commission has conducted a thorough review of the Draft Plan and will soon submit written comments during the 60-day public review period. We have seen the Planning Commission's letter and endorse its suggestions. As the Board of Town Commissioners, we have also studied the document and wish to formally submit comments for the County's consideration on one topic in particular: growth area designations. As always, we aim to advance our mutual interests in ensuring that the County and the Town have good plans that support each other and advance smart policies for thoughtful development and ongoing improvement. We are concerned and surprised that the Draft Plan does not designate Church Hill, combined with our planned municipal growth area, as a County Growth Area. The different status of municipal growth areas, within the context of the County Plan update, was not discussed at the multiple Council of Governments meetings we devoted to the update of the County Comprehensive Plan. We believe that Church Hill's planned development as a vibrant economic center and residential community is virtually important to our residents and to the well-being of the County as a whole. We see no sound policy basis for designating Centreville and Queenstown as County Growth Areas and not Church Hill. As you know the maps throughout the Draft differentiate Church Hill from the planned County Growth Areas assigning the Town a lesser role in the context of long term development policy. Despite this we intend fully to continue in coordination with Town residents and the State of Maryland to guide the development and improvement of Church Hill into a vibrant central place in northern Queen Anne's County. We ask that the County embrace this future too and revise the Draft accordingly.	Language is being revised to eliminate distinction.	Updated in accordance with Town Municipal Growth Element/designated Growth Area.	
10	B	Church Hill Town Commissioners	Agency	Town of Church Hill Board of Town Commissioners	Land Use		Church Hill has highway frontage on MD 213 and land planned and zoned for much needed commercial development. The Town is home to the Church Hill Volunteer Fire Company which just constructed its new fire station providing capacity for increased demands for service in the northern part of the County. The Town also has historic churches and other essential County assets that call for a prioritized policy framework that strongly supports the Town's planned growth. We strongly suggest that the Draft be revised to assign Church Hill, and its designated growth area, a County Growth Area designation.	So noted.	Updated in accordance with Town Municipal Growth Element/designated Growth Area.	

Queen Anne's County Comprehensive Plan
Comments Received During 60-Day Public Comment Period: Recommendations for PC Consideration
ORDERED BY TOPIC
Updated: January 6, 2022

Grp.	No.	Name	Comment Category	Affiliation	Chapter	Page	Comment	Notes	Addressed	PC Recommendations
10	C	Janet Rochester	Agency	Church Hill Planning & Zoning Commission	Land Use	Map 4-7	The Draft Comprehensive Plan regrettably does not support Church Hill's planned growth and development in the manner consistent our Town plan and growth goals. We are also concerned it may undermine Church Hill's role in advancing the County's essential planning goals such as clustering population in areas served by public facilities and community services, promoting economic development, protecting farmland, open spaces, and environmental resources, creating vibrant communities, and supporting the development of quality housing affordable for County residents. Throughout the draft document, the maps distinguish between Church Hill and the County's designated growth areas of Kent Island, Queenstown, and Centreville. For example, Map 4-7 titled "Growth and Priority Funding Areas" designates these places as "Growth Area" but refrains from using the designation for Church Hill. This is replicated on almost all maps in the document. Further, the Draft explicitly states on page 10-9, ironically in the chapter titled Town Planning Framework, that Church Hill's designated growth area is not also a County growth area. We believe Church Hill's designated growth area should be a planned growth area on par with that of Queenstown and Centreville. We see no policy basis for not supporting Church Hill's planned growth in the same manner of these other places or for assigning Church Hill a less significant role in the overall County planning framework. Here are some relevant facts: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Town is home to the Church Hill Elementary School, which according to the School Board is projected to have a utilization rate of 63% of State Rated Capacity by 2030. The Town has a municipal wastewater treatment facility with capacity to accommodate growth, sewer pumps stations that are were expanded to accommodate growth about a decade ago, and a history of responsible management of available capacity. Further, its system is not prevented from being expanded to support the planned build out of it entire growth area. The Town is home to Church Hill Park, a County facility that is within a short walking distance of every residence within in Town. It is home to the Church Hill Volunteer Fire Company which just constructed a larger and modern fire station increasing capacity for increased demands for service in the northern part of the County. The Town is located on MD Route 213 an arterial highway and just west of the MD Route 301 corridor. It has locational advantages that can make it attractive for jobs and business development. It is a designated Sustainable Community and has historic and recreational tourism potential that is currently the subject of our town center master planning. It has a competent land use plan that allocates acreage to employment and general commercial uses. The Draft County Plan, and its chapter on Town Planning framework, regrettably mischaracterizes the potential for Church Hill and assigns it a lesser rank within the context of the County's development. We strongly suggest that the Draft be revised to assign Church Hill, combined with its designated growth area, a County Growth Area.	Language is being revised to eliminate distinction.	Updated in accordance with Town Municipal Growth Element/designated Growth Area.	
