



Re: Charles County Commissioner Public Comments - 4-8-2025

From John Adelodun <AdeloduJ@charlescountymd.gov>
Date Wed 4/9/2025 11:04 AM
To jamielynnelarson@gmail.com <jamielynnelarson@gmail.com>

Good Morning Mrs Larson,

Thank you for taking the time to join the Commissioners' Public Comment Session on April 8, 2025. We appreciate your participation and the input you shared.

Your comments have been received and will be added.

Regards,



John Adelodun
Assistant Clerk to the Commissioners
Charles County Commissioners
Charles County Government
200 Baltimore Street | La Plata, MD 20646
E: AdeloduJ@CharlesCountyMD.gov | O: [240-776-6709](tel:240-776-6709)

From: jamielynnelarson@gmail.com <jamielynnelarson@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 9, 2025 10:50 AM
To: John Adelodun <AdeloduJ@charlescountymd.gov>
Subject: Charles County Commissioner Public Comments - 4-8-2025

[External Content Warning] This message is from an external sender. Please exercise caution when opening attachments and hover over any links before clicking.

Hello John,

Below is are my comments from yesterday. I submitted 3 separate documents hard copy which should also be included. I have also linked them below.

Regards,

Jamie Larson

Sent from my iPhone

Jamie Larson - District 1

- I was deeply concerned after listening to comments and commissioner responses made during the last joint town hall. There were untruths spoken about commissioner Bowling and Stewart which only were made to allow for the justification of term limits. These same tactics were used with the charter initiative. Have we not learned from the past? We need accountability now with transparency and removal of commissioner.
- Because of Commissioner Coates' legal case a vast amount of information is available to the public. On the TLR (The Lagasse Report) website. They have organized all documents reviewed during the first Sargeant report.
- The first document listed is a letter from the Black Caucus of Charles County, Maryland. It references promises made during the 2018 election cycle. Our commissioners, state Senators, Congressmen, and Delegates were addressed. It painted broad strokes of a list of priorities and actionable directives. Specifically calling out promises made by elected officials of not appointing Republicans to the county administrator and county attorneys office. It equates political affiliation to racism and discrimination. Charles County government has a standing policy, which explicitly prohibits discrimination within county employment based on political affiliation.
- The promises made are extremely concerning. This is what allowed for the racial bias behaviors to fester in our local government.
- **Question:** Who on the previous board which is currently sitting here agreed to this prior to the 2018 election?
- **Charles County Staff:** I have provided the original copy of Charles County staff's concerns which was presented to the board previously after Commissioner Patterson statements on October 24 of only agreeing to vote in favor of releasing the second Sargent report if staff names were no longer redacted.
 - Commissioner Patterson stated in January that Mrs. Hall would be able to speak to my questions about if staff's concerns been addressed. Have the commissioners met with county employees?
 - **Action:** An agenda item needs to be added for an update during a board meeting about what changes have been implemented to protect all county staff from commissioner directed racial bias and protecting their confidentiality when concerns are raised. The community and staff deserve a response.

Attachments:

1. Black Caucus of Charles County, Maryland - Original

2b. BCCCM List Projects October 2019
UPDATED LIST.pdf
dropbox.com



2. Black Caucus of Charles County, Maryland - Revised

2b. BCCCM List Projects October 2019
UPDATED LIST.pdf
dropbox.com



3. Charles County Staff Concerns provided by HRBC to the Board of Charles County Commissioners.

The Human Resources Employee Committee's (HREC) mission is to be a trusted voice of Charles County Government personnel. The committee is dedicated to volunteering their time to enhance our workforce culture through engaging employees and responding to their needs.

The HREC received comments in response to a discussion during the October 24th Board of County Commissioners meeting about waiving attorney client privilege – investigative report. Staff asked that some of the comments received by the HREC be shared with our elected officials to ensure that you are aware of the impact that some of your statements have on members of the workforce.

- Concerned that Patterson wanted names because he's going to start a list of employees or something. Some people by the nature of their jobs had to provide information and were interviewed in the investigations. They are not treating people like people.
- Under absolutely no circumstances should the identities be released for employees who filed complaints of discrimination or testified regarding the discrimination of others—some of those did so with the assurance of attorney-client privilege, and others with the assumption of privacy.
- How are we supposed to continue to work and maintain our composure/cool. It's hard enough, but after 10/24/23 what are we supposed to do now?
- Not acknowledging us as people with families, we're instructed to do things per our job and wanting the names seems as if it's just to create biases. Can they say their intent is pure and with positive intent?
- So many people are just putting their heads down and just working. That's not a positive work culture.
- Can the employees have a meeting with the Commissioners?

- The comments from the meeting on Tuesday were interpreted as threatening. They are determined to find out who participated in the investigation, they don't care if some were just doing their jobs.
- BOCC is only out to protect themselves. Employees are powerless and helpless.
- My concern as an employee with 3 of our commissioners is that they obviously are not concerned with how one of their colleagues treats County employees. It was also disheartening to see that they wanted the names of the victims released to the party inflicting discrimination/retaliation. How are employees supposed to feel comfortable reporting further issues if they are not supported and risk having their name be public? Overall, I was extremely disappointed in Collins, Coates, and Patterson yesterday. It is clear they do not want to do what is right.
- Commissioner Patterson's comments during session today (10/24) requesting to reveal the employees' names in the 2nd Sargent report are absolutely disgusting and disheartening. As an employee, I am terrified to be working near/around/for people who so obviously are only out for their own benefit. To so willingly want to expose the employees who were brave enough to come forward... knowing what had happened to them and what likely would continue to happen because of who Coates is... I have no involvement in the report or investigation, but this conversation moved me to tears. I have never been scared to work here before, but I am now.
- I was incredibly angry and deeply concerned that a commissioner would ask that all names be revealed in the second investigation to the public and then directly to the accused...it was clear the motivation was to intimidate a commissioner; however, the blatant disregard for the protection of employees was sacrificed for what I can only assume is blind allegiance to one commissioner and/or retaliation against another commissioner. The entirety of the issue at hand is centered around the abuse and mistreatment of employees by a commissioner. Why then, are we as employees expected to not be outraged that another commissioner would then throw county employees under the bus in the direct line of site of that very same commissioner? I am angry that any employee who was asked to participate, who was interviewed, and especially those who brought accusations about Commissioner Coates is now fearful of potential retaliation. Retaliation from three commissioners...not just Commissioner Coates. I say so because it is