10	D	Chris Jakubiak	Agency	Jakubiak & Associates, Inc. (on behalf of Church Hill)	Land Use	Map 4-9	On behalf of Church Hill, we'd like to know why Church Hill's designated growth area is not a designated Growth Area in the same manner as Queenstown and Centreville?	Revising all Growth Area language per "Town Growth Areas" email chain.	Updated in accordance with Town Municipal Growth Element/designated Growth Area.	
10	E	Charles Boyd	Agency	Maryland Department of Planning	Environmental Resources	Page 26	Goal 5-3, should be revised to reference Municipal Growth Areas, instead of 'Town', for consistency.	Updating nomenclature for all Growth Areas.	Revising language throughout draft.	
10	F	Charles Boyd	Agency	Maryland Department of Planning	Environmental Resources	Page 27	Strategy 2, Recommendations 2 and 8, should be revised to reference Municipal Growth Areas, instead of 'Town', for consistency.	Updating nomenclature for all Growth Areas.	Revising language throughout draft.	
10	G	Church Hill Town Commissioners	Agency	Town of Church Hill Board of Town Commissioners	General		If the County Planning Commission has any concern about modifying the Draft Plan in the manner we are requesting, please coordinate with us so that we can arrange a meeting to discuss this further. You are always welcome to visit with us in Church Hill and we applaud you and your leadership of the Department of Planning on the production of the Draft Plan. It's a substantial undertaking and we honor your commitment to the wellbeing of our County.	Noted.	Growth Area terminology updated throughout the draft.	
11	A	Barry Waterman	Public		Land Use	Map 4-8	Misidentified Wheatlands Farm across from Outlets as having ag zoning when it is zoned for high density mixed use.	Agreed. That parcel was annexed by Queenstown in 2014, and the Town subsequently amended its Comp Plan in 2019 to classify the land use as master-planned regional commercial (in accordance with the designated zoning)	Amend Map 4-8 to reflect mixed use. Also, all maps must be updated to reflect that this parcel is located within the Queenstown town limits.	
12	A	Darren Brown	Agency	Centreville Planning & Zoning Commission	Land Use	Map 4-10	Map 4-10 shows the County's recommended future land use for properties in the County and within the municipal limits of Centreville (and all towns). These land use recommendations are presumably drawn from the towns' adopted comprehensive plans, but Centreville is undergoing its own comprehensive plan update and will propose land uses that will almost assuredly differ from that shown on Map 4-10. To avoid confusion or the implication that Queen Anne's County is doing land use planning within municipal limits, we suggest that this map (and others as may be needed) be revised to remove land use recommendations for properties that are within municipal limits.	We can revert to the existing land use for Centreville and add a note to the map that the Town of Centreville is currently updating its Comp Plan and that the land use indicated represents existing conditions. Proposed land use for the Town may be found in the updated Centreville Comp Plan. We can then update this map accordingly once the Town has adopted its Plan.	Amend Map 4-10: Revert to existing land use within the Town Boundaries and add a note to the effect that the Town of Centreville is currently updating its Comp Plan and that the land use and growth areas indicated represents existing conditions. Proposed land use and growth areas for the Town may be found in the updated Centreville Comp Plan.	
12	B	Darren Brown	Agency	Centreville Planning & Zoning Commission	Land Use	Map 4-10	Regarding the recommended "future annexation area" shown on Map 4-10, the Centreville Planning Commission is evaluating adjustments in both land use and the boundary itself, about which we look forward to soon coordinating with you. For example, the County's draft plan would accommodate the conversion of farmland to development at the interchange of U.S. Route 301 and MD Route 213. Note that the Planning Commission must then consider the extension of its designated growth area in support of annexation of this area, the extension of municipal water and sewer facilities to this area and the development review within this area under municipal zoning authority. As you know, the interchange is an important gateway to the Town of Centreville. The Planning Commission believes any potential development there, must be considered a part of the Town's long-term plan. Our recommendation is to revise the draft plan to include a comment on the map indicating Town of Centreville will be updating its municipal growth element as required under the Land Use Article and will adopt a municipal growth area boundary and recommended land use designations that may differ substantively from that shown on the map.	Likewise, we can leave the annexation areas as the were indicated in 2010 and add a note to the map. We can then update this map accordingly once the Town has adopted its Plan.	Amend Map 4-10: Revert to existing land use within the Town Boundaries and add a note to the effect that the Town of Centreville is currently updating its Comp Plan and that the land use and growth areas indicated represents existing conditions. Proposed land use and growth areas for the Town may be found in the updated Centreville Comp Plan.	
13	A	Michael R. Foster	Public		Land Use	Map 4-10 & Map 4-11	This will confirm my request concerning Lots 1,2,3,and 4 of the Village At Benton's Crossing, referenced in correspondence dated April 5 and July 21, 2021. I requested all the properties south of the drainage ditch to be restored to a UC zoning. The property to the north of the ditch should continue to be SHVC. - The Planning Commission agreed and voted accordingly. - Map 4-10 and 4-11 do not reflect consistency with my request and the vote of the Planning Commission. - I respectfully request that the new plan's map be corrected to address this oversight.	Noted maps being updated to accurately reflect Planning Commission recommendations.	Revise FLU on Maps 4-10 and 4-11 to correctly address the PC's recommendation.	

Queen Anne's County Comprehensive Plan
Comments Received During 60-Day Public Comment Period: Recommendations for PC Consideration
ORDERED BY TOPIC
Updated: January 6, 2022

Grp.	No.	Name	Comment Category	Affiliation	Chapter	Page	Comment	Notes	Addressed	PC Recommendations
14	A	Andrew Price	Public	Windfall, LLC	Community Plans	Page 5	Please find here within a public comment regarding a parcel owned by Windfall LLC on the corner of Bennett Point Road and Route 18 - Map 059A, Parcel 223, Tax ID # 1805051061. - The property is currently zoned as Suburban Estate, 'SE', which allows 1-acre-density lots subject to successful perc tests unless it is in the designated Grasonville Growth Area (Figure 4-11). The property is narrowly configured, located directly between and fronting directly on US RT 50/301 and MD RT 18 and not particularly suitable for single-family residential development as envisioned by the Suburban Estate (SE) zoning district. In addition, historically we have been unable to secure a successful perk test on the property. - The property is more suitable to be an area of logical expansion of the adjoining Grasonville Gateway Medical Center (GGMC) zoning district. It is understood that a significant portion of the property is within the Critical Area, Resource Conservation Area (RCA) and that any future rezoning would need to be done concurrently with an application for Growth Allocation to change the Critical Area RCA designation to Intensely Developed Area (IDA) – similar to the adjoining GGMC zoned property with an IDA designation. - The Comprehensive Plan Update should include this property in the Grasonville Growth Area for future GGMC development served by public water and sewer, when available, is a necessary first step in the process. We look forward to hearing your feedback and collaboratively engaging on this proposal.	The indicated property is not within the existing growth area. This proposal for a map amendment was submitted as a 60-day comment and not during the time in which the County had requested. As all other properties that proposed inclusion within a growth area the Technical Committee does not support this request due to nearing limits of adequate public facilities (APF) including transportation infrastructure on its state and local roads, Chesapeake Bay Bridge, local school capacity, and sewage capacity permit restrictions at the County's KNSG Treatment Plant.	PC review request and make recommendation for the future land use map found in Chapter 4.	
15	A	Elle Bassett/Anne Richards	Public	ShoreRivers	Environmental Resources	Page 5	Within “planning issues and opportunities related to environmentally sensitive areas,” the fifth bullet should read “Development in environmentally sensitive areas should be avoided, but if it is necessary, it should use techniques to reduce impacts...”	Noted.	Change language to discourage on p. 5-5.	
15	B	Sara Ramotnik	Public	Eastern Shore Land Conservancy	Environmental Resources	Page 5	Sensitive Areas & Natural Resources: Under the fifth bullet, development should be avoided in environmentally sensitive areas.	Noted.	Change language to discourage on p. 5-5.	
16	A	Charles Boyd	Agency	Maryland Department of Planning	Environmental Resources	Page 9	Flood Hazard Zones. The FEMA flood maps are outdated (here’s a link to an article that discusses the issue: https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/studies-sound-alarm-on-badly-out-of-date-fema-flood-maps/). PlanQAC should acknowledge this and include a strategy to update the Flood Hazard Zone Maps as new data becomes available.	So noted. The current NFIP and FIS map became effective November 5, 2014.	Update Flood Risk Mapping, page 5-9 to include updating the maps when new data becomes available. Include a recommendation in Goal 5-2, Strategy 2.	
17	A	Frank DiGiallenardo	Public		Environmental Resources	Page 11	More needs to be done to preserve the County’s dark skies. I recommend reviewing existing measures in the QAC code in the light of current best practices, including use of the resources of the International Dark Sky Association.	Section 18:1-83 of the County Code addresses lighting as a design standard.	Amend light pollution on page 5-11 to include the portion of the County Code and add a recommendation to Goal 4-1, Strategy 1 to review current best management practices for light pollution and preservation of "dark skies".	
17	B	Elle Bassett/Anne Richards	Public	ShoreRivers	Environmental Resources	Page 11	Page 5-11 states that “planning for light pollution is crucial to the preservation and maintenance of wildlife habitat and the ecological systems in the county,” but there are no recommendations, strategies, or actions for this. Goal 5-2 should have an additional strategy that includes preserving and restoring habitats. Recommendations may include maintaining large blocks of forest to protect forest interior dwelling species and reducing artificial lighting by using timers or installing dark-friendly lighting infrastructure to reduce light pollution.	Section 18:1-83 of the County Code addresses lighting as a design standard.	Amend light pollution on page 5-11 to include the portion of the County Code and add a recommendation to Goal 4-1, Strategy 1 to review current best management practices for light pollution and preservation of "dark skies".	
17	C	Jay Falstad	Public	Queen Anne's Conservation Association	Environmental Resources	Page 11	• In a quintessential rural community, unlike an urban or suburban area, one can see the stars at night, unobscured by the dull glow of pervasive light pollution. The draft Plan recognizes the importance of “dark skies” to human well-being and to wildlife (p. 5-11), but the County Code’s provisions on light pollution are not reviewed and no specific additional measures are recommended. QACA suggests that the Plan should specifically recommend further consideration by the County of the light pollution problem, including use of the resources of the International Dark Sky Association and initiatives to designate and preserve existing dark sky areas of the County (e.g. around Tuckahoe). Recognizing that the Non-Contiguous Development Technique is, fortunately, not of much current practical importance, the draft Plan could well avoid discussing it at all. This is especially desirable since the discussion appears unable to avoid the oft-repeated but specious claim that NCD is “designed to preserve prime agricultural land and natural resources” (p. 4-11). In fact, as QACA has urged in the past, NCD actually enhances the undesirable economics of cornfield villages on productive farming lands, while the land that it restricts development on is undevelopable anyway.	Section 18:1-83 of the County Code addresses lighting as a design standard. All other referenceds to NCD	Amend light pollution on page 5-11 to include the portion of the County Code and add a recommendation to Goal 4-1, Strategy 1 to review current best management practices for light pollution and preservation of "dark skies".	
17	D	Cheryl Huyck	Public		Environmental Resources	Page 12	Light Pollution: The Plan is clear about the importance of “dark skies” but does no more than reference its importance. The Plan needs specific recommendations that target how to combat the growing problem of light pollution.	Section 18:1-83 of the County Code addresses lighting as a design standard.	Amend light pollution on page 5-11 to include the portion of the County Code and add a recommendation to Goal 4-1, Strategy 1 to review current best management practices for light pollution and preservation of "dark skies".	
18	A	Jo Manning	Agency	Town of Millington, Town Administrator	Environmental Resources	Page 20	Table 5-7: Why isn't Millington WWTP listed?	Materials received (and reviewed by County) didn't include.	Include Millington WWTP in Table 5-7. Reach out to Jo Manning, Town Administrator and use data from DPW.	
18	B	Jo Manning	Agency	Town of Millington, Town Administrator	Environmental Resources	Map 5-8	Map 5-8: Why isn't Millington Water Service area noted? Or the location of plant and outfall noted??	Utilized County-provided data.No Water Service Area maps included in WSMP.	Include Water Service Area Map from the Town of Millington 2018 Comprehensive Plan.	
18	C	Jo Manning	Agency	Town of Millington, Town Administrator	Environmental Resources	Map 5-10	Map 5-10: Why isn't Millington Sewer Service Area, location of plant and outfall noted?	Utilized County-provided data. No Sewer Service Area maps included in WSMP either. Confirm with DPW and include.	Include Sewer Service Area Map from the Town of Millington 2018 Comprehensive Plan.	
19	A	Frank DiGiallenardo	Public		Environmental Resources	Page 22	Lack of workers is important and dredging is difficult and expensive. But the biggest threat to QAC fisheries is poor and declining water quality and habitat. No habitat, no fish. All of the QAC major tributaries are impaired and will get worse unless development is better controlled.	Noted.	Include threats from the natural environment that could inadvertently effect the fisheries (aquaculture).	
20	A	Elle Bassett/Anne Richards	Public	ShoreRivers	Environmental Resources	Page 25	Goal 5-1, Strategy 1: 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.	Adding related recommendation to Goal 5-1, Strategy 1.	Revise language as noted.	
21	A	Elle Bassett/Anne Richards	Public	ShoreRivers	Environmental Resources	Page 25	Goal 5-2, Strategy 1: Considering the County’s waterways are listed as impaired for nitrogen, phosphorus, and sediment, and the fact the predominant land use in the county is agriculture, implementing agricultural best management practices should be included as a recommendation.	Adding related recommendation to Goal 5-2, Strategy 1.	Revise language as noted.	
22	A	Elle Bassett/Anne Richards	Public	ShoreRivers	Environmental Resources	Page 27	Goal 5-3, Strategy 2: The plan should expand upon on-site sewage disposal systems, either in this chapter or in the Water Resources appendix. In addition to use of Best Available Technology, the county should encourage or require septic installers, inspectors, or designers to complete MDE training frequently to ensure properly functioning systems.	License required through QAC Plumbing Board for installation of all septic systems. Completion of MDE training course required for license. MDE in the process of developing license for septic system inspectors.	See Goal 5-3, Strategy 2, Recommendation 3, Table 5-9, WRE Goals & Objective (Pg AD-4). Add detail about plumbing board in chapter 3.	

Queen Anne's County Comprehensive Plan
Comments Received During 60-Day Public Comment Period: Recommendations for PC Consideration
ORDERED BY TOPIC
Updated: January 6, 2022

Grp.	No.	Name	Comment Category	Affiliation	Chapter	Page	Comment	Notes	Addressed	PC Recommendations
22	B	Elle Bassett/Anne Richards	Public	ShoreRivers	Environmental Resources		The plan should expand upon on-site sewage disposal systems. In addition to use of Best Available Technology, the county should encourage or require septic installers, inspectors, or designers to be certified and complete MDE training frequently to ensure properly functioning systems.	License required through QAC Plumbing Board for installation of all septic systems. Completion of MDE training course required for license. MDE in the process of developing license for septic system inspectors. See Goal 5-3, Strategy 2, Recommendation 3, Table 5-9, WRE Goals & Objective (Pg AD-4). Add detail about plumbing board in chapter 3.	Add detail about plumbing board in chapter 3.	
23	A	Elle Bassett/Anne Richards	Public	ShoreRivers	Environmental Resources		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.	Can briefly expand the species habitat section.	Add details regarding SAVs and oyster reefs to the Species Habitat section that begins on page 5-10.	
24	A	Elle Bassett/Anne Richards	Public	ShoreRivers	Transportation	Page 8	Page 6-8 discusses waterways and public access. Therefore, those elements should also be mentioned within the strategies and actions of this section.	Adding recommendation under Goal 6-2, Strategy 1.	Add recommendation under Goal 6-2, Strategy 1.	
25	A	Heather Murphy	Agency	MDOT	Transportation	Page 20	2018 Beach to Bridge Plan – Consider mentioning that MDOT SHA started pursuing alternative actions in the Summer of 2019, including closure of the westbound US 50 left-turn from westbound US 50 to MD 18B (Main Street) and the left-turn from westbound US 50 to MD 662 to discourage motorists from diverting on to the local road network. The MDOT SHA has recently completed a Concept of Operations (ConOps) to study the application of Transportation Systems Management and Operation (TSMO) technologies along US 50 from the Bay Bridge to Ocean City. Planning is complete, and design and traffic signal operations started in summer 2021. Construction is planned to begin in Summer 2022. For further information, please contact Mohammed Raqib, Chief, MDOPT SHA Mobility Planning and Engineering Division at 410-787-5886 or via email at mraqib@mdot.maryland.gov.	The 2018 Beach to Bridge Plan is listed as a County transportation study. This would not be the appropriate place to indicate this initiative by the State.	It may be beneficial to change the first bullet in the Vision on page 6-1 to read, "Coordinating with towns and state agencies for new traffic patterns, safety concerns..."	
26	A	Jon Mullarky	Public		Transportation	Page 20	Section on Traffic Volume should acknowledge that truck traffic, some generated by the Port of Baltimore, and some avoiding I95 is a significant contributor to ADT.	Freight corridors are indicated. WM should investigate to determine if data can be included in the discussion.	If specific details are available include.	
27	A	Cheryl Huyck	Public		Transportation	Page 29	Strategy 2, Recommendations: The Plan states that the County will monitor and participate in the MDTA Chesapeake Bay Bridge Crossing Study yet there is no mention that as reported in the 9/30/21 issue of the Kent County News Queen Anne's County Commissioners signed a resolution in August supporting the consolidation of the current, five-lane Bay Bridge into one, eight-lane span. To state in the Plan that the County will monitor and participate in MDTA Study suggests there is consideration of alternative Bridge locations but the recent Resolution suggestions the decision is done and made. Apparently a new Bay bridge will run through QAC no matter its irreversible damage to the County and the Chesapeake Bay environment.	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.	Amend Goal 6-1, Strategy 2, Recommendation 1 as follows: Monitor and participate in the MDTA Chesapeake Bay Crossing Study NEPA process to identify the location of a new Bay Bridge crossing, "in order to insure safe, adequate transportation planning and protection of historic and environmental resources."	
27	B	Elle Bassett/Anne Richards	Public	ShoreRivers	Transportation	Page 29	Goal 6-1, Strategy 2: Not only should the County participate in the Maryland Transportation Authority (MDTA) Chesapeake Bay Crossing environmental impact study required by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the County should specifically advocate for the new crossing to have minimal environmental impact on sensitive lands and water quality.	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.	Amend Goal 6-1, Strategy 2, Recommendation 1 as follows: Monitor and participate in the MDTA Chesapeake Bay Crossing Study NEPA process to identify the location of a new Bay Bridge crossing, "in order to insure safe, adequate transportation planning and protection of historic and environmental resources."	
27	C	Jay Falstad	Public	Queen Anne's Conservation Association	Transportation	Page 29	The draft Plan calls (on p. 6-29) for the County to "[m]onitor and participate in the MDTA Chesapeake Bay Crossing Study NEPA process to identify the location of a new Bay Bridge crossing". That participation should of course occur, but it should be backed and informed by a County Comprehensive Plan stating forthrightly that a new eight-lane span will massively increase development pressure on Queen Anne's County (and the Eastern Shore generally), as the second span in 1973 so obviously has done. Such a clear statement of this undesirable and unavoidable impact will give added impetus to consideration of the "no-build" alternative, and it will lay down a marker for the far-reaching State-funded program to preserve Eastern Shore farmland that the new bridge, if built, will require.	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.	Amend Goal 6-1, Strategy 2, Recommendation 1 as follows: Monitor and participate in the MDTA Chesapeake Bay Crossing Study NEPA process to identify the location of a new Bay Bridge crossing, "in order to insure safe, adequate transportation planning and protection of historic and environmental resources."	
28	A	Nancy	Public	Historic Sites Consortium	Historic & Cultural Resources	Page 9	Preservation in the County Code: The wording in the first paragraph of this section should be changed to less "intrusive" to property owners. Suggest the following: "Best practice in historic preservation is to build enough time in the process for concerned parties to consult with and advise owners on alternatives to property demolition."	Revising language as noted.	Revise language on p. 7-9 as noted.	
29	A	Charles Boyd	Agency	Maryland Department of Planning	Economic Development & Tourism	Page 22	Sustainable Communities. Certified PFA areas in the unincorporated county, which are developed, may be eligible for Sustainable Community designation, and therefore eligible for revitalization funds. The only existing Sustainable Communities in the county are within incorporated municipalities. The county should consider a strategy to qualify targeted revitalization areas for access to these funding and revitalization resources.	Agreed.	Add suggested recommendation to Goal 8-1, Strategy 2.	
30	A	Charles Boyd	Agency	Maryland Department of Planning	Housing	Page 18	The housing Pipeline and Needs Analysis does not describe any projects or developments in the pipeline. A needs analysis or capacity analysis with estimates of available housing and housing needed by growth area would be helpful. Determining the current supply and demand for housing, and where it exists, as well as identifying the type(s) of housing needed, and where the potential for are the future needs are, could provide a stronger foundation for the county's proposed housing objectives.	A capacity analysis would be beneficial in this location since we have stated many times that there is an existing availability of vacant lots despite sewer allocation and no further major subdivision in growth areas.	Add strategy to Goal 9-1, Strategy 1.	

Queen Anne's County Comprehensive Plan
Comments Received During 60-Day Public Comment Period: Recommendations for PC Consideration
ORDERED BY TOPIC
Updated: January 6, 2022

Grp.	No.	Name	Comment Category	Affiliation	Chapter	Page	Comment	Notes	Addressed	PC Recommendations
31	A	Craig Holberger	Public	Kent Island Resident; Piney Narrows Yacht Haven Marina Condominium	Kent Narrows Community Plan	Page 38	<p>There seems to be no mention of the effects of Sea-level rise in this entire plan.</p> <p>Sea-level rise should be addressed in all aspects of this "Comprehensive Plan"</p> <p>WEAKNESSES & CONCERNS page 38 ; opportunity sites pg 42 ; INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENT NEEDS pg 44</p> <p>Sea-level rise should be taken into consideration for all new development and re-development including infrastructure (roads and walkways). Increasing levels of High tides already routinely go over bulkheads and flood parking areas and roads in the area. Projected sealevel rise in the next 10-20 years will have serious impact on the entire Kent Narrows area.</p>	<p>Include details from 2016 Sea level Rise and Coastal Vulnerability Assessment Plan See Study Area 3. Roads will be impacted (MD 18 through the Kent Narrows area is inundated by both SLR scenarios) along with the QAC Sherriff Kent Narrows substation and EMS Station 200 property. Existing wetlands that provide protection for the KN area will also be impacted.</p> <p>"Project review will include an assessment of the County's vulnerable resources to ensure that the goals of the County's hazard resiliency policy documents are contemplated." Directly from Pg 5-17 in QAC Plan.</p>	<p>Add details from 2016 Sea Level Rise and Coastal Vulnerability Assessment Plan.</p>	
32	A	Sandi Olek	Agency	Maryland Department of Natural Resources	Kent Narrows Community Plan		<p>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.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>Added in or expanded acknowledgement of maritime industry and important in several areas throughout the plan.</p>	
33	A	Sandi Olek	Agency	Maryland Department of Natural Resources	General		<p>Finally, there was no discussion regarding the impact the COVID 19 pandemic has had. With more businesses adopting hybrid working models, more people are staying at home. This means more water is being used and more wastewater generated. We urge the county to consider these changes when assessing infrastructure demands related to waste treatment, so they can more accurately assess capacity and plan for the future.</p>	<p>COVID is mentioned in a few chapters throughout the plan, but impacts on water/sewer not directly. Flow numbers are generated from the state and not the County although may be beneficial to include possible impact in Chapter 8: Teleworking Implications</p>	<p>Update chapter 8 and include possible impacts in Teleworking Implications.</p>	